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BMC NATIONAL COUNCIL<br>Draft Minutes of the National Council Webinar meeting held on $26^{\text {th }}$ February 2020. 18:00-19:30

## To discuss the Proposed Process for Council Nominated Director (CND) Appointments

## In attendance

## Voting members:

President
Cymru South Wales
Lakes \& CND
London \& South East
Midlands
North East
North West
North West
Peak
Peak
South West
South West
Yorkshire \& Deputy President

## Observers:

Director
R33 Working Group
R33 Working Group
Clubs Committee Chair
Chair, LMG

Lynn Robinson
Steve Quinton
Fiona Sanders
Chris Stone
David Jones
Mark Anstiss
Bill Beveridge
Carl Spencer
David Brown
Alison Cairns
Helen Wilson
Philip Wilson
Andy Syme

Jonathan White (JW)
Rik Payne (RP)
Roger Murray (RM)
Peter Salenieks
Martin Wragg
(LR) Chair
(SQ)
(FS)
(CSt)
(DJ)
(MA)
(BB)
(CSp)
(DB)
(AC)
(HW)
(PW)
(AS)

## Apologies for absence

Jon Punshon, Robert Dufton, Mick Green.

## 1. Welcome and Introduction

LR welcomed people to the webinar meeting and gave an overview of the background to why the meeting was being held. LR emphasised that if anyone had any questions, then to ask for clarification during the meeting and that the meeting was being recorded.

## 2. Background

A National Council webinar meeting that was held on the $10^{\text {th }}$ February, 2020 agreed unanimously, via vote, that the Organisational Development Group (ODG) R33 Working Group would propose a process for future Council Nominated Director (CND) appointments.

Once this had been concluded, it was agreed that another NC webinar, to discuss the R33 proposed process for CND appointments, would take place followed by an electronic vote that would require $75 \%$ agreement by voting members of NC. This would take place after the webinar and NC voting members will have a few days to vote.

LR explained the importance of NC reviewing, inputting into and knowing the CND appointment process that will take place prior to and during the next NC meeting that is being held on the $28^{\text {th }}$ March 2020.

## 3. Proposed Process

A paper which outlined the proposed process was discussed. The table below outlines the proposed process for the CND selection process and includes points for clarification and rationale for the proposal. This was amended by LR during the meeting, incorporating changes agreed by NC members who were at the meeting.

## Proposed Process

1 NC will be provided with a paper stating the role of CNDs.

This will include a briefing on the skills matrix key points.

Candidates to provide:

- a two-page CV
- a statement of 500 words maximum. This should include reference to the CND role description
- a self-assessment against the Board of Directors skills matrix (anonymised) and submit as part of their application.

Deadline $=$ by the close of play $15^{\text {th }}$ March.
The statements and updated skills matrix will be distributed to all members of NC via Teamwork (including all the candidates).

## Points for clarification / rationale

So that all of NC (including candidates) are clear about the role and have the opportunity to ask questions to the Chair of NC and the Chair of the Board.

To ensure all Councillors have been informed of any skills gaps.

The skills matrix and CND role briefing paper will be updated prior to issue. The intent is to reduce the size of the briefing paper to assist Councillors in understanding the issues.

The candidates' information will be put on Teamwork on the $16^{\text {th }}$ March, giving NC members time to review the information prior to the NC meeting on the $28^{\text {th }}$ March.

| 3 | The NC Chair will give an overview, at the NC meeting on the $28^{\text {th }}$ March of: <br> a. the aim of the nomination process including the requirements to be mindful of the skills matrix and CND role. <br> b. any key points from the briefing paper and skills matrix. | To give NC members the opportunity to ask questions and ask for points of clarification before voting. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Candidates to give a presentation (5-minutes maximum); this could include supportive slides (eg PowerPoint) if they choose. These presentations will not be distributed prior to the meeting. <br> After the presentation, people will be able to ask directed questions in relation to their presentation. <br> Candidates will be present in the room whilst the other candidates make their presentations and Q\&A. <br> The order that the candidates give their presentations will be randomly selected. <br> To clarify the candidates will be able to vote. | Not surname alphabetical. Randomly selected, so no bias given to any particular candidate. |
| 5 | At the end of their presentation there will be a Q\&A session for up to 20 minutes. <br> The order that the candidates are asked questions will be randomly selected. | Longer than previous. <br> Gives the candidates the opportunity to answer questions last. No bias given to any particular candidate. |
| 6 | Voting members of NC cast their vote based on a ranking system on the ballot papers provided. <br> See Appendix One (page 5) for more detail. | The R33 group explored and debated what was the most suitable voting system for the circumstances of three candidates and two vacant roles, given that the candidates were known to NC. <br> It was acknowledged that there are challenges with any voting system. The two main considerations that were taken into account were that of; simplicity (first past the post) and consensus (Borda Count ranking system). <br> It was concluded that consensus was the most important consideration and therefore the voting system recommended by the R33 is the Borda Count ranking system. |


| 7 | Two BMC Officers will review the results out of <br> the room. <br> See Appendix Two (pages $6 \& 7$ ) for more <br> detail. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Contention will only arise if either all three <br> (very unlikely) or the second and third <br> candidate have the same number of votes. <br> In the case that the second and third <br> candidates receive the same number of votes, <br> a simple majority vote will take place, involving <br> just the 2nd and 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ place candidates. |  |  |
| After the second vote, if there is still a draw, <br> the Chair of NC will have the casting vote(s). <br> The outcome of the vote will be published. |  |  |
| The individual candidate scores will be <br> published. | In line with the conclusions and recommendations <br> from the Governance Working Group. |  |

Jon Punshon sent his apologies, but Mark Anstiss reported back that he had spoken to Jon regarding the above proposal, and he agreed with the R33 voting system proposal.

## 4. Next Steps

NC voting members will now be asked to vote, via an electronic poll, via google polls, whether they agree, disagree or abstain from the proposed process. The voting members will have a few days to vote. The deadline for votes will be close of play on the $3^{\text {rd }}$ March, 2020.

## 5. Conclusion

Members were thanked for their input into the above proposal.
In the meantime, if any NC members have any questions or queries, then contact Lynn Robinson (lynn.robinson@bmcvolunteers.org.uk) or telephone 07731012054.

The above was accepted as an accurate record of the meeting:

## APPENDIX ONE

## Instructions to all Voting Members of National Council (NC)

There are two vacancies for Council Nominated Directors (CNDs) on the BMC Board of Directors. It is for voting members of NC to nominate who they would like to represent them on the Board.

Three councillors have expressed interest in being nominated for the two positions, therefore the Borda Count ranking process will be used to select the CNDs.

## How to vote using the Ranking System

1. After reading the three candidates applications, hearing their presentations and responses to questions, you need to decide your preference as to which candidates you want to represent you, as CNDs, on the Board.
2. The candidate who is your first choice - allocate them 3 points.
3. The candidate who is your second choice - allocate them 2 points.
4. The candidate who is your last choice - allocate them 1 point.

Please see the example table below:

| Name of Candidate | You complete this <br> column | Explanation |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Candidate A | 1 | Candidate that is your last choice |
| Candidate B | 3 | Candidate that is your first choice |
| Candidate C | 2 | Candidate who is your second choice |

Please complete the table below (names in surname alphabetical order):

| Name of Candidate | You complete this column <br> Write in number 3, 2 or 1. Each candidate MUST be allocated a <br> score, or none of your scores will count. |
| :--- | :--- |
| As an the process <br> gagreed - real <br> names not used. | You cannot allocate the same score to one or more of the <br> candidates. You must put 3, 2, or 1 next to a name in this column. <br> $3=$ first choice <br> $2=$ second choice <br> $1=$ last choice |
| Jones, Susan |  |
| Smith, Fred |  |
| Walters, Simon |  |

Once all the votes have been counted, the two candidates with the highest scores will be nominated.

## Instructions to BMC Officers regarding counting the votes using the Borda Count Ranking System

Each voting member of National Council (NC) present at the NC meeting on the $28^{\text {th }}$ March, apart from the three candidates, will be asked to complete a ballot card as shown in the example below.

| Name of Candidate <br> As an example to get the process agreed - really names not used. | You complete this column <br> Write in number 3, 2 or 1 . Each candidate MUST be allocated a score, or none of your scores will count. <br> You cannot allocate the same score to one or more of the candidates. You must put 3, 2, or 1 next to a name in this column. $\begin{aligned} & 3=\text { first choice } \\ & 2=\text { second choice } \\ & 1=\text { last choice } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Jones, Susan | 2 |
| Smith, Fred | 3 |
| Walters, Simon | 1 |

## Spoilt Votes

1. There must be a number beside each name. If not, then this will be classed a spoilt vote, so discard the ballot card and don't include any of the scores in the count.
2. If the same number is used more than once, for example, if someone puts the number 2 beside each name, this will be classed a spoilt vote, so discard the ballot card and don't include any of the scores in the count.
3. The numbers 3 , 2 and 1 MUST be allocated to a candidate; otherwise it will be classed as a spoilt vote and must be discarded.

## Counting the Votes

1. Write the names of each candidate on a separate sheet of paper (three sheets of paper).
2. Go through each ballot card and write the number given to each candidate on the separate sheets.
3. Count the numbers, see example below, with ten people voting:

| Name of Candidate | Score given |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jones, Susan | $2,2,2,1,3,2,1,2,1,2$ |
|  |  |
| TOTAL SCORE | 18 |


| Name of Candidate | Score given |
| :--- | :--- |
| Smith, Fred | $3,3,3,2,1,3,3,3,3,3$ |
| TOTAL SCORE | 27 |


| Name of Candidate | Score given |
| :--- | :--- |
| Walters, Simon | $1,1,1,3,2,1,2,1,2,1$ |
| TOTAL SCORE | 15 |

## The two candidates with the highest scores are nominated.

In the example above that would be Susan Jones (18 points) and Fred Smith (27 points).

## What if two candidates receive the same score?

In the event of an equal score being given to the second and third choice candidates, another vote will take place between those two candidates. This will use a simple majority count.

Voting members of NC will be given another ballot sheet with the two candidates' names on. Voters will be asked to put a cross beside their preferred candidate. The candidate with the most crosses will be nominated.

If, after a second vote, the scores are still equal, the Chair of NC will have the casting vote.

## Publishing the Results

The outcome of the vote will be published. The individual candidate scores will be published.

