

MINUTES OF THE N.C.P.MEETING HELD AT STAFFORD ON FRIDAY 6TH
JUNE 2003.

Present: D.Edwards, T.Redfern, D.Proctor, E.Hoole, Pat Ramsden, G.N.Mollard.

1. Apologise for absence: D.Baines, J.Crowsley, D.Morrison, I.Williams,
S.Tomkin,
R.Mehew.

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 13th January were read and approved.

3. Matters arising.

3.1 The C.I.C. handbook will not be ready for it's target date. It appears R.M.
is running

behind on a couple of areas, it then must go back to the C.I.C. panel for
tweaking and then
to D.E. for proof reading.

3.2 A.C.I. are now full members of N.C.A. and have full voting rights on all the
committees, T.R. is their rep. On these committees.

3.3 The position of C.I.Cs used on training courses has been raised again by the
Northern
panel (4.3.3.3). This will be re-discussed at the 'six month in period' i.e. at
the September
meeting.

3.4 Module 3 personal skills at level 2 with S.R.T. for the leader. Most panel
members

agreed that this was only workable on a one to one basis . It was noted that the
panel felt

there was a need to have a body present who was not part of the assessment.

3.5 Traverse lines at level 1. D.E. will cobble together wording to meet the
need of level 1

basic traverse lines. Something like ' A basic level one traverse line is one
where the rope

people attach themselves to keeps them on safe ground, in the event of a slip
the person

would not be hanging in space'. The definitive wording will be included in the
next run of
the handbook.

3.6 D.E. reported that liason had taken place between A.Piece, D.Carlisle, D.P.
and himself

re the C.I.C. mines module. Recommendations have been taken to the C.I.C. panel
who

have approved this section. D.E. reported that little change has taken place
from the original

as those involved felt they needed to run with it for a time and then modify it
as and when

necessary. Thanks to D.E. for actioning this.

4.00 Training Committee.

4.1 Site specific assessments: There was a lengthy discussion around this
subject, some felt

that if the N.C.A. were to make recommendations then these would impede upon the
work

of C.I.C.s who were not trainers and Assessors. It could also take work away
from C.I.C.s

who were not panel members. Others felt the wording suggested by D.E. was
constructive

and useful and accepted this as a recommendation. It was agreed that there was more work needed on this and the Training Committee would action this investigation. 4.2 training courses for cavers were discussed, most of these were D.C.A. generated. It was noted that there was a real need for more S.R.T. courses to be run for clubs. A suggestion was put forward by G.M. that possibly professional cavers could become mentors attaching themselves to specific clubs. They would be available to give advice and also to run free training courses for that club if it so wished. This was felt to be worth considering and should be taken back to the panels. It was noted that this could not do the professional cavers image any harm at all in the eyes of the club cavers. A.C.I. also felt they had a role to play in this area.

5.00 The Scout Association Authorisation Scheme. D.E. gave a brief potted history of the situation, he said there were two principles to be aware of, firstly the ideal world where all scout caving leaders entered the L.C.L.M.A./ C.I.C scheme. He felt this was unrealistic in a voluntary body although some scout cavers have taken this pathway. D.E. pointed out that scouts were not obliged to have formal qualifications and therefore there was no leverage to force scout cavers down the L.C.L.M.A. road. The second principle is that any coherent plans to formally improve what is at present available must only be a positive move. D.E. pointed out that we are at present talking to the Scout Association where there has been an impasse for the past ten years. D.E. suggested that we need to be willing to compromise, with the draft on the table we stand a very good chance that every Scout Association cave leader would at least have been through a level one or two training courses. This in itself would be a major step forward. T.R. said he was totally opposed to the N.C.A. becoming involved in any scheme that would undermine the L.C.L.M.A. in accepting lesser standards than those already available. D.E. asked what was the alternative? Should we just leave the Scout Association as it is and generally wash our hands of it, or should we at least influence some change that would improve greatly the status quo. D.E. pointed out this is not a rival to the L.C.L.M.A. it is purely an in-house scheme which will hold no validity outside of the Scout Association. D.E. suggested that it appeared we were all in favour of the scout Association leaders

undergoing the relevant training at level one or two, but the problem arose at the assessment level. Maybe the N.C.A. could endorse the training section and suggest they use the N.C.A. University club package for their consenting adults. We could then suggest that they use a C.I.C.holder to carry out the assessments rather than doing them in-house, but we would obviously not endorse this last section although it would come inline with our suggestions for site specific assessments. G.M. suggested that if the Scout Association was adamant that they wished to keep the assessment in-house then at level one the assessor should be at least level two and at level two the assessor should be C.I.C. D.E. will bounce these proposals off I.W. he will then re-draft and circulate at the next N.C.P. meeting. We must remember that the N.C.A. wishes to move this forward as much as the Scout Association does, and the N.C.A. needs to have some influence in the scout Association to ensure good practise prevails.

6.0 Assessors that do not meet the norm. For some time there have been a few Trainer/Assessors that do not hold C.I.C.s some because they have specialist knowledge that the N.C.A. required and some that had 'grandfather' rights having been in at the inception of the scheme. Possible LCMLA revalidation options were discussed including the six year re-validation by running a workshop, attending a workshop or taking part in a C.I.C. revalidation (to be agreed via C.I.C. Panel D.E. to action).

7.0 C.I.C.s that wish to downgrade to L.C.L.M.A. level one or two. All C.I.C.S wishing to downgrade must initially contact D.E. If the C.I.C. is in date then they will be expected to attend a six-year re-validation. If the C.I.C is out of date then D.E. will make the decision as to whether the downgrade can be accepted. All C.I.C.s downgrading will be expected to register with the L.C.L.M.A. scheme.

8.00 The new section 4b has a defer box. If a candidate is deferred this must be completed and sent in to P.R. This is the case when you consider the candidate is not as yet ready for assessment and should be re-assessed some time in the future. This should not be used if you are just waiting for the candidate to produce a piece of writing.

9.00 3.4.1d will now read: 'Once an assessment has been started it must be completed within one year. The validity of any assessment module will lapse after twelve months and any such module may have to be repeated'. This was agreed to unanimously. It

was also agreed that that candidates over the one year but not over two would be sent to D.E. Where the lapse was greater than two years and if the candidate can prove exceptional circumstances then the application must be put to the N.C.P.

10.0 The Bibliography. This needs updating; there is no reason why the C.I.C. and the L.C.L.M.A. bibliography should not be a joint one. T.R. agreed to take this on board. This will then go to P.R. for circulation to the panels. This needs to be concise rather than comprehensive but should cover all areas of both syllabuses.

11.0 Idris would like to increase the amount of technical information available to club cavers on the N.C.A. website. Des Marshall has given all the information that he collected some years ago to Idris with the intention of possibly publishing some or all of it. D.E. may possibly be willing to take on this task, but it will need a budget, updates from the original contributors and the release of ownership by Des.

12.0 a.o.b. B.C.A. and how it will effect C.I.C.s and L.C.L.M.A.s The general consensus was that there would be strong opposition from both parties to paying a mandatory yearly subscription to keep your qualification. People are members of B.C.R.A. because they wish to be and they see it as value for money. It was generally felt the it was a nonsense if your certificate ceased to be valid just because you don't pay your subs. This does not effect your technical competence. We felt we would be willing to include an element of B.C.A. membership in the initial registration fee but after the first year it would be voluntary. If B.C.A. was offering services that leaders wanted they would stay members if not they would walk away. Area panels should include this as an agenda item at their next meeting

12.1 The professional side of caving does not appear to be well represented on the N.C.A. Council, I.W. represents training but that is a total overview and not necessarily the panels or the freelance instructors.

13.0 Date of the next meeting----- 24th September at Stafford 10.30 a.m.

14.0 Meeting closed at 2.00 p.m.