



Oxfordshire Cross Country League

ESTABLISHED 1987

sponsored by

**Oxford Mail**

## Equal Gender Race Distances Working Party Meeting Minutes

*Date:* Wednesday, 31<sup>st</sup> July 2019

*Time:* 19:30hrs

*Venue:* The Turnpike, Yarnton

### **Present:**

*League Officer:*

Dene Stringfellow (*League Manager*)

*Working Party Members:*

*Alchester RC:* Richard Gould

*Banbury Harriers AC:* Ros Kelling

*Bicester AC:* Emma Gould

*Bicester TC:* Lucy Davidson

*Didcot Runners:* Robert Dalgliesh, Sarah Rogers

*Headington RR:* Madeleine Ding

### **1) Apologies**

The following apologies were recorded:

*White Horse Harriers AC:* Simon Leech

*Witney RR:* Dan Wymer

### **2) Summary of Meeting Discussions**

The meeting focussed on establishing the options to be put forward as part of a revised Equal Gender Race Distances Proposal for review by member clubs at a meeting in early September before finalising the proposal for voting at a later meeting.

Thanks go to Dan Wymer (*Witney RR*) for producing his summary (**Appendix A**) that was used as a basis for discussion at the meeting.

It was noted at the beginning of the meeting following the decision to reject an equivalent EGRD proposal at the recent Hampshire Cross Country League AGM it has come to light that in some cases at least female athletes of member clubs have complained they were not consulted.

It was also noted that a recent hike in chip timing costs along with continued results post processing requirements has led the Chiltern Cross Country League to abandon chip timing for the time being.

It was decided the in the interests of clarity to keep the proposal options as simple and straightforward as possible, highlighting key points as bullet points rather than lengthy explanations to avoid any confusion.

During the course of the meeting concerns were raised regarding fixture organisers' minimum and maximum race distances with particular reference to the proposed **Option B**. It was felt the target distances should generally match those for **Option A** to avoid confusion.

The following points and concerns were raised and discussed during the course of the meeting:

- It was felt the options to be put forward for the revised proposal will have a significant positive impact for clubs that include junior sections. In particular, the gradual progression through the age groups in terms of race distances would avoid large jumps in race distance that could lead to athletes turning away from the sport.
- Male athletes make up the majority of the participants which could have an impact on the final vote. However, male athletes cannot be excluded given the potential impact on their race distances.
- The majority of member clubs do not have junior sections and may not take into consideration the impact of any decision reached on those member clubs that do have junior sections and their junior athletes.
- The possibility of taking an athlete poll was reconsidered, however **DS** pointed out that in the majority of cases it is the club that pays the entry fees, not the athletes. It is the member club that will inevitably have the final say in any decision.
- The impact on results production could be significant depending upon any decision reached.
- **DS** stated however that the purpose of the working party was to focus on the proposed options, not the potential impact on the results production. Whatever decision is ultimately voted for will have to be implemented.
- It was felt more publicity would be required to ensure member clubs send representatives to the review meeting and to get the message across of the importance of the meeting.

In the light of the discussions and decisions reach during the meeting **DW's** summary was rationalised to produce the proposed proposal options detailed in **Appendix B**.

### 3) Next Meeting

No further meetings are planned before the review presentation meeting scheduled for 11<sup>th</sup> September. It was agreed any further discussion/interaction will be conducted via email correspondence.

### 4) Outstanding Actions

- September review meeting date and venue to be confirmed – **action EG**.
- Agenda for review meeting – **action DS**.
- Documentation for review meeting – **action DS**.
- Notice of meeting to be emailed to member clubs, published on website and social media – **action DS (deadline: Wednesday, 21<sup>st</sup> August)**.

### 5) Close

The meeting was closed at 21:15hrs.

*Dene Stringfellow*  
**League Manager**

04 August 2019

# Equal Gender Race Distance Summary

Tuesday, 30 July 2019

Dan Wymer (Witney RR)

	Equal Distance (same for all events)	Equal Distance (chosen by host club)	Status Quo	
			(league rules)	(2019 average)
U9	1.2k (run together)	1.2k (run together)	1.2k (run together)	1.2k
U11	1.5k	1.5k	1.5k	1.5k
U13	3k	1.5k - 3.5k	2.5k	2.7k
U15	4.5k (run together)	3.5k - 5k (run together)	M: 4.8k, F: 3.5k	M: 4.9k, F: 3.8k
U17	6k (run together)	5k - 6.5k (run together)	M: 4.8k, F: 3.5k	M: 4.9k, F: 3.8k
U20, Senior & Vets	8k (+/-0.5k)	7k - 9k	M: 8.5k, F: 6.5k	M: 9.2k, F: 6.9k

## Team Structures & Competition

Change from U15/17 boys and U15/U17 girls teams to having a combined (boys & girls) U15 team & combined (boys & girls) U17 team.

Change from U15/17 boys and U15/U17 girls teams to having a combined (boys & girls) U15 team & combined (boys & girls) U17 team.

## Race Timetable

Same number of races as currently, although slightly longer U13, U15 & U17 races may require timings to be spread.

Same number of races as currently. Timetables may need to be spread if clubs chose longer race distances. Timetables may need to be condensed if clubs choose shorter distances. Could lead to different timetables for each round (or standard timetable based on longer races with potential gaps between races if shorter distances chosen).

## Distance Steps For Age Groups

Offers a much more progressive stepping of distances from one age group to the other.

Offers the potential for more progressive stepping of distances from one age group to the other. However, club choices provide a wider range of potential steps.

**Volunteer Requirements**

Less courses so less setup time and may require less marshals (course design dependant). If timetable needs to be stretched then volunteer time would similarly increase.

Less courses so less setup time and may require less marshals (course design dependant). If timetable is stretched by longer races then volunteer time would be similarly increased. Likewise, if the timetable is compressed, volunteer time would be reduced.

**Course Set Up**

1 less course required (6 rather than 7), could also reduce further by considering 2x 1.5k lap for U13. Some adjustment to certain existing courses required in first year.

1 less course required (6 rather than 7), could also reduce further by considering reusing laps for younger races. Some adjustment to certain existing courses required in first year.

**Participation**

Relatively small changes of course distance for older age groups should minimise the impact on participation.

Clubs can choose a distance that they feel could maximise participation.

# Equal Gender Race Distance Revised Proposal Options Summary

Wednesday, 31 July 2019

EGRD Working Party

	<b>Option A</b>	<b>Option B</b>	<b>Option C</b>	
	<b>Equal Distance</b>	<b>Equal Distance</b>	<b>Status Quo</b>	
	<b>(same for all events)</b>	<b>(chosen by host club)</b>	<b>(league rules)</b>	<b>(2019 average)</b>
<b>U9</b>	1.2k (run together)	1.2k (run together)	1.2k (run together)	1.2k
<b>U11</b>	1.5k	1.5k	1.5k	1.5k
<b>U13</b>	3k	3k	3k	2.7k
<b>U15</b>	4.5k (run together)	4.5k (run together)	M: 4.8k, F: 3.5k	M: 4.9k, F: 3.8k
<b>U17</b>	6k (run together)	6k (run together)	M: 4.8k, F: 3.5k	M: 4.9k, F: 3.8k
<b>U20, Senior &amp; Vets Male &amp; Female</b>	8k (+/-0.5k)	7k - 9k	M: 8.5k, F: 6.5k	M: 9.2k, F: 6.9k
<b>Team Structures &amp; Competition</b>	3/team combined - U15 & U17 Male, U15 & U17 Female	3/team combined - U15 & U17 Male, U15 & U17 Female		
<b>Race Timetable</b>	Little impact to timetable	Little impact to timetable		
<b>Distance Steps For Age Groups</b>	Offers a much more progressive stepping of distances from one age group to the other.	Offers a much more progressive stepping of distances from one age group to the other.		
<b>Volunteer Requirements</b>	Little or no impact on volunteer numbers	Little or no impact on volunteer numbers		
<b>Course Set Up</b>	1 less course required (6 rather than 7)	1 less course required (6 rather than 7). Course flexibility - best course for venue.		
<b>Participation</b>	Relatively small changes of course distance for older age groups should minimise the impact on participation.	Clubs can choose a distance that they feel could maximise participation for senior races.		