



Referee Committee

Minutes of Meeting
June 13, 2018
Conference Call
DRAFT

Attendance

Referee Committee:

Andrew Blackwood – Chair
Bob Appleyard – Referee College
Terry Friel-Portell – Safety/Referee Utilization
Dee McComb – NW, Regional Coordinator Representative to Committee
Marcus McElhenney – Athlete Representative
Jean Reilly – FISA Coordinator
Lyn Wylder – Secretary

Absent:

Rachel Le Mieux – Trials Coordinator
Gevvie Stone – Athlete Representative

Regional Coordinators:

None

USRowing Staff:

Jules Zane, Manager Referee and Membership Programs

Guests:

Patty Hyatt, NW
Ruth Macnamara, MA
Lloyd McDonald, MW

Andy called the meeting to order at 8:33 PM EDT

1. Andy Blackwood
 - a. Welcome
 - b. Roll Call and Identified guests (noted above)
 - c. Announcements
 - i. Many referees have seen Patrick McNerney, our CEO, around the country. He has asked many of the referees how to make the referee experience better. Andy has had an informal discussion with Jules and Susan Smith about this. If you haven't been in one of these conversations don't worry members of the Committee will be given a chance to provide input in this critical subject.

- ii. Andy stated that due to everyone's schedule he would like for the call to end no later than 9:30. If we need to continue discussion on something we can schedule another call.
- 2. Referee Program Update (Jules Zane)
 - a. There have been conversations about moving the Referee Data System (RDS) to another software platform. Doug Jones suggested that USRowing consider using Sales Force which would likely be easier to use, allow for share functions and have better overall functionality. Howard Meisner, who was involved in the development of our current software, is involved in discussions. USRowing has decided to do this and has set a goal of having a new RDS by this year's convention. This software can also be used for other functions at USRowing. Jules had provided an e-mail response to Terry on this issue and wanted to bring the rest of us up-to-date.
 - b. USRowing has struck a new apparel deal with JL Design Enterprises, Inc. During those discussions JL stated that they are interested in presenting their clothing ideas to the referee corps and noted that they could provide a one stop shop for referees. They have many partners that should be able to meet all of our needs and they would provide this service year-round and at cost.
 - c. Recruiting Update – Jules noted that this year we have about the same number of new referees at this point in the year as we did last year – and that last year was a record year for adding referees. He is excited as he believes that we are moving forward at a good pace.
 - d. SafeSport Update – Jules has been working with the chief referees to make sure that all referees working at USRowing owned and registered regattas are compliant with SafeSport and background checks. He has not found many, if any, referees that are scheduled to work that are non-compliant
 - e. Jules noted that last weekend USRowing wrapped up the youth program for the year. He wanted us to know that USRowing is looking at updating the travel and compensation policies for referees. They want it to be better than the NCAA policy, which seems to be the gold standard. The money for this will be included in the budget for all 2019 USRowing owned events and will not be allowed to be lowered or deleted.
- 3. Regional Coordinator Planning and Projects (Dee McComb)
 - a. Dee provided an update of what the Regional Coordinators have been working on. They had hoped to have a face to face meeting sometime in June, but that hasn't worked out so they are going try a video conference call this Saturday June 16th for 3 hours with a follow up on June 30 with same system. Topics planned for discussion are:
 - 1. A proposal for updating the selection process for national juries including: how to deal with duplication, how to select the additional 6 referees, how to make sure that regional representation is balanced, and

ensuring that selected referees have the appropriate skill level

2. Reviewing the need for a specific rank for Chief Referee
3. Reviewing the current evaluation form
4. Discussing how to approach recertification

These items are at top of list but added if anyone one on the committee wants to add something – we are welcome to, just talk to Dee.

Zane added that the meeting software is called Zoom and he has an account that we can use for our calls if we want. Just let him know.

4. IOP Revision (Dee McComb) See Attachment 1
 - a. Dee had an assignment at the last meeting to propose new language for Sections 39 and 40 of the Internal Operating Procedures. She provided that in Attachment 1 to these notes.
 - i. She noted that she did this but hasn't circulated it to anyone else for input so she is open to comments. The goal was to clarify Sections 39 and 40 made them more consistent with each other.
 - ii. She also added a Section 41 for people who are absent from refereeing for more than two years. In that case they need to go through the whole process including observations, but exceptions could be considered by full committee.
 - iii. Terry asked if one or two years was in the current IOP. Dee responded that it is currently one year but she is proposing two years based on our discussion at the last meeting.
 - iv. Dee added SafeSport requirements to both sections but noted that could be redundant as that is a requirement for all referees, so SafeSport could be included by reference.
 - v. Terry suggested that since the last line and a half of each section addresses the same issue, we could use the same language. Dee also noted that we could have one paragraph. Terry clarified that she likes the two paragraphs but was just suggesting a minor change so that both sections should read the same with same words.
 - vi. Bob noted that he thinks that going back through observations isn't necessary. He has always thought that candidacy is to expose people to what it is we have to do. So, if someone has been a referee they know what we do and don't necessarily need to go through that step again. Andy suggested that he thought it would be necessary as we change our procedures every now and then and this way they would be familiar with current procedures.
 - vii. Bob also wanted to make the sections very clear cut - this is what you do if you don't have a license for a period of time. This is how you get it back. He was only questioning need for candidacy.

- viii. Andy asked Dee to update her proposal by removing Section 41 and strike any mention of two years. Then she can circulate the language to the Committee and see if we have consensus. The IOP says that the Director of Referees can make changes to the IOP, so we should be within our function to make these changes.
5. Consider Request from Lloyd McDonald (See Attachment 2)
- a. Lloyd said that he wrote the attached policy on the use of electronic timing to capture what he thinks is standard practice. He suggested that we need a real policy on how we interact with HereNow and other contracted timing companies. He noted that we still do a complete manual backup but that the assumption is that in most cases the electronic timing is more accurate and therefore preferred. He asked if we are OK with the first 3 bullets? Yes.
 - b. The next bullets discuss scenarios that deal with the failure of the electronic system for some reason. He wanted to standardize when and how we go to the manual backup timing system. He noted that for heats if we go to manual timing we use manual timing for all of the heats even if we have electronic timing for some of the heats. So, he suggested that we do the same for time trials. In other words, if we are missing one electronic time for a boat in an event that has a time trial and have to use the manual time, we use the manual time for all of the boats in that particular event. Lloyd noted that HereNow and AJ don't necessarily agree with this and prefer that if we are only missing one time that we go back to electronic time for the rest of the times. Lloyd suggests that we use either all electronic times or all back up times for all boats in an event. The committee's consensus was to agree with Lloyd.
 - c. The next situation deals with missing the electronic elapsed time for the first boat in a race. Lloyd proposes that in this case you would use the manual time for the first boat and the electronic splits for all of the other boats in the race. This process (manual time for first boat with electronic splits) would be done for all of the heats in an event.
 - d. Lloyd also wanted to discuss an issue that has come up this year due to a technology change with the iPads at the start. Instead of using a plunger that has a tactile feel to it, HereNow is using an iPad with a "button" on the screen. The issue is that with the plunger, which is usually operated by the assistant starter, the operator could start the clock without looking at the plunger, but with the iPad the operator has to look at the screen to be sure that they are touching the correct place on the screen. If assistant is doing this takes them away from their attention on other things. Lloyd suggest that if we are using the iPad – then HereNow should provide person to do start the timing system and not have referees do this. The question is what is the role of the assistant starter are they just administrative or are they the second set of eyes making sure that there is a fair start?

- e. The last item that Lloyd wanted to discuss was how the Chief Judge should work with the electronic timing provider. He was specifically concerned with the when the results are published. The Chief Judge is responsible for confirming the results - not someone from the electronic timing provider. He has had situations when the results were posted before they were confirmed by the Chief Judge and they were posted incorrectly. Jean asked Jules if the contract between USRowing and HereNow specifies how and when results can be posted? Jules hasn't seen the contract but will look at it. Jean suggested that this clarification be added to the contract.
- f. Dee moved that that the document provided by Lloyd (Attachment 2) be written affirmation for Club Nationals and after that regatta we can decide if we want to confirm its use for all regattas with electronic timing. Andy suggested that in the last sentence in Paragraph 6 we should put period after Chief Judge. He noted that HereNow and AJ are addressing the need to quickly post results. It does make the regatta more interesting and gratifying to spectators, but they aren't always correct which can cause a lot of problems. Jules said that he can see both sides and asked if we can we delay posting results until we can be sure that they are correct. Bob noted that FISA has been through this with Swiss Timing and now has a very good process for interaction between the referees and Swiss Timing. Bob suggested that Jules talk to Kris Grudt to see how FISA handles this.
- g. Andy noted that the first four items note the role of electronic and manual timing and when to use which system. Item five is about hardware and item six is about the posting of results. These last two items involve external input. Andy asked if it was permissible for timing vendors to post unofficial results if marked unofficial? Lloyd noted that there is a provision in the Rules of Rowing for posting unofficial results. (2-501 Finish of Race (e))
- h. *Terry moved that we affirm this document for Club Nationals. Dee seconded it.*
 - i. Discussion:
 - 1. Jean stated that it was fine for Club Nationals but that we also need to put this in the Rules of Rowing. We will may have time to work out wording details before changes to rules need to be finalized
 - 2. Bob noted that HereNow isn't interested in using a plunger or other tactile system to start the timing for a race and they don't see an issue with using the iPad. HereNow has also said that the duty of the assistant starter "shall be" to run their technology. The consensus of the referee committee was that they don't agree. The duty of the assistant starter is to insure a safe and fair start.

3. *The vote on the motion was passed: 7 for; 0 against.
Motion passed.*

6. Consider Equipment Issues shared by Rachel Le Mieux (See Attachment 3)
 - a. This item will be held until our next scheduled call. During that time Andy will work with USRowing to define the boundary between the safety committee and the referee committee. The question is also if this a malfunction or a design error and if this has been brought to USRowing what do they say.
7. Our next meeting is scheduled for 8:30 PM on July 11, 2018
8. Adjourn at 9:42 PM

Respectfully submitted,

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

ACTION ITEMS

1. Dee - update the working on Sections 39 and 40 of the IOP and circulate the revised language to committee members for discussion
2. Jules - review the contract between USRowing and HereNow to see if it specifies how and when results can be posted. (You might also see if there is anything in the contract that specifies how the timing system is started at the beginning of a race (but this wasn't specifically asked in the meeting.))
3. Jules - talk to Kris Grudt to see how FISA handles the coordination between Swiss Timing and the Chief Judge at their events.
4. Unassigned – After Club Nationals work with Lloyd to determine what language about electronic timing should be included in the Rules of Rowing or IOPs.
5. Andy - Define the boundary between the USRowing Safety and Referee Committees and define the question being brought to the Referee Committee by Rachel