

British Caving Association

Minutes of the Training Committee Meeting 29th September 2005
10.00 a.m. at Stafford County Council Sports and Social Club

NOTE:- These minutes remain as a draft until approved or corrected by the next meeting.

Present	Idris Williams	BCA Training Officer
	Graham Mollard	NCP Chair
	Tom Redfern	ACI
	Eric Hoole	Cambrian Caving Council
	Nigel Atkins	Derbyshire Caving Association
	Paul Rafferty	British Cave Research Association
	John Cliffe	Co-opted.
	Steve Tomalin	Co-opted.

1. Apologies for absence.

Nigel Ball CIC Panel Chair, Steve Holding NAMHO
T.O. also apologised for not sending the mileage claims for the last meeting. He stated that Jonathon Roberts (BCA Treasurer) was now back in circulation following his severe car smash and would be able to deal with these claims. The subject of mileage allowance was raised and T.O. was asked to request an increase due to the recent escalation of fuel prices.

2. Minutes of meeting 9th April 2005

It was pointed out that the spelling of Tony Flanagan was erratic. Apart from that the minutes were accepted as a true record.

3. Matters arising from the minutes.

Joint Services Award comparison.

G.M. reported that he had had a discussion with Paul Rafferty, who is involved with the military scheme. P. R. tabled copies of the Joint Service Adventure Training Caving Proficiency Course Plan. A long discussion followed ending in the agreement that P.R. and G.M. would get together in comparing syllabuses (which at first sight look very similar) and report back to this committee with some guidelines.

Trainer/Assessor Insurance.

The NCP minutes 13th June 2005 detailed the request for:-

1. Professional indemnity.
2. Public Liability.
3. Product Liability.

T.O. queried the definition of product liability. It was explained that, this was to include equipment belonging to BCA or an individual Trainer/Assessor or any alleged defects in the schemes. However a complex discussion then ensued regarding the possible types of claim which could theoretically occur. It was agreed that this together with details of the numbers of assessors, and the number of training and assessments carried out should be sufficient to enable an approach to be made to the brokers.

T.O. Reported that he had attempted to discuss this with the BCA Insurance managers at Hidden Earth but had been unable to progress the matter.

Action:- T.O. to take this up with the BCA Insurance managers on a more formal basis.

Porth-yr-Ogof. This had been discussed at NCP where South Wales had stated that if P-y-O was on a candidates list then they would be carefully questioned as to the area to be entered, if the resurgence was present they should be assessed as to how they would handle it. T.O. raised a question regarding the differentiation between candidates not assessed in this and those who had been assessed regarding it and whether this should include White Horse Pool, which although deep and presenting many of the hazards of the resurgence did not have the resurgence's accident record.

J.C. stated that S.Wales panel felt that all candidates were assessed in these areas. T.O. pointed out that he at least was an exception to this having been assessed and re-validated three times without this being mentioned, although in fairness he could be expected to know about the hazards. G.M. stated that at NCP the ALO had confirmed that the assessment would include the resurgence if that was on the candidates list.

After some discussion it was agreed that Porth-yr-Ogof would have to appear on candidates Section 5's either including or excluding deep water as appropriate to avoid any confusion.

T.O. then raised the question of existing award holders but it was agreed that these would be dealt with at the three yearly re-validations.

Action:- G.M. to take up with S.Wales ALO that all assessments and re-validations should include an assessment of the candidates method of dealing with the Resurgence and White Horse Pool.

T.O. to instruct TASP that if the report from the Assessor did not state including deep water the Section 5 to be issued excluding deep water.

Notice of Expiry of Qualifying Awards. T.O. stated that all CIC and LCMLA holders are given 3 months notice of the expiry of their awards. He had now set up with TASP a procedure whereby all Trainer/Assessors are also given 1 month notice of their removal from the list of Trainer/Assessors if not revalidated.

Publications. Weather and flooding:- The only progress had been made was that PR had read through the information originating from D.Baines and others, however, progress beyond this point was very slow. T.O. stated that there should be some money available under the heading of Technical Advice which could be used to provide help on this subject. It was agreed that PR be given a commission to draw up an outline of what would be needed for the publication together with references to sources.

BCA Newsletter. A new issue had come out in which training was only represented by a list of courses and contacts. The committee felt that this was a poor substitute for Speleoscene/Training Bulletin as it had a limited circulation, however, there seemed at present no way to deal with this problem.

LCMLA Trainer/Assessors not holding CIC. A number of these exist. NCP had drawn up a list of routes for them to revalidate their awards with a practical on a three yearly basis to bring them into line with those holding CIC. T.O. stated that a case had arisen whereby a T/A had revalidated his award by a route which whilst suitable for a leadership development revalidation for the award was not included by the NCP as a route to revalidation of his Trainer/Assessor status. It was agreed that NCP would look at this wording with a view to opening up all practical routes for 6yearly revalidation to be suitable for this purpose.

4. NCP Report back.

G.M. Stated that the last meeting had been poorly attended and certain panels had not been represented for some time.

D. Carlisle. It had been possible for him to run a few courses covered by an employing centre.

Trainer Assessors responsibilities. A query had arisen about the liability falling on the Trainer Assessor if the candidate supplied his own technical equipment for which the T/A has no knowledge of its history. After some discussion it was agreed that legal opinion be sought on this matter.

Action:- T.O. to take this up with BCA Legal.

NCP had also discussed a feeling that a T/A sees a candidate on one occasion in one cave should there be a form of words which stated that the candidate met the standard on that day on that cave. General discussion ensued on the subject of overall responsibility of the T/A and it was agreed that the whole scheme was robust and it was generally accepted that any assessment under any scheme was a snap shot. Trainer/Assessors should keep records of the check lists, for each assessment so that if there should be a query later, records would exist confirming compliance with the requirements.

Handbook Issues.

Failure of Modules 2 or 4. NCP recommended that where a candidate fails either of these modules a time extension of a maximum of 12 months from the date of the failure can be given to retake the module.

Under Eighteens There had been some instances where candidates had attended training before their eighteenth birthday. NCP proposed that under eighteens be allowed to attend training provided that each case was referred to the Training Officer prior to the training. After some discussion Training Committee did not endorse this proposal.

Failure to do LDR on time. NCP proposed the following

5.4 A candidate has done a three year revalidation but failed to do a six year LDR on time. N.C.P. agreed that this candidate would be allowed twelve months maximum in which to carry out the LDR and the revalidation would run from the date the six years was originally due.

5.5 A candidate does a LDR more than twelve months before a standard three year revalidation is due. N.C.P. feels that the next revalidation should be a standard revalidation and should be no more than four years from the date of the workshop.

5.6.A candidate does an LDR. Less than twelve months before a standard revalidation is due. The N.C.P. feels that the next revalidation should be a standard revalidation and be dated from the date the standard revalidation was due.

5.7. LDR was done more than twelve months before a six year LDR was due. N.C.P. feels that a standard three year revalidation will be due no more than four years from the date of the workshop.

5.8 LDR done less than twelve months before a six year LDR is due. N.C.P. feels that a standard revalidation is due three years from the date that the six year revalidation was due.

Training Committee agreed that these would be incorporated into the LCMLA Handbook at next review and used as guidelines in the meantime.

Risk Assessments. A long discussion was held on this subject. There were many views expressed as to what was intended under this heading. It was agreed that large parts of the LCMLA and CIC syllabus covered all relevant aspects of the dynamic day to day assessment of the risks involved and how to deal with them, however, the syllabus did not offer (and some believed that it should not) any guidance on the formal statutory risk assessments required by Health and Safety legislation. No progress was made on reaching a consensus, however, P.R offered to send out copies of written assessments used at his centre.

Trainers only as panel members. Derbyshire panel had enquired regarding the possibility of having persons on the panel who were Trainers but not Assessors. It was pointed out that only Trainer/Assessors could undertake Training, however, it would be possible for T/As from other areas to run course but not assessments in a particular area. G.M stated that the requirements for "Trainers" to be on the panel would have to be the same as Trainer/Assessors. N.A reported that since the NCP meeting Derbyshire panel had decided to appoint further Trainer/Assessors.

Transfers between areas for mines and transfer from cave to mine. The point had been raised about Area transfers for mines and the committee agreed that where this happened T/As from the new area could insist on a practical assessment if there was any doubt about the candidates knowledge of differing mine types or other matters. A query had arisen from a candidate who had done cave training but requested mines assessment. The query had been dealt with by insisting that the candidate attend mines training. The committee endorsed this procedure. The committee also agreed that more latitude could be available for a mines trained candidate who wanted assessment in caves.

Notification of needs for LDR to ALOs. S. Wales panel requested that ALOs be given a list of the candidates due for LDR as the notices went out, to enable better planning of workshops.

Action:- T.O. to look into the feasibility of this.

5. CIC Panel Report back.

Entry onto CIC Training Courses. This had been raised at NCP as well. Currently the qualification for entry on to CIC courses was previous attendance at Level 2 training, although progression to assessment was not possible until Level 2 assessment had been completed. The purpose of this was to open up CIC training to recreational cavers. Problems had occurred on some CIC training courses when cavers who were not fully SRT proficient had held back other course members. Some debate was entered into regarding methods of overcoming this problem. The committee agreed to await CIC Panel recommendations.

Teaching Skills. N.B. had discussed with T.O. a proposal to change the emphasis in CIC training from caving skills to teaching skills as currently some panel members felt that the emphasis was wrong.

Appointment of Trainer Assessors. The committee discussed the procedure laid down for this but at present CIC panel had not yet formally identified a need for more T/As.

If CIC panel reported back to Training Committee that there was a need then the procedure would be implemented.

6. CIC Handbook finalising for publishing.

T.O. said that the teaching skills proposal was a long-term issue and he did not intend to hold up progress on the handbook for that, as there was a backlog of 2 years worth of candidates waiting for their copies. He apologised for the delays in his proof checking but hoped to have it finalised this year. He had the amended mines module clauses and now needed the cover pictures.

7. TTASP work.

It was agreed that there was no need for T.O. to detail every case dealt with. One case did need discussing:- This was a candidate whose award expired in May 2004. The candidate had discussed this with T.O. asking for an extension due to maternity leave and sickness. He had stated as per handbook that the candidate needed to be reassessed. In 2002 Bob Mehew had been in touch with her and stated that an SRT module could not be used to reset her clock. However, later paperwork had been submitted to G.M. (following a telephone conversation between her assessor and T.O.) showing the award expiring in June 2005. In view of the maternity and sickness G.M. agreed an extra 10 months extension to gain logbook experience before revalidating.

T.O. pointed out that this candidate had made contact three times and had been given slightly different advice. He felt that this showed the need to record any variations to standard as a logbook insert to serve as a record.

Action:- T.O. to set up such a procedure with TASP using a 4B sheet.

8. Training Grants. 2005 progress.

T.O. reported that there was again a shortage of applications. The position was confused, as at the beginning of the year it was not known if there would be any money after April. It was known that there was £500 up to April which had been promised to DCA this eventually resulted in a claim for £370 as an event had not been well supported and a further event had been run at minimal cost.

Further applications had been approved for £130 Devon Mining Club.

£100 Elysium Caving Club.

£500 Council of Higher Education Clubs.

This Totalled £1100 out of £2000 with a further application expected from SWCC.

N.A. tabled further applications for 2006 together with an application for an SRT Rig & Rescue event in Nov. 2005.

This still left a projected shortfall for this year.

Action:- Regional Council Reps to promote grant aided training in their areas.

T.O. reported that he had been in touch with Jon Whiteley regarding SRT training at Hidden Earth 2005. He had asked if something could be laid on out of the main hall. This had not proved possible so the idea had been dropped.

Regarding Hidden Earth 2006 this was to be in Derbyshire 23rd-24th September. It was agreed that Training Committee would look into the possibility of running SRT training and also guided novice trips aimed at spouses and offspring of attendees.

Action:- T.O. To discuss this with Hidden Earth organisers.

9. Any other Business.

UK Sport grants.

T.O. stated that a letter had been received from UK Sport which finally clarified the position. The grant had been halved last year (and virtually all of this allocated to training), and it would be halved again for next year reducing to nothing the year following. BCA Chairman had managed to persuade Sport England to make a grant of £5000 for next year so the indications were that for next year, training funding would continue as the same level. T. R. suggested that CCPR would be the best route to apply pressure as a number of other governing bodies were in the same position. He added that there seemed to be a lack of joined up thinking that whilst one government minister was praising NGBs for their contribution over the work at height matter another arm of government was deleting the funding which made it possible. T.O. suggested that one response that Training Committee should make was a revision of the fee structure for the Award schemes. These fees had been fixed at least for the last three years.

Action:- T.O. to circulate prior to the next meeting a summary of the financial position of Training without government grants.

Work at Height.

T.R stated that a meeting with HSE was about to happen, it appeared that Gorge Walking, canyoning etc. had no specific NGB and seemed to fall between ourselves and MLTB. After some discussion the Committee agreed that if it was dry and involved ascent it was more akin to climbing, however if it was wet and involved descent then it was more like caving. If it came to a need for this activity to come under the wing of any specific NGB then it was felt that BCA was the most appropriate body.

Level 2 Trainer Assessor.

Andy Lewington had fulfilled the requirements for progressing from a Level 1 Trainer to Level 2 in S.Wales panel. Training Committee resolved to approve this subject to recommendation at the next NCP meeting.

CIC Trainer Assessor Appointments.

N.A. raised the appointment procedure used about three years ago when some appointments were made. He stated that these had not been in accordance with the procedure laid down in the CIC Handbook. However, it was then pointed out that these appointments had been made prior to the Handbook being published and that they should have been made in accordance with whatever procedures were in force at the time. T.O. stated that any further appointments would be made in accordance with the current handbook requirements.

10. Dates of next meetings.

17th December 2005 and 8th April 2006 were already agreed. September 28th 2006 was agreed (this is a Thursday).