



Referee Committee



Minutes of Meeting
March 14, 2018
Conference Call
FINAL

Attendance

Referee Committee:

Andrew Blackwood – Chair
Lyn Wylder - Secretary
Bob Appleyard – Referee College
Dee McComb – Regional Coordinator Representative to Committee
Jean Reilly – FISA (joined the call at 9:00 EST)
Rachel Le Mieux – Trials Coordinator
Terese Friel-Portell – Safety/Referee Utilization
Gevvie Stone – Athlete Representative
Marcus McElhenney – Athlete Representative

Regional Coordinators:

None

USRowing Staff:

Jules Zane, Manager, Referee and Membership Programs

Guest:

Patty Hyatt, NW

Andy called the meeting to order at 8:34 PM EDT

1. Andy Blackwood
 - a. Welcome
 - b. Roll Call and Identified guests (noted above)
 - c. Announcements
 1. Rachel raised concerns about the use of the travel agent. She used the USRowing designated travel agent and USRowing was charged \$340. When she priced the same trip, the cost was \$255. She asked how much we are paying the travel agent and raised concerns about the difference in price, especially with the tight budget that USRowing has. Jules responded that he will review this when Rachel sends him her ticket. He thought that the price difference might be the difference in a basic ticket versus a regular economy. He stated that they had used this company for a long time and this isn't normal and it certainly isn't her fee. He will report back at the next meeting.
2. Referee Corps Size: Terry Friel-Portell, Lyn Wylder, Andy Blackwood
 - a. Andy reported that Terry, Lyn and Andy have been working on a project to determine the desired number of referees by region. We are focusing on weeks 14 – 20 which seem to be where the most referees are needed. We have the data from the RDS (Referee Data System) and have sent requests

for information to the referees that served as chief referees at a regatta during this period in 2017. We want to confirm the data in the RDS and also determine the ideal number of referees at each regatta. In addition, we have plotted regatta locations and referee locations. We will continue to refine the data and work on projections for our needs for the next few years.

3. Plenary Examination Approval: Bob Appleyard and Dee McComb (see Note 1 below) *NOTE: A copy of the proposed exam was also provided but will not be included as part of the minutes.*
 - a. Bob used the comments from the regional coordinators and worked with senior members of the referee college (Jean Reilly, John Walker, Kirsten Meisner) to revise the exam. They added a section on the duties of the chief referee, updated the questions about the organization and updated and grouped the questions by position. Dee sent the new exam to the regional coordinators for their review. They were very pleased with the response but had some concerns about how to grade the chief referee questions. Bob has added some comments in the answer key to address the kind of response that should be seen. The coordinators had no requested changes and are satisfied with the exam.
 - b. The new exam was accepted as presented.
 - c. Andy thanked Bob, Dee and the others that worked on this project.
4. FISA Liaison Update: Jean Reilly (see Note 2: executive summary below)
 - a. Andy referred everyone to the full report provided and asked that people hold any questions until Jean could join us.
5. Clinician Status
 - a. The committee discussed the requirements for someone to be designated as a Clinician and whether a regional coordinator necessarily needed to be a Clinician.
 - b. It was noted by Rachel that the skills needed to be a Regional Coordinator and the skills needed to be a Clinician are different and that you don't necessarily need to be both. Dee thought that it might be easier for the Regional Coordinator if they were also a Clinician from an administrative standpoint. Terry pointed out the Clinicians are looked at as having greater knowledge. Bob pointed out that from the IOPs (Internal Operating Procedures) the Regional Coordinator is an elected position and he didn't see a specific minimum qualification. Rachael pointed out that there is not a requirement that Regional Coordinators also be a Clinician but that Clinicians should have some degree of competency.
 - c. Bob, speaking from his role as Dean of the Referee College, said that he and others were just starting work on a proposal to bring the referee college into the IOP. He suggested that we should clarify the role of the Regional Coordinators as it relates to referee training in the IOPs as well. He noted that our practice has been to go with the recommendation of the regional coordinator.
 - d. If the Regional Coordinator is unable to provide a recommendation due to a conflict of interest or similar circumstance, then we could use a recommendation from a previous regional coordinator or the current clinicians in the region.
 - e. Lyn noted that not every good and/or experienced referee is a good teacher.
 - f. Bob said that he has just started this discussion in the referee college and that he will be coming back with a proposal for the education of our referees

to our rules and the use of the referee college. If we can get the proper support, the college will make an effort to train the Clinicians. He noted that this was a good conversation and very timely.

6. License Reinstatement
 - a. Tom Fuller has requested reinstatement as a fully licensed referee as he believes that this will facilitate his work as an observer and coach of newer referees.
 - b. Tom was reinstated by acclamation.
7. Referee Program and Governance
 - a. Bob asked, is there a budget for the referee program? *Jules responded that there is a specific referee administration budget, which may have been increased slightly in the domestic budget. So, the answer is yes, it exists.*
 - b. Rachel stated that she is a partner in an accounting firm and knows of no state law that would allow prevent us from seeing the numbers. She also noted that she was previously the referee committee treasurer and could see what was available in each region. She believes that we will be more effective if we have that information. *Jules stated that he has put in the request for sharing this information. He will get back to us when he hears from his superiors.*
 - c. Bob asked Jules if there is a position description for the Referee Program Manager. What is the role of Manager versus Director of Referee Programs? What is the role of the Referee Committee? The Referee Committee used to have a treasurer and monitor the referee budget. How much responsibility does Jules have? In the past the Committee was policy and not management – is that the current case? We need to get this resolved this calendar year. *Jules: He has requested a job description and will share it with us when he gets it. He is still responsible for the registered regatta program as it is related to referee corps. He doesn't want people to feel that he is splitting program with member services. His focus will be on the referee corps. Someone else will be responsible for membership. As to the title of manager versus director, he has the same authority to make a decision as John did. If anything, he should have more time to work with the referees.*
8. Item 4 FISA Liaison Update: Jean Reilly
 - a. As Jean joined the call and went over the executive summary from the FISA Liaison Report. She noted some interesting trends at FISA like the request for umpires under 40 to work the Youth Olympics. That was a request from the IOC (International Olympic Committee). That regatta will also be 500-meter sprints due to the size of the body of water that is available. But she suspected that we will begin to see different race formats different from 2000 m side by side racing. She asked that committee members review the metrics provided in her report
9. New Business
 - a. Jean noted that the San Diego Crew Classic was working to attract new and younger referees. The SW needs 70 referees in their region so they will be working the alumni tents and the beer garden recruiting referees.
10. Next meeting
 - a. The next conference call of the Committee will be on April 11 at 8:30 EST.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 PM EDT.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyn Wylder
Secretary, USRowing Referee Committee
wylderlyn@gmail.com
503-780-8413

Note 1: from Bob about the Plenary Examination

We believe it is important that everyone promoted in rank to Referee demonstrate a common awareness of how the USRowing Referee Corps is organized. Not from a theoretical perspective, but from a practical working perspective, reflecting the current status of our organization. This guided the selection of questions under “Organization”. Compared to the existing 2009 version this section has expanded from 10 to 16 questions. However, answering these require just short factual-based statements, so this expansion does not significantly add to the burden of effort and time to complete this section. If an individual does not immediately know the answer to any of these questions, then the effort to discover and write down the correct answer represents the educational component of completing this section to “bring them up to speed” to the level of awareness that we expect.

The existing exam has 5 questions under the heading “General Questions”. These included several for a chief referee. We have instead created a section “Chief Referee” in which we pose 7 questions that are specific to this position. These build and expand from the questions in the existing version. As long as attainment of this rank serves as the qualification for serving as a chief referee, we believe it is important to document that those who will be promoted can demonstrate basic awareness of the general responsibilities of this position, along with a few practical application questions that are basic to this position. These questions are a direct reflection of the curriculum we have developed and used in chief referee colleges.

We then retained the position-specific grouping of questions, with sections on “Control Commission”, “The Start”, “Referee”, and “The Finish”. Most of these questions are taken directly from the existing exam, with a small amount of editing to a few of those existing questions, and elimination of several that we thought were redundant.

Note 2: Executive Summary of FISA Liaison Report, Jean Reilly

Since the 2014-2015 restructure, nominated USA Umpire selection to FISA Juries has steadily increased by 35% to annual 70% of nominations selected. Selection baseline was 55% in 2014 and moved to 65% in 2016 and to 70% in 2017 and 2018 (90% in 2017 and 2018 if Jury Alternate positions are included). Additionally, the Candidate FISA Exam first time passage rate is 100% (up from 82% prior to 2015). The Exchange Program is now well known internationally with 9 countries actively participating (300% growth from 3 original participants in 2015). Forty percent (40%) of USA FISA Umpires have taken advantage of the Exchange Program created to enable USA FISA Umpires to continue development of their international Umpiring skills as well as further their international presence and

relationships with Umpires from other countries. Since 2015, all USA FISA umpires wanting to work internationally in any given year have been able to do so.

Since 2016, USRowing Metric #1 (*Have USA FISA Umpires on as many FISA Regatta Juries as possible each year. Target: 1 WC; 2 Championships; 1 Coastal or World Masters*) has been achieved. Through 2016, minimum targets for USRowing Metric #2 (*Ensure that the USA will have FISA Umpires qualified for all World Championships and for the Olympics in 2020, 2024, 2028 etc.*) were not achieved. Following the FISA vote to increase umpire mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70, Metric #2 was met (see 2017 FISA Liaison Report). Given a 65-mandatory retirement age, Metric #2 would not have been met in 2017 or 2018 due to an aging USA FISA Umpire group. The USA will be in a stronger position if 1) The USA hosts a World Cup; 2) Umpires not yet working a World Cup are prioritized to work a World Cup or Pan Am games in 2019; and 3) 3-4 FISA Prospects with significant runway (30+ years eligibility) become Applicants by 2020 and Candidates by 2022. The creation of a Continental Championship much like the European Championships would provide FISA Umpires additional opportunities to work. The USA is also in a stronger position if FISA formally revises the definition of “progressing at an international level” to state that either of a Jr World Championship or U23 World Championship must be completed prior to working a World Championship. This change would provide the USA with increased bench resulting in a stronger pool of Umpires available for WC jury nomination.