



USRowing

**Minutes of
The US Rowing Association
Referee Commission Meeting**

**March 20, 2004
Chicago IL**

In attendance: Robert Appleyard, Bill Collins,
Roxanne Everetts, Rachel Le Mieux, Tom Lotz,
Tom Mannle, Bruce Soden, Larry Tolle, John Walker
USRowing Staff: Jody Pope
Partial Attendance: Nikola Vajda, Pat O'Connor – City
Securities, Jerra Bales – K & K Insurance

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Appleyard (8:05 PM)
2. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**
Le Mieux moved to approve the agenda; Soden seconded. (Motion passed 9-0)
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 2003:** Le Mieux reported that executive session minutes from December 2003 have not been transcribed. Date discrepancies from previous draft versions have been corrected. Minutes are automatically approved 10 days after final distribution
4. **COMMISSION ACTIONS SINCE December 2003 MEETING:**
 - a. None Reported.
5. **TREASURER'S REPORT**
 - a. Final report on 2003 expenditures. Collins reported that expenditures for 2003 were \$9758.06, under the \$12,000 budget allocation. The principal reason for the underrun was no summer meeting. The unused portion is not carried over.
 - b. Current (2004) budget and expenses: Budget allocation of \$12,000 for 2004 will likely be exceeded, because a summer meeting is being planned for, and the rate of expenditure. The proposed distribution of the funds will be the same as in 2003, based on the minutes of the December 2003 meeting.

Tolle commented that the distribution of line items seemed not realistic given that items were being budgeted for that were not being spent.
Collins went over the budget line item by line item, in response.

Appleyard commented that overall, the budget allocation for 2004 would be fully utilized, with the possibility of being overrun.

Everetts asked if the issue of a larger allocation should not be brought up now; Collins demurred, given that the year has just begun.

Appleyard indicated that he would like to present a request to the Board for a larger allocation, but such a request needs more documentation and evidence to support it. Currently, members are subsidizing the enterprise, so that the true costs are hidden.

Collins reported that the Commission received donations in the amount of \$955.00.

- c. Issuance of new licenses: Collins presented alternatives and a proposal for issuing a more substantial card to indicate Referee license and status. Collins presented examples of each alternative, and discussed the costs involved in each. He provided an example of the information content to be provided on the card. This would be Name, Title/Status, referee license number, and USRowing number.

Collins proposed to acquire 500 cards at a total expense of a little over \$500.00. The Commission would provide an updated list of names to the vendor four times a year, with information flowing through the Commission Vice Chair. Cards would be returned to the Commission for distribution.

Lotz moved to authorize Collins to proceed with the proposal for the 20mm card. Soden seconded. (Approved 9-0)

Collins to send notice in email that he is making the initial order in case if any changes are needed on the card.

- d. Preparation and implementation of a standardized expense tracking form to distribute to Clinicians. Appleyard asked Collins for a status report on a standardized expense tracking form. This item has not been pursued; and in its absence it is hard to document the true expenses incurred by the Regions, and should there not be a more standardized approach?

Discussion centered on the current budget allocation for each region, currently \$200.00, primarily used to support clinics and clinicians. Le Mieux commented that she could use more funds, to invest in more equipment. It was generally acknowledged that more was being spent, i.e., regional activities were being subsidized by the clinicians themselves and outside parties. The Regions were polled re: could they live with the current allocation of \$200 per region.

Poll Question: is the current \$200 regional budget allocation sufficient?

- SW – yes
- NW – yes – at current expectations
- MA – don't know, need more info
- NE – Yes – at current expectations with current clinicians paying out of pocket
- MW – no

6. Commission Operations and Governance

a. Election of officers for the 2004 term

Appleyard noted that Commission officers would serve for one year, based on the December 2003 meeting. Collins noted that the limits on consecutive terms approved in December, 2003, would not properly take effect until 2004. A consensus of the members agreed with this interpretation. It was agreed that election for any contested position would be by written ballot; Nikola Vajda agreed to act as the teller of elections.

1.) Chairman

Appleyard nominated himself, Lotz seconded.

Approved by acclamation

2.) Vice-chairman

Everetts nominated herself, Appleyard seconded.

Tolle nominated Le Mieux, Soden seconded

Everetts elected 6-3

3.) Secretary

Mannle nominated himself, Le Mieux seconded

Tolle nominated Walker, Soden seconded

Mannle elected 6-3

4.) Treasurer

Everetts nominated Collins, Soden seconded

Approved by acclamation

b. Objectives and goals for the 2004 term:

Welcome to new members

Roundtable opportunity to state preference for priority issues that require commission attention.

Collins indicated that new licenses were important as an accomplishment; Everetts indicated that they would be a retention item as well. Collins would like to see the information content on the USRowing website to be improved.

Lotz: no report.

Tolle reported on the MW issues: referee requirements to include the regatta specialist

concept and recognizing the role of the Chief referee; the interplay among regatta registration, organization membership, and related issues; improving head race rules; and the growth of masters rowing.

Appleyard: to represent the interests of this Commission and referees at large to the Board; to engage in a dialogue with the Board about what constitutes a registered regatta, to include the interests of the Commission in that dialogue; and to address the continuing concerns re: the financial costs of being an official.

Everetts: recruiting training and retention as areas of continuing and critical importance; emphasizing that officiating is enjoyable.

Walker: liaison roles with other groups/bodies within USRowing and external groups; standardizing the communications among all parts of USRowing so we can speak as one voice. The liaisons are a good step in this direction.

Soden: recruitment, retention and rewards for the referees. The number of referees in the NE needs to increase or there will not be enough refs to support the number of regattas.

Mannle: Looking at a three-year horizon, would expect by the end of that time to have sharpened the relationship for the expectations of referee competence at different levels of experience, and to see this adequately reflected in testing and training materials. Also, to emphasize the soft skills needed to be a competent referee, i.e., human relations and interpersonal skills. Every moment is a teachable moment, and these are sometimes lost because we're more eager to harshly correct than to gently educate.

Le Mieux: focus on the financial issues associated with being a referee, followed by recruitment, training and retention.

Appleyard appreciated the comments and indicated it was a valuable basis for moving forward.

Everetts moved to compile a list of goals to be reviewed for accomplishments and lessons learned at the December 2004 meeting. Collins seconded. (Approved 9-0)

Mannle to compile list of action items (beginning with the December 2003 meeting) aligned with goals and provide to Chairman by April 15.

c. Proposal to appoint commission liaisons to USRowing committees and events.

Lotz presented the motions previously submitted to the Commission

Appleyard noted that the liaison proposals do not impose any structure on the other groups, and that the Chairman remains the formal point of contact for them. Rather, the proposal delegates other Commission members to provide the practical, routine channel of communications between the other groups and the Commission

1.) Motion; discussion; and vote for approval.

Motions if approved to be reflected in the IOP Trials, NSR, High Performance to be invested in one individual

Lotz motions via email (attached) re: Liaison to USRowing Committees (strike “standing”, include Youth, Adaptive and High Performance); Tolle seconded. (Approved 9-0)

Liaisons to national championship regattas: the Commission engaged in a substantial discussion concerning the pros and cons of the motion. Lotz withdrew his motion as written

Regional representatives will act as de facto Commission liaisons to national championship regattas held in their regions. Liaisons to provide reports to the Commission in December 2004.

2.) Appointments

A discussion ensued re: appointment by the Chair vs. election of liaisons by the Commission; the consensus was that the Chair should make the appointments.

Masters committee: Lotz and Tolle expressed interest.

Junior and youth committees: Le Mieux and Soden expressed interest; Soden subsequently withdrew.

High performance committee: Appleyard expressed interest.

Adaptive rowing community: Walker expressed interest.

Appleyard made the following appointments:

Le Mieux – Junior and youth

Appleyard – High Performance/ Competition Task Force/Trials

Walker – Adaptive rowing

Competition task force of the board: See above; Appleyard as single liaison for High

Performance/Competition Task Force/Trials

USRowing national championships: See above

Masters national championships: See above

d. Commission subcommittees

1.) *Affirmation of commitment to utilizing the subcommittee structure.*

Mannle proposed the following revision to the subcommittee structure: the subcommittees of the Commission shall be:

- Grievance/appeals
- Ethics and performance
- Publications and recognition
- Curriculum, training and evaluation
- Rules and safety
- Selections
- Policy and procedures

Walker expressed concern that there was not sufficient time to fully consider the implications of the proposed reorganization. Discussion ensued. After discussion, Mannle amended his motion to call for a non-binding vote. (Failed, 3-5-1)

Le Mieux moved to eliminate the Selections subcommittee as being superfluous to guidance/procedures already in the IOP; Soden seconded. (Approved 9-0)

2.) *Differentiate areas of responsibility delineated by “training” and “education” (i.e. recruiting testing and training versus education publications and recognition) No discussion, see 1) above.*

3.) *Proposal to expand “rules” subcommittee to “rules and safety.” No discussion, see 1) above.*

Mannle to develop a proposal to amend the committee structure, including items 2 & 3, and distribute to Commission by email for vote.

4.) *Proposal to commission a working group/subcommittee to provide an annual review and summary of insurance and liability issues that may impact referees (Appleyard). Discussion centered on the need for the information, and its desirability. Appleyard moved to establish a subcommittee on Insurance and Liability (attached); Soden seconded.*

Appleyard amended his motion to establish the group as an ad-hoc advisory task force, rather than a standing sub-committee. (Approved 9-0)

Appleyard to continue to develop the ad hoc committee, and assign a liaison now so the issues are covered for the current season (potentially Lloyd McDonald).

Mannle to address the issue of the proper locus for continuing responsibility for insurance and liability issues in a discussion of a revised committee structure.

5.) *Must each designated subcommittee be headed by a sitting member of the Commission, or*

may they be appointed with a Commission member as a formal liaison?

Tolle and Le Mieux expressed strong reservations about having standing committees of the Commission (note revised terminology) be headed by non-Commission members

Collins expressed interest in having leadership opportunities in the committee functions be available for non-Commission members, and is comfortable with the idea as long as one Commission member is on the committee.

Tolle indicated that while it is potentially feasible, it has not worked yet. Le Mieux indicated that while non-Commission members could head ad hoc committees, it would not be appropriate to have them head standing committees of the Commission.

Discussion on term limits focused on a committee head whose performance was deemed unsatisfactory, yet under the second motion their term on the committee would be as long as their term on the Commission.

Appleyard moved to allow subcommittee heads to be non-Commission members; Soden seconded. (Failed 3-6).

Appleyard moved that the commitment as a subcommittee head lasts for the duration of an individual's term on the Commission; Soden seconded. (Failed 0-9)

Le Mieux moved that the committee heads would be appointed for a term of one year, beginning in January, Collins seconded. (Approved 9-0)

6.) *Appointment of subcommittee heads*

Appleyard reported that the following were currently acting in the following roles and/or made appointments as indicated in italics:

- *Grievance/appeals*: Soden
- *Ethics and performance*: Mannle and Lotz expressed interest; no appointments at this time; interested parties to contact the Chair
- *Education, publications and recognition*: Everetts
- *Recruiting, testing, training*: Walker
- *Rules (and safety)*: Collins
- *Selections*: Deleted per above
- *Nominating*: Discussion centered on maintaining an open process. Le Mieux moved to delete the nominating committee from the structure; Mannle seconded. (Approved 8-0-1)

Le Mieux to write the procedures for insuring an open process

7.) *Grievance / Appeals Subcommittee (Soden)*

Discussion/acceptance of submitted by-laws (procedures). Soden presented the by-laws as previously submitted (attached).

Tolle and Everetts commented that "by-laws" was not the appropriate form for the information; it should rather be "procedures" that could be attached to or included in the IOP.

Appleyard asked that Article VI para 2 be specifically identified to the Board as not taking effect until the Board so approved.

Tolle indicated that the form of the information as presented needed to be re-worked before approval.

Collins indicated that there is nothing in the IOP that is organized using the Article structure contained in the proposed procedures.

Appleyard commented that as an Appendix to the IOP, the procedures as presented and formatted would be acceptable.

Soden commented that the intent of the procedures was to create a documented record that would streamline the grievance/appeals process.

Tolle expressed reservations about the ability of individual members of the grievance/appeals committee to call meetings or call for action, and election of the Chair. Further, the concept of a quick task force, ombudsman-type role, to handle grievances/appeals that could be done without full committee action should be included.

Appleyard indicated that the Chair retained discretion, by virtue of the IOP, to refer grievances/appeals to this committee or use another mechanism. Further, some revisions would be necessary for both the committee proposal and the relevant IOP section before the new procedures could be implemented.

Soden moved to approve the grievance/appeal procedures as submitted; Le Mieux seconded. Motion tabled pending revisions. Interested parties to submit revisions to Soden NLT March 31, 2004

8.) *Ethics and Performance Subcommittee (Soden/Appleyard)*

a.) Discussion/acceptance of drafted ethics and performance standards.

Soden and Jay Jacobus submitted a proposed referee code of ethics, and draft procedures for the ethics and performance committee, in anticipation of receiving a complaint.

Proposed committee procedures tabled, pending review and re-formatting similar to grievance and appeals, and appointment of committee head.

Appleyard to distribute referee code of ethics to Commission members.

b.) Discussion /acceptance of drafted guidelines for processing complaints.

c.) Working group to formulate a standardized procedure for working with referees whose skill or performance falls below competency levels (item 11c December 2003 minutes). See above; tabled pending appointment of committee head.

9.) *Education, Publications and Recognition subcommittee (Everetts)*

a.) preparation of Level II clinic material for 2005 (body of the race). Material to be presented at the July Commission meeting.

b.) central archive and distribution of approved clinic material

Appleyard commented that its time to implement this process, after years of discussion. People prepare material, and it gets used, and shouldn't there be a repository.

Everetts indicated that if the material goes on the USRowing website, it needs to be vetted and approved before posting.

Collins commented that there should be an annual distribution of a CD with all approved material to clinicians.

CD with approved material to be distributed in January 2005, pending approval in December 2004, with the material submitted to Commission by October 2004.

c.) status of plans to produce a new training video.

Everetts indicated that there was a proposal to turn the Referee training manual into a script for the proposed production. Stan Wellborn is working on the script and is seeking funding.

Collins asked if previous versions of the videos should be looked at for information.

Tolle indicated that he thought the video should be restricted to introductory information, rather than training in particular functions

Consensus of the commission was that any video should be on introductory material, for general familiarization with referee responsibilities, and to be used primarily for recruitment.

d.) Chief Referee Manual

Everetts indicated that Bob Walton identified a need for a Chief Referee training manual. The

Commission will review draft materials when submitted.

e.) Clipboard – publication plans for 2004.

Clipboard published in January, favorable comments received, more pictures welcome.

Two more Clipboards scheduled for 2004; more probably unaffordable. There are plans for one issue to feature emergency preparedness as a theme. The committee attempts to produce one article for the USRowing monthly e-newsletter.

Appleyard commented that it was desirable to have input and editorial effort from all regions, not just MA, where the bulk of such effort resides currently.

f.) Scheduled commission mailings & notifications

Lotz inquired about publicizing notice of Commission meetings; although in the minutes that are distributed to all, USRowing website and its e-newsletter are appropriate forums. 85-90% of officials have email.

g.) Follow-up to proposal for developing a National Clinician Conference (item 14a December 2003 minutes). Nothing to report; status report to follow at summer meeting.

h) Call for new business items

Appleyard inquired as to his status as Director of the National Referee College: should his report go under the committee report or remain a separate agenda item. Consensus was to leave the College a separate agenda item.

10.) *Rules (and safety) subcommittee (Collins)*

a.) Process for reviewing and submitting rules change requests (Appleyard; and item 9c from December 2003 minutes)

Appleyard reported that Tom Fuller is the Board representative for rules changes. The Board has indicated that the Referee Commission should not defer consideration of proposed rules changes that do not involve safety and fairness; the Board desires a yes or no vote.

Appleyard indicated that the Commission would provide a clear affirmative/negative position on any proposed rules changes.

Current date for submission of rules changes is June 1; some Board members and others would like a later date. Given that all rules changes must be approved by the Board, most probably in December/January, the Commission needs to decide before the December meeting, and the later proposed changes are submitted, the less time the Commission has for deliberation.

Lotz indicated the need to amend the IOP, which calls for final approval by the Commission at the December meeting. Also, that the Commission may need to have a fall rather than summer meeting, if the timelines are to be accomplished.

Tolle observed the Board has yet to decide on several rules proposals that have been on the table for some time.

Le Mieux indicated that a hard and fast date for submission would not be advisable.

Appleyard reported that June 1 obviates the possibility that club rowers may have input for the next year, based on their summer season.

Mannle inquired whether a process that required submissions of changes by September 1, with final approval by the Commission NLT November 1 via email, would work. Appleyard indicated that November 1 would be acceptable to the Board.

Le Mieux expressed grave reservations that the September 1st date did not allow enough time for effective deliberation by the Commission.

Collins moved that rules changes should be submitted to the Commission NLT September 1; Lotz seconded. (Approved 8-1)

b) Misconduct and grievance procedures (Lotz motion; and item 9a from December 2003 minutes).

Lotz presented a detailed proposal to increase awareness of the USRowing Misconduct and Grievance procedures among the referees (attached).

Discussion ensued; Mannle indicated that he was not aware of the Misconduct and Grievance procedures, or how they were invoked. (Lotz found a copy and circulated).

Several members expressed confusion about when the procedures should or could be invoked.

Le Mieux indicated that it was important to separate the issues of concern from the masters community re: cheating, and the education of referees re: what to do about misconduct, or filing appeals.

Members discussed several scenarios, identifying the various contingencies and interactions involved between the protest/appeal procedures in the Rules and the Misconduct and Grievance procedures.

Mannle suggested that the Grievance/Appeal committee (Soden) be asked to prepare an interpretative summary of the two sets of procedures, for consideration by the Commission.

Lotz motion via email; after discussion, Lotz made a revised motion (attached); Soden seconded. (Approved 7-2)

Soden and Grievance/Appeal committee to prepare requested information for review at Summer meeting.

c.) Bow balls (Le Mieux; item 18c from December 2003 minutes). No discussion.

d.) Designation/coordination with a head race working group to address issues of rules and standards for head races. No discussion.

e.) New proposals or issues from the table.

Collins inquired whether rules about open water refereeing were still in effect; Appleyard indicated that the Board preferred to keep these rules on the books for the time being.

Lotz inquired about youth/junior rowers rowing for high schools and clubs in a single season; Lotz and Le Mieux to discuss.

11.) *Recruiting, Testing and Training subcommittee (Walker)*

a.) Question bank for Assistant Referee examination.

Walker distributed the revised Assistant exam; there are approximately 100 questions in the exam bank.

Appleyard, in response to a comment from Lotz, asked members to state what they would like the exam to accomplish. After a round of discussions, Appleyard suggested that members provide comments and suggestions to Walker.

Le Mieux moved to accept the exam as presented, with Walker to amend the grading; Mannle seconded. (Approved 8-0-1).

12.) *Selections subcommittee (Le Mieux)*. See above; deleted.

13.) *Nominations subcommittee (Appleyard)*. See above; deleted

e. **Internal Operating Procedures**

1.) *Report on maintenance (Collins)*

Collins asked whether it would be beneficial to provide an index to the contents of the IOP; consensus was that this would be beneficial.

2.) *Proposals for additions and/or updates:*

a.) Policies to govern preparation of the commission meeting agenda, and conduct of the meeting (Lotz). Discussion ensued about the pros and cons of having more vs. less open meetings of the Commission, allowing comments from non-members. Members with comments or specific

language to include re: this issue should provide such language to Collins.

B.) Revision of policy stated in paragraph 29 (Mannle). Deferred until discussion of ethics and performance

c.) Communications with the national referee corps (Collins): Collins expressed reservations about the reliance on email to communicate with referees.

d.) Update IOP 8 to reflect item 8d from December 2003 minutes. Appleyard reminded that this item should be included in the next update of the IOP.

e.) Inclusion of reinstatement policies (item 11b December 2003 minutes). Appleyard reminded that this item should be included in the next update of the IOP.

f. Commission Summer meeting

Two proposals:

- Princeton July 9-10
- Seattle July 16-17

Appleyard observed that Princeton would be less costly overall. Appleyard moved to hold the summer meeting in Princeton, NJ to meet on the evening of July 9 and all day July 10; Soden seconded. (Approved 9-0)

7. Insurance and liability discussion (Pat O'Connor)

Le Mieux suggested that this item be deferred pending results of on-going work by the ad hoc task force on this subject.

Consensus was to allow the presentation go forward as a matter of professional courtesy, but to limit the discussion to the allotted time.

a. O'Connor presentation:

Referees are covered under the USRowing D&O policy, and the General Liability policy, provided that the event is a registered regatta if the number of organizations participating is 4 or more; OR

If the number of organizations participating in the event is 3 or less, all organizations are members of USRowing.

NASO policy does not appear to offer good protection for Referees, because the policy does not include a rowing as a covered activity, and the language is not clear about the extent to which officials are participants; this is important in some situations.

Current accidental injury policy covers medical expenses up to \$25,000 per person per occurrence, with no lifetime cap on number of occurrences. Coverage is second payor, and there is a \$250 deductible if there is no first payor.

Waiver signed by Referee is to hold USRowing harmless; Referee is covered regardless of whether he or she has signed the waiver; USRowing is at greater risk if the waiver hasn't been signed.

Appleyard thanked O'Connor for the information, and indicated that the Commission would have a point of contact established to continue the discussions with insurance representatives.

[At 3:20, Le Mieux suggested that the Commission prioritize the remainder of the agenda, or agree to work the agenda as listed until finished, however late adjournment occurred, and made a motion to implement the latter; seconded by Soden. Approved 6-0-3.]

8. Outstanding action items/issues from December 2003 meeting

Walker reported on the training and testing issues.

a. Follow-through and closure of the 2003 recertification examination

Appleyard indicated that he sensed that there had been little feedback on the exam to those who took it. He inquired what purpose was served by not providing feedback.

Several members commented on what feedback to provide, and methods of doing so.

The consensus was that regional reps should provide individualized feedback, if not done already, with the Q&A for the exam to be provided in a future issue of the Clipboard.

Regional reps to provide feedback to individual referees who took the recertification exam in 2003.

b. adherence to uniform standards for application and interpretation of the Rules of Rowing

Item 9d from December 2003 minutes: is there a need for commission-level action?. No discussion.

9. call for new business items

a. Recruiting Poster.

Le Mieux reported that Chris Lang suggested developing a recruiting poster, similar to the ad appearing in the Head of the Schuylkill program

b. Proposal to define work credit based upon regatta units or days

Application of the accounting unit change to standards TBD; tracking for this year to start October 1 2003, with tracking in subsequent years to begin on January 1.

There was a recognition that approval of this concept affected standards for advancement and maintenance of licensure.

Straw vote/discussion: Tolle proposal dated 1-4-04.

Discussion: Mannle proposal dated 2-20-04

Mannle noted that his proposal would be withdrawn if the Tolle proposal did not go forward.

Tolle motion moved; Soden second. (Failed 2-7).

Le Mieux moved adoption of the regatta day, where any regatta or group of regattas worked in 24 hour period would be considered as one day; Tolle seconded. (Approved 9-0).

Recruiting, Testing and Training to prepare a report on the impact of the regatta day concept on advancement and license maintenance requirements.

c. Rank Structure

Clarification and affirmation of December 2003 discussion (item 11e from the minutes) to modify the license maintenance requirements in order to allow individuals to chose at which rank level they wish to remain and also to .voluntarily move “backwards” within the rank structure

Appleyard identified straw vote in December on allowing referees to maintain status as Assistant. However, any change in rank or status implies a change in the requirements for entry, advancement and maintenance of licensure.

Tolle would like to see the option provided to officials so they can better accommodate referee responsibilities into their life styles, i.e., someone with more family responsibilities who cannot travel out of region.

Collins and others indicated there are many officials who do not want to advance or travel, they want to remain as Assistants focused on the local level.

Soden indicated that if referees were given more freedom to choose their level, it would aid retention.

Everetts commented that under any concept allowing referees to chose their rank level, it would be important to retain standards of competence.

Tolle moved that referees should be allowed to chose the rank they prefer; pending accomplishment of specific action items; Le Mieux second, with call for roll-call vote. (Approved 7-2). Yes: Tolle, Lotz, Mannle,

Soden, Walker, Everetts, Appleyard. No: Le Mieux, Collins

Recruiting/Testing/Training to identify implications for maintaining standards of competency for potential approval by the Commission at the December meeting, with full implementation expected by January 2005

d. Regatta Specialist

Proposal for revision to the current rank structure (Tolle/Appleyard)

Le Mieux expressed several strong reservations about the proposal and indicated that the NW is not in favor. Time would be better spent mentoring candidates and assistants, and recruiting new referees. Le Mieux believes that the barriers to recruiting more referees are primarily financial. The NW sympathizes with the MW recruiting problems.

Appleyard asked if there were any specifics as to the financial concerns; Le Mieux responded that these concerns were broader than the \$75 stipend being proposed

Appleyard asked other members for comments on the proposal.

Mannle indicated that the proposed solution to the MW recruiting problem applied to regions without similar problems; he suggested that the proposal be implemented contingent on a finding that a particular region or area had a recruiting problem, and could then use regatta specialists. As proposed, Mannle felt he could not support the proposal if it applied to everyone, rather than being targeted to a specific region. Also, the proposal should be approved on a trial basis, to insure that the solution as proposed actually solved the recruiting problem as described.

Soden indicated his opposition to the proposal, and that time would be better spent recruiting more officials rather than managing regatta specialists.

Walker indicated he was in favor of the proposal based on talking to other refs in the SW region.

Everetts thought the proposal would provide a good base for recruitment, and did not want to deny another region, but that the proposal was not needed in the MA.

Appleyard stated that the demands are tapping out people who are going into refereeing, not just in the MW. Looking at the growth of the sport and the age and demographics of the current referee corps, there will be a problem in the future.

Tolle stated that if the proposal was defeated, there have to be some alternatives. This proposal

has been discussed for some time, and change is difficult. Many referees are doing non-referee duties at major regattas, so the lines between different types of work are blurred. Money is a critical thing, and there is no money solution. The proposal has to be implemented uniformly if approved.

Lotz: Proposal is for mainly land positions plus marshal; proposal should be only for land positions.

Collins indicated that those in the SW that he has talked to accept the idea, and that it's an alternative to the expense barrier to increased recruitment—those who do not want to sign up to be a full official could be a regatta specialist. This may give us a pool of people who would get involved with regattas and may aspire to be an official. Concept should have a two or three year shakedown before putting it in the Rule book.

Walker, as head of Recruiting/Training/Testing: Concept would entail fewer requirements for entry, a few regattas and a short test. Regatta specialists should be members of USRowing.

Appleyard moved that Tolle's proposal be adopted; Walker second. Le Mieux called for roll call vote. (Failed 4-5.) Yes: Tolle, Collins, Walker, Appleyard. No: Lotz, Le Mieux, Mannle, Soden, Everetts

Le Mieux moved for the appointment of an ad hoc committee to assess the financial burdens affecting recruiting of new officials; Mannle second. (Approved 7-0-2.) Appleyard authorized Le Mieux to organize the scope and membership of the committee.

Mannle moved that commission approve the Regatta Specialist proposal as a pilot project for the MW, pending the completion of certain action items by the Recruiting/Testing/ Training committee; Soden second.

Tolle indicated that the MW did not want to participate in a pilot project for the Regatta Specialist proposal. Mannle withdrew the motion based on Tolle's comments; Soden withdrew the second.

e. Proposal for head race certification (Lotz)

Lotz indicated a need for candidates to observe a head race. Concept tabled.

10. Regattas & Events

a. USRowing nationals – status report (Tolle)

Tolle provided an update, outlook was for a good regatta. Tolle presented a proposal to make the national championships attractive for the referees,

including a stipend of \$50 per referee per day (attached).

Discussion ensued about the amount of reimbursement, and tradeoffs between the number of referees and the total amount of expenditure.

Le Mieux acknowledged that the per day stipend was a good idea, but said that in the short run West Coast officials would be disadvantaged. Everetts replied that the proposal was specific to this year; Tolle agreed with this interpretation.

Soden and Le Mieux maintained that for national championships, 100% of referee expenses should be reimbursed. Appleyard noted that full reimbursement for this year was problematic, given that the budget was already set.

Pope reported that there is some flexibility in the budget to accommodate alternative arrangements.

Le Mieux cited IOP 21, noting that no gain should be expected, and that referees should be compensated fairly.

Mannle suggested that the question be called, but also suggested that the issues for next year be referred to committee for further work.

Collins suggested that officials might be compensated proportionally to the number of shifts they are available to work.

Tolle moved that the proposal as presented be approved; Everetts second.

Le Mieux moved as an amendment that for the 2004 national championships, referees be compensated at 100% of their reasonable travel costs, proportional to the number of shifts available to the Chief to be scheduled; Tolle indicated he would accept the amendment; Everetts accepted the amendment. (Approved 9-0).

b. Masters Nationals (Lotz)

Lotz has been investigating the availability of obtaining Stillwater (wakeless) launches for use during the regatta, costs to be determined.

1.) LOC proposal for use of static referees.

Lotz reported on the prior proposals for static refereeing at the Masters Nationals, expressed disappointment at the tone of the comments surrounding the rejection of this proposal

Approval of static refereeing would require several changes to the Rules, requiring Board approval, which is not feasible. A second specific concern was safety.

For purposes of making a record vote, the proposal for static refereeing was moved by Lotz; Soden seconded. (Failed 1-8)

c. insurance and liability issues

See presentation by Pat O'Connor, above, and appointment of ad hoc committee

d. referee college (Appleyard)

1.) Status Report

ARCO OTC site approved for use in 2004, limited to 30 participants, students and faculty.

2.) Participant recruitment guidelines: regional appointments versus first-come first-served.

Appleyard asked whether approval of attendance should be continued by Appleyard, or should regional reps be involved or provide input.

Collins suggested that no formal approval should be granted, and that the list be reviewed for final approval; Appleyard asked for a specific date, and July 1 was suggested.

Priority for attendance should be given to those who need to attend to maintain Clinician status.

3.) objectives and goals for the 2004 Clinician's school (item 14b December 2003 minutes).

Appleyard will begin developing curriculum for the Clinician school on or about April 15, and has asked for input from the members, as well as nominations for specific topics and/or faculty.

11. Other business, old and new

a. Mileage reimbursement

Collins moved to increase mileage reimbursement from \$.25 to \$.325, conforming with USRowing Board practice; Soden seconded. (Approved 9-0.)

b. Call for specific proposals to move forward with item 2 from the December 2003 minutes

Item 2b indicates that the Commission should draft an issue or policy statement for consideration by the Board concerning the value of the Referee Corps to the sport of rowing and how USRowing may support the efforts of the Referees in fulfilling their commitment to safety and fairness to the sport.

Appleyard indicated that this would be his focus as a member of the Regatta task force, and that the Board was "going back to square one" in dealing with the relationship between USRowing, the Board, and the referees.

Given that there appears to be an openness to new ideas, Appleyard indicated that we should all be mindful of opportunities to identify projects for support of the Referee Corps.

Mannle indicated that what was necessary was not so much a statement of policy, but a "Business

Case Analysis" and volunteered to provide a first draft to the Commission by the summer meeting. Mannle to provide a draft by the summer meeting.

c. discussion on items 6c and 18b from December 2003 minutes; decision whether to move forward with a specific proposal and budget for expanded operational funding.

6c. Tolle minority opinion that the Referee Commission budget should be \$25-30K

18.b. Should the budget allocation of the Referee Commission be based on some percentage of the dues that Referees pay?

Appleyard indicated that he favored budget proposals that accurately reflected the costs of doing business; Walker indicated that there is no current reason why the Board should approve a larger allocation, since the Commission has operated successfully at the \$12-15K level.

Appleyard indicated that referees subsidize Commission operations, and that the burden should be shifted back to USRowing. We as a body should develop a budget that reflects true costs.

Appleyard requested that regional reps develop a "true" regional budget estimate for 3 years.

Regional reps to develop a 3 year budget estimate reflecting the true costs of regional activities, for presentation at the summer meeting.

d. Reimbursement guidelines for referees

1.) Proposal to increase the recommended per diem to \$75 from its current level of \$50 for registered regattas.

Collins indicated his support for the concept, but that staffing requirements had to be identified in advance so that the LOC could plan effectively; given the possibility that more referees might attend than originally planned, the reimbursement level might need to be adjusted. Further, colleges and clubs should be encouraged to provide financial support for the referees who work their events

Le Mieux indicated that training and development of referees might mean that more referees might need to attend regattas than the minimum number required.

Mannle indicated that he was unaware of the recommendation, and suggested that it was being widely ignored, and that perhaps efforts should concentrate on getting the current recommendation more widely adopted, before increasing the level of reimbursement. Further, that reimbursement considerations apparently

were complicating the planning process for the Chief Referee re: number of referees required.

Appleyard suggested that this was an education issue for the Chief Referee, to insure that the LOC provided adequate support.

Le Mieux indicated that a reimbursement level of \$75 would be considered excessive in the NW.

Appleyard stated that the overall intent of the recommended level was to reduce the out of pocket expenses borne by referees.

Le Mieux to assess the specifics of what constitutes an acceptable level of reimbursement.

- e. **Discussion on the need for the referee commission to provide leadership and also to speak with one voice in promoting consistent and equitable national standards for guiding referee reimbursement policy.**

No explicit discussion of this item at this time; principle expressed repeatedly during discussion of other specific items (e.g., liaisons to USRowing committees).

Le Mieux to develop a paper to identify issues associated with speaking with one voice re: reimbursement.

- f. **Adjustment of minimum standards for advance based on adoption of the regatta day as the unit of measure**

See above.

- g. **Reduction in membership dues**

Collins proposed dues of \$25 for referees who do not also compete as rowers.

Tabled; Collins to develop a specific proposal.

12. Adjournment

Appleyard moved to adjourn the meeting; Soden second. (Approved 9-0.)

Meeting was adjourned at 9:26 PM.