

2019 NEISA Annual Meeting Agenda
December 7, 2019
MIT - Classroom 32-155

Action Items

1. *NEISA Specific Action Items*

- a. Assad to confirm term limit clarification
- b. Assad to confirm website payment is covered by our ICSA dues
- c. Assad to confirm why miscellaneous section decreases drastically in the 2020 treasurer's report
- d. Assad to create a committee to work on term limits

2. *NEISA Action Items involving the ICSA*

- a.

3. *ICSA Action Items*

Motions

1. Motion to create Graduate Secretary position to support the Graduate Commissioner.
Majority in favor.
 - a. [Voting Record](#)
2. Motion to adopt the Graduate Secretary role with the addition to the bylaws.
 - a. Diana: Second.
 - b. [Voting Record](#)
3. Motion to make the Draft Committee one of our regular committees. Mike: Second.
 - a. [Voting Record](#)
4. Assad: I Move to accept the proposed budget.
 - a. Mike: Second
 - b. [Voting Record](#)
5. Pizzo: I move to adopt [the showcase rotation](#) up until the fall of 2023
 - a. Assad: So moved.
 - b. O'Connor: Second
 - c. Majority in favor.
6. Judge Coordinator Initiatives for 2020:
 - a. Do a better job communicating with hosts about their umpires and judges.
 - b. Utilizing resources to make rookie umpires feel more confidentMove that we accept
 - c. Weidenbacker: second
 - d. None opposed
7. Motion to accept the PR report.

- a. Brian Nelson: second
 - b. None opposed
- 8. Motion to combine in and out of conference drafts
 - a. 20 in favor, 2 opposed
- 9. Motion to change [the women's draft order](#)
 - a. None opposed
- 10. Motion that we select teams 1-10 to be in the Friis, and teams for the Staake based on performance rankings
 - a. 19 in favor, none opposed
- 11. [We propose the draft order as written above](#); it extends the draft into teams 17 and 18
 - a. Dusek: I would propose changing the current proposal to 1-18 to 1-x. It will open up access.
 - b. Motion withdrawn
 - c. Motion to accept the proposed team race draft.
 - i. O'Connor: Second
 - ii. All in favor?
 - 1. Majority in favor, 1 opposed
- 12. Motion to elect slate of Executive Committee
 - a. Motion passes, none opposed
- 13. [Recruiting Rules](#)
 - a. Straw poll, do we philosophically agree with this?
 - b. Majority in favor. 2 opposed.
- 14. Meeting criteria proposal: meetings are announced publicly and the results are published online, with a call-in option online, meetings recorded, meetings recorded, and meeting minutes distributed for everyone to see.
 - a. Majority in favor
- 15. Membership Status Requests
 - a. Application by Olin College for Provisional Membership
 - i. Motion seconded and approved
 - b. Application by UMaine for Regular Membership
 - i. Motion seconded and approved
 - c. Application by UMass Amherst for Regular Membership
 - i. Motion seconded and approved

Meeting Notes:

I. Call to Order (President: Paige Clarke '20, D)

II. Roll Call

- A. Sarah Herde (Bates), Jack Valentino (Bates), Alexander Kostas (Bentley), Sarah Alix (Bentley), Lizzie Russell (Boston College), Declan McGranahan (Boston

College), Chris Lash (Boston University), Alex Honke (Boston University), Maia Agerup (Boston University), Frank Pizzo (Bowdoin), Preston Anderson (Bowdoin), John Mollicone (Brown), Emilie Blinderman (Conn College), Justin Assad (Dartmouth, as proxy for Ryan Mullins), Paige Clarke (Dartmouth), Lillian Vincens (Fairfield), Danielle Grosso (Fairfield), Matthew Little (Fairfield), Mike O'Connor (Harvard), Eli Burnes (Harvard), Taylor Martin (Maine Maritime), Olivia Mitchell (Maine Maritime), Mike Kalin (MIT), Fran Charles (MIT), Thomas Dunn (Mass Maritime), Finn Bascio (McGill), Coleen Ross (Northeastern), Carolyn Corbet (Northeastern), Griffin Lorimer (Providence College), Julia O'Connor (RWU), John Ingalls (SRU), Emmet Smith (Tufts), Matthew Galbraith (Tufts), Brian Nelson (CGA), Christina Nothacker (CGA), Maxwell Miller (UCONN), Elliott Trester (UCONN), Diana Weidenbacker (UNH, as proxy for UNE), Clay Greig (UNH), Caroline Patten (UVM), Jeff Dusek (Wellesley, Olin), Olivia LaRoche (Wellesley), Jared Reineck (Wentworth), John Holt (Wentworth), Eric Marshall (UMaine), Hugh Dougherty (UMass Amherst), Thomas Jagielski (Olin), Sander Miller (Olin)

- B. 1 Graduate and 1 Undergraduate vote per every Regular Member School, no school may hold more than 4 votes including proxies

III. Additions to the Agenda

- A.

IV. Approval of Fall Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

- A. Waiting for a quorum.
- B. Move to accept October meeting minutes.
 - 1. Mike: Second

V. NEISA Committee Reports

A. Commissioner's Report: Justin Assad, Dartmouth

- 1. As an organization, we are working smoothly and meeting regularly. Regarding Nationals: Though the Nationals was hard for us to host, I thought they went really successfully. This is definitely repeatable for us. Going forward, we are looking for NEISA to provide a stipend of \$15k for that regatta; this year, we actually got around \$9k for it. I thought that even though that was below the goal, it was a great success, especially considering we did not have the support of NYYC. We have a ton of people to thank for the success of that regatta – for a lot of the heavy lifting, for use of the boats, coachboats, and umpires – and I'm really proud of that. We should all be proud of that.
- 2. Spring Nationals
 - a) Spring Nationals are going to be in a different order than last year, with the women's event first, then coed, and team racing last.

That's a big change from how it had been previously. I think in the big picture, that's a good change, especially regarding housing and travel expenses as team racing would fracture the week. I think in the long term, it could be better for us as a conference because it will ensure that the most dedicated teams will attend the Team Race Nationals (because otherwise they will have to extend their housing plans). It may not play out that way, but we'll see.

3. Proposal to reorganize roles of Commissioner and re-introduce the role of Graduate Secretary

- a) As everyone knows, we've instituted a term limit for the commissioner role of 5 years. This is the end of my 5th year. I think everyone can corroborate that we found that no one is able to take the job as it stands. During my tenure, I had help from two assistants to run the Dartmouth team while I ran NEISA – I recognize that is definitely not the case for a lot of teams. As a small committee, a few of us have worked to find a way to split this role so it is more manageable.
- b) Having a Graduate Secretary to help on the administrative side of the commissioner role with tasks outlined in the proposal, as well as to help the undergraduate Secretary, will help to ensure our conference keeps running as smoothly as it has been.
- c) Discussion:
 - (1) Mike O'Connor, Harvard: I think this is a smart decision. The commissioner role is a lot of work, and this is a great time to split the role. A side note that I think is important to note is that the division of duties are not set in stone; Whoever these two people are, they will have to work together very closely.
 - (2) Assad: Yes, absolutely. And the stipend is TBD – we'd like to get to a \$3k stipend for these two positions, but it will be over the course of a few gradual increases to get to that. We are proposing a \$2k stipend to start, and then a minimal increase in dues across our 40 members to cover it.
 - (3) Frank Pizzo, Bowdoin: Can you explain the term limits again?
 - (4) Assad: We are envisioning 1 year terms, elected annually by the membership, with a maximum of 3 consecutive terms for both positions. The expectation is that the Graduate Secretary will move into the Commissioner role.

So, this means that they will have a maximum of 6 terms between both roles.

(a) Confirm term limit clarification

(5) Straw Poll: All in favor?

(a) Majority in favor. We will open it to electronic voting.

(6) O'Connor: I move to vote on the adoption of a Graduate Secretary role with the addition to the bylaws.

(a) Diana: Second.

(b) [Voting Record](#)

(7) Assad: I also want to move that we make the Draft Committee one of our regular committees. We have instituted more drafts over the past few years, which have greatly helped the conference, but we need to make sure they are operating fairly.

(a) Mike: Second.

4. The only thing I want to add, as my last morning as Commissioner, is that I hope to work with the new Commissioner and Graduate Secretary to outline all of our committees and roles for more transparency across the conference, and hopefully post these on the NEISA website. We would like to make sure everyone knows who is on the committee, as well as what they are all doing and responsible for.

B. President's Report: Paige Clarke, Dartmouth

1. Good morning! This past year was another great one for NEISA; this past year we have won the women's and coed championships. [] We were able to execute nationals without going over budget, and had help from all over the conference to run the regatta from all angles.
2. We do have some areas of weakness we should focus on. We did not have as many women's teams competing this season, which is ___ for our level of competition, and also important for ensuring we have enough berths in NEISA for women's nationals.
- 3.

C. Treasurer's Report: Ryan Mullins, Boston College

1. Unfortunately we do not have a good way to call him in, so Ryan asked me to submit the report as written and pull up the financials online (as they are sensitive, we don't want to post them).
2. Year to year, our financials are consistent. Our biggest expense is judging. These costs have definitely increased, but this is an investment that also helps increase the quality of our regattas throughout the conference. I

wanted to note that rather than billing by event, we bill the most active teams 1000% more which helps cover the cost of judges.

3. Ryan recommends a modest dues increase over the next few years, which if nothing else, helps us keep up with inflation. This is to help us to build up a buffer of a few thousand dollars that we can use for various projects; for example, a few years back we used this buffer to fund Techscore.

- a) Diana Weidenbacker, UNH: What is the graduated dues amount?

- b) Assad: Let me pull up the report. It is important to note that we are hosting Nationals every 4 years, so NEISA's net income every 4 years will be lower. About the graduated dues amount, I can't say for sure; I think we're sensitive to the fact that we have a broad spectrum of schools competing at different levels, so we will graduate the costs proportional to the size of the program. Paying NEISA dues comes out of different pockets for different schools, and we want to be sensitive to that.

- (1) As a side note, we do have some schools that haven't paid dues – a lot of the time this is due to red tape or other administrative issues. Usually it is not an issue with being able to pay, but if we ever do come across this issue, we want to work it out with the team. We don't want to kick anyone out of NEISA and not let them sail because they can't pay.

- c) O'Connor: Can you go back to the numbers – There's nothing for the website on here, do we pay for that or the ICSA?

- (1) Assad: That is covered by our ICSA dues I believe; I will ask about that and confirm.

4. Assad: I Move to accept the proposed budget.

- a) Mike: Second

- b) All in favor?

- (1) Majority in favor.

5. Jeff Dusek, Wellesley: Question - a few categories, like the championship meeting as well as the "miscellaneous" category, drop pretty drastically for next year. Do we know why?

- a) Assad: I will have to ask Ryan about that.

D. NEISA Scheduling Coordinator's Report: Frank Pizzo, Bowdoin

1. Our NEISA scheduling draft will be this Thursday at 3pm. I will send out the draft packet after this meeting as there might be some changes.

2. I want to highlight some changes in the schedule from last year:

- a) Friis Trophy: 10 NEISA spots

- b) Vietor Trophy: 10 NEISA, hosted by CGA w/ support from CC
 - c) Sacred Heart & Priddy: 10 NEISA, and some berths for other conferences
3. Many ICSA regattas have changed.
- a) USF Womens: 1 NEISA berth instead of 2
 - b) Tulane: 3 NEISA invites
 - c) Conn: 2 NEISA spots to 3
 - d) Rudkin @ Eckered: 6 NEISA spots
 - e) Tulane Team Race and Womens Tulane Regattas: we believe they are promotional because they are new
 - f) Navy Spring: 5 NEISA
 - g) Two J/70 events at CGA: 6 invites, but no set NEISA berths for it. I know a lot of teams included these regattas in their questionnaire, but I think CGA will be deciding the invites on that.
 - (1) If there is a conference that is given a set berth, that conference goes “to the end of the line” so, for the CGA regatta, NEISA is at the end of the line. CGA cannot skip over people in the scheduling order when picking invites - If in NEISA, Harvard selects before Bowdoin, and CGA is trying to decide who to take, they need to take Harvard.
 - (2) O’Connor: So it could be the case that we have one of those regattas with CGA and no one else from NEISA?
 - (3) Assad: Yes, but I believe that is what they wanted. Brian do you think you can shed some light on that?
 - (a) Brian Nelson, CGA: I’m not sure.
 - (4) Pizzo: I’ve actually talked to him about it – there is a keelboat league that happens in the fall, and I think they are looking to capture that competition. I’d actually love to talk to the teams that play in this league a lot - for example, charleston, maritime schools, etc.
 - (5) Assad: Ah, so to basically to address a more national keelboat schedule.
 - h) Pizzo: Any other questions?
 - (1) Assad: It’s worth pointing out that for those Tulane promotionals, they are a great opportunity to sail at our nationals venue but won’t count towards anything.
 - i) Showcases

- (1) We've had two years of hosting Showcases where we have had trouble securing hosts, and have had to find hosts last minute.
- (2) For these Showcase regattas, the agreement was that these venues were supposed to have two fleets of boats and be geographically in Boston or more south. I count 8 schools who qualify for this. I have created a rotation for the next few years with two schools hosting different events each time. This will allow the hosts to know what they are hosting and when, giving them ample time to prepare. This also allows everyone else (like MAISA) to know where they are headed.
- (3) Pizzo: I move to adopt the rotation up until the fall of 2023
 - (a) Assad: So moved.
 - (b) O'Connor: Second
 - (c) Assad: Are we going to vote on a rule for backing out of these?
 - (i) Pizzo: I'd like to after this.
- (4) All in favor?
 - (a) Majority in favor.
- j) Pizzo: I don't have a proposal, but I think this is good for discussion. I don't know if we need a penalty for hosts backing out of hosting these events. Maybe it's not a big deal for the rest of the conference, but it puts us in a tough place with the rest of the ICSA and makes it look like we are not committed to the idea of a showcase.
 - (1) O'Connor: I think it's crucial that the alt finals gets taken as seriously as the finals. "I don't want to host the alt finals because I'm not in it" is a terrible message to send and I think we need to stop that.
 - (2) Assad: Yes. The women's alt final is especially important – it's a true womens B level. I think especially as Frank pointed out, we should probably have a penalty so we are showing we are serious to the ICSA.
 - (3) John Ingalls, Salve: We need to consider the scenarios that are out of coaches' control as well - for example, the state of RI said we cannot host a regatta because of the traffic with cruise ships, other events, etc.

- (4) O'Connor: Yes, absolutely. This is more focused on the scenario where a host says "I just don't want to host it".
- (5) Assad: and thank you John for stepping up to host! I think this penalty can be implemented in a way that will take those scenarios into account. I do think that we need to do something to ensure more stability for the rest of the country.
- (6) Fran Charles, MIT: It appears on this rotation there are some schools that host only finals and some only alt finals. I think we should consider all schools for both events.
- (7) Pizzo: Yes, I think the idea is that they would switch next cycle – so they would host women's one year, coed another, etc.
- (8) Ingalls: Yes, I meant to ask that, because it looks like Salve is only hosting alts.
- (9) Pizzo: I'm not tied to it, I just focused on alternating between co-ed and women's events (so for example, we're not going to Brown for every Women's event).
- (10) Assad: I think we're in the first phase of most of these schools being two-fleet venues, and we may add more two fleet venues or get rid of some two fleet venues after 2023. It makes sense to keep this rotation short for now.
- (11) Charles: That is fair. I think that for now it should be corrected so schools are not hosting the same events every time.
- (12) Mike Kalin, MIT: before this, the alt finals had an automatic berth - will we be keeping this?
- (a) Assad: Yes, I think it's appropriate to keep this. I think it's a way of saying thank you for hosting.
- (13) Assad: We just approved this, so we will need to revise to correct repeat schools.
- (14) Pizzo: Where are the things that need to change?
- (15) Charles: Yale is only in one column; I think they are only hosting finals. Salve seems to only be hosting alt finals.
- (16) Pizzo: If we want to adjust, I am fine with that.
- (17) John Mollicone, Brown: We can adjust based on participation - say for example, oh this team has a really

weak women's team this semester, we'll move this regatta for now.

(18) Pizzo: I don't think we should move the regatta based on the strength or weakness of the team; I think we should just keep it on a set schedule, and not change it last minute. This schedule takes into account Schell and Urn weekends for alternating MIT years, other nuances and etc.

(19) Assad: Maybe one day the southern restriction we can host. But anyway, a possible penalty - if a host drops out, they cannot participate in either showcase.

(20) Weidenbacker: I think yes, there should be a penalty for hosts that just do not want to host it, but we need to make sure that we build in a clause that is sensitive to the situations that are beyond people's control.

(21) Assad: Yes, agreed. I think if we have a set rotation 5 years in advance, this will get rid of a lot of these scheduling issues. If it is truly out of their control, we will not penalize them. I do not think we are prepared to create a rule right now, so we should probably discuss this in the January executive committee conference call.

(22) O'Connor: I agree, we are definitely not prepared to discuss this now.

(23) Emilie Blinderman, Connecticut College: Using the subjective judgement of the executive committee in in-acting this rule would be good.

(24) Assad: Frank, will you work on this?

(25) Pizzo: Yes, sure.

4. Pizzo: This might be taboo in NEISA, but I started working on a rotation for our Spring championships. There used to be restrictions where you could not host if you had hosted in the past 3 years, and so on; we got rid of these rules because we expected to pick these championship venues based on the Spring Nationals venue. I don't think that is actually the case.

a) We have 10 hosts in NEISA if we add Bowdoin and Dartmouth back in the mix. I think it would be helpful to create a rotation for these regattas, as well as the other championship regattas. The advanced notice would be great for our conference and the people putting in the work to host the regattas.

b) O'Connor: I think it's a great idea, I'm just not sure how set in stone this schedule will be so far in advance.

- c) Pizzo: Because the nationals schedule is set so far in advance, I think we can work around it.
- d) Assad: For MAISA, rotations have definitely pigeonholed teams into hosting sub par regattas in the past. But I think the idea could be good for us as a guideline.
- e) Mollicone: Is there a reason for changing it – is there a problem with the bids? I think there are lots of variables at play here, like new boats and equipment, that may make teams wary of committing to a rotation.
- f) Charles: I was going to piggyback on this. I think we have a healthy situation where people will put in bids when they are comfortable hosting an event. I do think it is great that in NEISA, we consider all teams to host our events, unlike in MAISA, who does not even consider places like Cornell for their events.
- g) Mollicone: I agree.
- h) O'Connor: It's important to note that Frank is just suggesting we create a committee to look at it. I think we should definitely do that, because there is merit to this idea.
- i) Assad: Definitely. For example, I think CC has done a great job hosting team racing for the past two years, but there was concern with our championship being hosted at the same venue twice. Rather than creating a new committee, I think the championship committee and competition committee can work on this and give us their recommendations by February.

E. NEISA Awards Committee Report: David Thompson, Dartmouth

- 1. Assad: No awards committee members here, so I will present.
- 2. Though they are not here to hear it, we should thank them for all of the time they put in. They spend around 6 hours a week deciding who should win our awards, and represent us at the national level at the ICSA awards.
- 3. We want to change how the sportsmanship award is voted on. They would like to set up a process where people are nominated via email; I don't think we need to vote on this, but I would like to discuss it.
 - a) O'Connor: I think any discussion about those awards before they are given is great. The awards should reflect the whole year, instead of whoever we can come up with on the Saturday night at the regatta.
 - b) Weidenbacker: Is there a rule that disqualifies teams from this award just because they are not at nationals?

- (1) Assad: The idea is that this would happen via email so we can nominate people before the spring championships and every team can be included. I will make sure this is clear.
4. Sailor of the Week – the awards committee will not award sailor of the week on the weekend of the conference championships as it detracts from the team that has just won the event.
- a) I want to emphasize that we love to recognize our smaller teams that have a sort of “breakout performance” at our bigger events, so I’d encourage everyone to submit those when they happen.
 - b) O’Connor: how many nominations are they getting on a weekly basis?
 - c) Assad: Less than one. They would like to recognize more people but they need the nominations to do this.
 - d) All in favor?

(1) Unanimous

F. Judge Coordinator’s Report: Amanda Callahan, RWU

1. Amanda’s report is online. We are really fortunate to have her in this role; she works really hard in it and takes it very seriously.
2. For priority events, she is actively seeking out judges. Let her know early if you have anyone who can judge at an event, as there are many spots to fill. It’s important that everyone does this.
3. For all of our in conference and out of conference regattas not on this list, the hosts are responsible for finding judges and umpires. You can’t email Amanda the week before the event and try to find a judge.
4. Initiatives for 2020:
 - a) She is going to try to do a better job communicating with hosts about their umpires and judges.
 - b) Utilizing resources to make rookie umpires feel more confident
5. Move that we accept
 - a) Weidenbacker: second
 - b) None opposed
6. O’Connor: Burn and I have created an extensive list of people who we think could be judges at New Englands. Let us know if there is anyone we should add to that list from your school. We are trying to figure this out early so we are prepared.
7. Assad: Great point Mike. An email to the NEISA list only does so much. You, as coaches, reaching out to your alumni is much more effective.

G. Performance Ranking Committee Report: Mike Kalin, MIT

1. I can pull a Greg and just say no changes and fold my arms, but that's basically what it was. It's not that we didn't discuss and look at the numbers, but it's just that there are no major changes to report.
2. Having the women's PR reflect the coed system is working well. It is emphasizing the important events, and the weighting seems to be correct. We recognize there are some anomalies with the system that we expect to correct themselves over the next year.
3. Singlehanded is an old and debated topic. There is an argument saying that singlehandeds and sloops are not dinghies and team racing, so why are we scoring them – The counter argument is that usually, a team's best sailors are attending those events, so those regattas are taking a scoring opportunity away from them.
 - a) When taking a look at the numbers this year, singlehandeds did not affect scoring that much. Sloops did for a few teams, but we think this is fine and should be kept the same way.
4. The other issue is the alt-finals. I think it was two years ago when URI figured out that they could get more points from sending their top team to the Oberg and winning than sending them to the alt finals – This was the reason for creating the A- regatta ranking, a step below an A level and above a B level. It's a separate category of scoring so we keep the incentive to go to those events (such as the Hood).
 - a) Previously there was a sliding scale so that the Atlantic Coast Tournament winners could not get more points than the Atlantic Coast Championship sailors, but that is difficult to implement and not as effective. We are comfortable with the system of an A-ranking for the alt finals regatta.
5. We've also added more C levels across all weekends. Frank can you touch on that a bit?
 - a) Pizzo: There are two C levels almost every weekend, a lot of them being 1 day events for those teams who have trouble making it to two day events – this is something we discussed last annual meeting.
6. Questions?
 - a) Assad: The Performance Ranking Committee team puts in a lot of work - thank you so much, especially to Mike.
7. Assad: I move to accept the PR report.
 - a) Brian Nelson: second

H. Draft Committee Report: Frank Pizzo, Bowdoin

1. We have put in a lot of work for this, especially Skip White before he retired. We had not looked at our draft committee in a while, so it was about time we revisit it.
2. The first thing we wanted to tackle was the NEISA in-conference and out of conference regatta drafts. Currently there are two separate drafts, with separate picking orders. They reflect the old system, especially the interconference draft. We think there needs to be a change. We propose to combine these drafts into one draft.
 - a) Assad: Second
 - b) Pizzo: If you look at the google sheet, this is for the co-ed draft – it makes sense because you’re picking all of your regattas at once, not picking them over two rounds. We followed what was the in-conference draft and just tweaked it a little bit; there were some natural breaks, overall these numbers reflect pretty accurately where these teams would get their picks
 - c) Assad: We hope that this will help us fill all of our top level regattas – we have been having an issue with this over the past few seasons.
 - d) Pizzo: Hopefully this will help teams build out their schedule and prepare for their season.
 - e) O’Connor: What’s important to note is that for the interconference draft, the number of regattas we could choose from went way down, so it seemed silly to have a separate draft.
 - f) Assad: All in favor - remember, one vote per school.
(1) 20 in favor, 2 opposed
3. Women’s out of conference draft
 - a) There are not a lot of regattas that are a part of this draft. Under the old system, the order was 1-4 or 1-16, depending on how many teams are playing. We thought for us, that was too big of a bonus for the top 4 teams because they could select the most popular regattas and it would never spread to the rest of the conference. We propose a tiny tweak: go through 1-4, give 1 another pick, and then do 5-16. We selected 16 because there are 16 teams sailing women’s events in out of conference events.
 - b) Assad: to be sure, we’re removing the highlighted boxes that used to be a second pick for the top teams.
 - c) Pizzo: Yes, they wouldn’t get those pick until after 16. I propose this new women’s out of conference draft order
(1) Weidenbacker: second

d) Dusek: The way it's written in the proposal and shown here are different. In practice it'll make no difference but I just wanted to confirm.

(1) Assad: It's the same, just written differently.

e) If the number of teams competing changes, will we change this?

f) Pizzo: I think if we were consistently getting 17, 18, 19 women's teams, yes we would change it, but probably not before we get consistent participation.

g) Weidenbacker: we always talk about getting more women's teams participating in our conference - I think by giving those first teams a second pick, we shortchange our smaller teams by not giving them an opportunity to compete. I think we should add that back in when we have measured depth in our women's teams in NEISA.

h) O'Connor: I see what you're saying, but unfortunately I don't think we're filling these events.

i) Assad: Yes, I definitely see what you're saying Diana. Mike is right, we are just not filling these regattas.

j) Blinderman: Right, and usually the few popular regattas just have really long alternate lists - the ones at the bottom aren't being filled. If smaller teams want to go, they can.

k) Dusek: Yes some events are available, but sometimes they are events that exclude the smaller teams for other reasons. For example, USF Women's - a smaller club team could go, but will likely not be able to afford to attend. I want to be cautious about how we are talking about it. Not all berths are created equal.

l) O'Connor: I agree. We just needed a better example - the Toni Deutsch was not filled either, and that is in Boston.

m) Assad: I want to make sure everyone realizes that if we do not vote in favor of this proposal, we are going back to the old method of giving teams 1-4 two picks.

n) All in favor?

(1) Majority in favor.

4. Pizzo: The weekend of the Friis/Staake trophy is unique in that the Staake teams are set (they do not have to pick that event). The Friis Trophy has just increased from 8 NEISA teams to 10 NEISA. Something we should consider is pre-filling the Friis and Staake. The Friis will be at Yale this year with Stanford and a midwestern school. What has happened this year is that some of our top teams did not get into the Friis - what do we think

about pre-setting the Friis and Staake so that we have a qualifier that the non-qualified teams can focus on.

- a) Mollicone: We used to be at 8 NEISA, now we're at 12 right? What if it goes somewhere like RWU where they cannot host all of those boats?
 - b) Pizzo: Yes. I think if we go back to a school with a smaller fleet it will have to go back to a draft.
5. Pizzo: I move that we select teams 1-10 to be in the Friis, and teams for the Staake based on performance rankings
- a) 19 in favor, none opposed
6. We propose the draft order as written above; it extends the draft into teams 17 and 18 (historically those teams have not participated in team race events so). We have added a few regattas in the spring so we think that this will add a lot of opportunity for teams to attend various events around the conference.
- a) Dusek: I would propose changing 1-18 to 1-x. It will open up access. It won't likely change anything, but I think it's consistent with other drafts. We should not have an exclusionary system when drafting into our TR events.
 - b) Taylor Martin, MMA: I think some of our lower level teams usually get some opportunity to draft events, but I think there is a rule on getting a second team in.
 - c) Martin: I mean for a second regatta, not second team at one regatta.
 - d) Assad: are there team races not on the draft?
 - e) Pizzo: Herring Pond is not on the draft, that is chosen in reverse PR order. After the draft, events will still be open. Maybe this is me as the jaded scheduler, but right now is the time of year where everyone says they want to play – but March will roll around, and no one is committed to it.
 - f) Assad: there is a disparity in these regattas – and Jeff, I'm not sure how you feel about this – it can be discouraging to go to the wrong even and sail in 4,5,6 for every race that weekend. Im wondering if we need another reverse filled, non-drafted team race that will give a second opportunity for these teams.
 - g) Blinderman: I think like you're saying, the Herring Pond is a great example. If those teams want more Herring Pond like events, we should add them. Also, I feel that this discussion is not necessarily related to the proposal.

- h) Dusek: Improving our team racing by improving our fleet racing is a fair point. I just do not think there is a reason to close off these events; we do this in fleet racing. I don't know why we would restrict it.
- i) Assad: I think the reason we are concerned is because we have a big attendance issue in this time of year (early spring). Some teams will drop regattas and cannot attend, but do not offer enough time for other schools to make plans to fill those berths.
- j) O'Connor: We need to go through this new draft order and see how it shakes out. We could make this exact change next year after we see how this works this year.
- k) Assad: I think approaching this proactively is good as well, with adding more events like the Herring Pond.
- l) Pizzo: Currently, the way it works is it goes 1-10, 1-3, 11-14, 1-16, repeat. This really only modifies this last 1-16 to 1-18. It's a tiny change that brings a couple more teams into the mix.
- m) Mollicone: So just adding teams 17 to 18 into the draft.
- n) Assad: It is such a small change, so maybe we should just say 1-x.
- o) Caroline Patten, UVM: It seems 1-14 is getting more benefits than just the Staake; the cutoff is a little harder to jump for the teams after.
- p) Assad: Did we have a lot of open spots at mid-level team races last year?
- q) Pizzo: Yes, the one we hosted had a few; Tufts hosts a bunch, and Yale as well. I think there are more opportunities for participation in those type of events.
- r) Assad: So in a practical situation, we're not running out of spots.
- s) Dusek: I guess my point is that we would like more flexibility to choose events that work for our schedule instead of whatever is available.
- t) Pizzo: That is fair. I just think that is a huge change rather than a tiny change; I think it has the ability to change the entire makeup of some of these regattas.
- u) Dusek: I'll withdraw this proposal, with the condition that we discuss this next year with consideration as to what weekends or events work for these smaller schools.
- v) Charles: We are seeing decreasing participation in our midweek fly regatta. That could be a good opportunity to get some sailing in against other teams, though it doesn't count for scoring.

(1) Assad: Thanks Fran, that's a great idea.

w) O'Connor: I would also like to ask Jeff to join us on the Draft Committee.

(1) Dusek: Sure

x) Assad: I move to accept the proposed team race draft.

(1) O'Connor: Second

(2) All in favor?

(a) Majority in favor, 1 opposed

I. Competition Committee Report: Greg Wilkinson, BC

J. Championship Committee Report

1. Championship Updates

a) Women's (Brown) - John Mollicone

(1) Not much of an update for now. Amanda was in touch with me about judges and chief judges. I told her I preferred to have someone other than a Brown alumni as chief judge. We have two year old FJs, we might get new jibs. We have the 420s we used at nationals, with the mains we got for that event. We're planning to have coaches on the water. Will run the Dellenbaugh the same way.

b) Coed (MIT) - Fran Charles

(1) We haven't done anything yet. We'll look for a PRO who's not an MIT employee. Boats are in great shape. I have brought up to the Championship Committee (which I guess is just Greg) that we have a problem with our standardized SIs that allows judges to use rule 42 on the water; We don't trust them to be consistent and up to date with class rules in college sailing. That was extremely evident at Nationals last year. We thank the judges for their time of course, but some of these calls were crazy; I was looking at the same boats as they were and these calls were not acceptable. I think we are doing a disservice to have them be able to enact that rule on a whim.

(a) Assad: We should have a debate about this on the championship committee level.

(b) Charles: I agree, I just was not able to have a debate before. I was told "no, we're giving them the flag" and then I had to work with them. I said, "put that flag back in the bottom of the boat".

(c) O'Connor: we had to do the same thing at the Urn - we had one judge who wanted to get some experience and I said no, do not call rule 42, just listen to protests. Someone else ended up showing up as well who had a clue, and we were comfortable giving them the flag.

c) Team Race (Harvard) - Mike O'Connor

(1) We have ordered a new fleet of Zim FJs. We don't know if they will be ready, that's up in the air. Worst comes to worst, we can work with MIT if we need to. We want to mirror what they are doing at nationals - they are planning to use 420s for the gold fleet, so we will do the same.

K. Boats and Safety Report: Fran Charles, MIT

1. I want to recognize those who were on the committee last year who helped come up with advisory standards for minimum temperatures for safe sailing. We thought it was important that we consider this in New England
 - a) Taylor Martin from MMA, Jeff from Olin, Jeff from Conn, Kevin Coakley from Harvard, and Jared from Wentworth.
2. We suggest that we wear drysuits when the water temp is less than the air temp. When the wind chill is 26 & below - no sailing.
3. We have created guidelines for the # of safety boats and how to address that in a regatta situation; clearly telling them to leave their duty of judging and to watch the people that are swimming, and so on.
4. We have also compiled suggestions for cold weather dressing. Brian Clancy from Cornell, Audrey Giblin from Dartmouth, Someone else from BC - it's a great resource.
5. We would like to have another small subcommittee to deal with the idea of windchill so we can get a clearer idea for a conference guideline. We as a committee could not agree on a number and come to a conclusion, but we would like to as we think our host schools would like some guidelines. These are not rules, but if you do break them, you open yourself up to liability. We need to address this with probably 3-4 calls before hosting in march. We will want to come up with a number the NEISA executive committee can vote on.
6. Charles: If you are interested in serving, please reach out to me.

VI. Old Business

A. Election of NEISA Executive Board for 2019

1. Commissioner : Graduate
 - a) Mike Kalin

2. Graduate Secretary: Graduate
 - a) Frank Pizzo
3. President : Undergraduate
 - a) Brian Nelson (CGA '21)
4. Vice President: Undergraduate
 - a) Nominations: Preston Anderson (Bowdoin '22), Eric Marshall (UMaine '21), Carter Brock (Northeastern '22)
 - b) Winner: Eric Marshall (UMaine '21)
5. Undergraduate Secretary: Undergraduate
 - a) Jack Valentino (Bates '22)
6. Treasurer: Ryan Mullins, BC
7. Schedule Coordinator:
 - a) Justin Assasd will act as interim scheduling coordinator until January 12th
8. Northern Regional Director: Diana Weidenbacker, UNH
9. Central Regional Director: Mike O'Connor, Harvard
10. Southern Regional Director: John Mollicone, Brown
11. Director of Boats and Safety: Fran Charles, MIT
12. Competition Committee Chair: Greg Wilkinson, BC
13. Northern Regional Representative: Undergraduate
 - a) Nominations: Finn Bascio (McGill '22), Preston Anderson (Bowdoin '22)
 - b) Winner: Finn Bascio (McGill '22)
14. Central Regional Representative: Undergraduate
 - a) Nominations: Carter Brock (Northeastern '22), Thomas Jagielski (Olin '22)
 - b) Winner: Thomas Jagielski (Olin '22)
15. Southern Regional Representative: Undergraduate
 - a) Julia O'Connor (RWU '23)
16. At Large Representative/Scheduling Coordinator Administrator: Undergraduate
 - a) Lizzie Russell (BC '21)
17. At Large Representative/NEISA Awards Administrator: Undergraduate
 - a) Preston Anderson (Bowdoin '22)

VII. New Business

A. Championship Committee Report

1. There is a committee working on the exec director position for the ICSA. Everyone has hopefully seen the consultant's report that was revealed at the annual meeting last year - there is a committee working on the

position, but there is also discussion on the future of what this sport will look like. I just wanted everyone to know that those wheels are still turning, and turning in a positive way for New England. I'm not on the committee so I can't speak to details, but feel free to ask me any questions.

- a) Weidenbacker: I know one of the comments was about splitting varsity and club teams. Can you speak to that?
- b) Assad: That the feedback from the consulting group told us that one of the ICSA's core values is that everyone competes together. I think we are looking to keep an avenue open for teams that are growing to keep competing at a higher and higher level; they do not want to exclude teams from this growth. The ICSA has 210 members, so the goals of each group will change dramatically. The goal is to find a balance of meeting all of these goals for these groups, while still progressing the organization forward.

(1) If there would be any reorganization, it would be more focused on giving teams that are participating frequently more opportunity.

B. [ICSA Recruiting Committee Rules](#)

1. The other thing I wanted to discuss and is where our conference stands on recruiting rules. The feeling is that these rules have not been taken seriously and there needs to be some "teeth" behind them.

- a) "Failure to comply with these regulations may result in the loss of eligibility for the student athlete and the loss of postseason opportunities for the institution implicated" - the interpretation of this, as it stands, is that teams would not be able to compete in Nationals but would be able to compete in conference championships.
- b) I think the idea is to have teams avoid recruiting the winner of a single handed competition before July 1. The concern is not conversations between students.

(1) Dusek: We need to consider the student run teams with organizing structures that would be impacted by this, such as student leaders.

- c) Martin: I think this is way too vague. Many institutions already adhere to NCAA compliance; I ran this by our NCAA coordinator and she said it was far too vague to be enforceable as it's written.
- d) Weidenbacker: How does this impact Rose Bowl? There is a collegiate night where sailors and parents can talk to college

coaches are able to talk to sailors. This is the same with the CJ Buckley Regatta and the Orange Bowl.

- e) O'Connor: This rule of talking to sophomores is broken all the time. This should be outlined and emphasized more. Who is going to police this?
 - f) Mollicone: Exactly, who is going to police this - It's good to have these rules, but we can't even police who's sailing on weekends.
 - g) Assad: I think the idea is to submit a grievance to the ICSA; It is intentionally vague.
 - h) Carolyn Corbet, Northeastern: As a student run team, our Captain, President, and Recruitment chair pretty much run these early stages of recruitment without the input of our coach. I'm concerned with how this would affect teams like ours - club teams with coaches that might have students involved with recruitment.
 - i) Assad: As it stands, this rule would not apply to students, so I think your situation is OK.
 - j) Mollicone: Also, what about high school teams - we have high school teams sail with us all the time.
 - k) Assad: I believe it is intentionally designed to consider teams who share facilities by specifying recruiting-specific visits.
2. Assad: Straw poll, do we philosophically agree with this? Not necessarily the wording. 1 vote per person.
- a) Majority in favor. 2 opposed.

C. Discussion of term limits for graduate committee members

- 1. Not a vote but a discussion. We have a rotation in our terms, which was a result of frustration with the lack of rotation in ICSA leadership.
 - a) Pros: we have fresh people in every position that will bring a new perspective; Cons: if we have someone who is spectacular in the role, they will be forced out by these rules.
 - b) As an example, I've been commissioner for 5 years and scheduling coordinator for 9 years. Maybe I've been here too long and should not have a vote anymore; Maybe I should have my voice heard in some other capacity.
 - c) Dusek: There is value in institutional knowledge. I'm not sure what term limits necessarily solves, especially because we do not have much enthusiasm in signing up for these positions.
 - d) Assad: I think we are all cautious of challenging our friends, but this is a good way to keep the ideas and viewpoints in our meetings fresh.

- e) Pizzo: Also, it is a natural breaking point. A good way to get out, if you want to.
- f) Weidenbacker: How I see it is that the top heavy jobs that require lots of time and effort – the jaded scheduling coordinator viewpoint – these jobs that really are running the organization really benefit from longevity. The other jobs are not that time intensive less so. There is benefit in institutional knowledge, but if someone is really dropping the ball, they should say that. I don't think anyone wants to be in that job for the rest of their lives, but there is not that many people and it's not that hard of a job.
- g) Dusek: Frank's point of having a natural way to transition out of a role is a very valid point that I hadn't thought of. I think having a way to leave without feeling that you are letting anyone down is extremely valuable.
- h) Assad: Straw poll again, we will give this to a committee to work on if it passes.
 - (1) Majority in favor, 1 opposed.
 - (2) We will need a committee for this.
 - (3) Pizzo: Let's put all the coaches who aren't here on it.
 - (4) Assad: Let me think about it, I'll put the committee together.

D. Meeting criteria proposal

1. Dusek: There has been a practice in the last couple of years to have the strategic planning meeting take place via the NEISA coaches list. I propose we put criteria in place where these meetings are announced publicly and the results are published online, with a call-in option online. It would be nice to have these meetings recorded, and meeting minutes distributed for everyone to see. If we are going to have these ad-hoc strategic meetings, we should make them accessible to everyone.
 - a) Assad: I second, and have some explanation: some undergrads may feel that these discussions do not reflect what is relevant to their team. That is why we have these meetings, that are making sure we're preparing for our goals as an organization; for example, the addition of B and C level events to foster development at the lower levels. I think it would be good to have these meetings become a little more formalized.
 - b) Blinderman: A lot of the stuff talked about was really just relevant to the top teams; I'm not sure we need so many rules for meetings.

Announcing meetings a week in advance is great, but it was my view these are meant to be ad-hoc.

- c) O'Connor: I do not see any downside to what Jeff is proposing.
- d) Pizzo: It could even be more productive if we do what he is proposing; I wouldn't have to drive 8 hours to sit in a room and be marginally productive. We could call/video in, and it would not be hard to have someone take notes.
- e) O'Connor: Is there a concern about putting it on the NEISA website rather than an email list?
- f) Blinderman: We might not want to publish our internal documents when we strategize against our competitors.
- g) Assad: Yes, I think we need to keep some of our documents internal.
- h) Dusek: I amend the proposal - exclude the part about the NEISA website and just send it via request.
- i) All in favor?

(1) Majority in favor.

E. Appointing of ICSA Committee Reps

- 1. Hall of Fame: Ken Legler
- 2. Procedural Rules: John Mollicone
- 3. All-America: David Thompson and one rep as selected by the NEISA Awards Committee
- 4. Eligibility: Jeff Bresnahan
- 5. All-Academic: Matt Lindblad
- 6. Membership and Development:
- 7. Championships/Competition: Greg Wilkinson and Justin Assad
- 8. Communications: Ali Blumenthal
- 9. Interconference Regattas: Frank Pizzo
- 10. Appeals: Mike Kalin
- 11. If you are interested in joining any of these committees as the NEISA rep, let me know.

F. Membership Status Requests

- 1. Application by Olin College for Provisional Membership
 - a) Sailing team started last year. Small school, ~350 people. They sail with Wellselley with their 2 FJ, and are co-coached by Jeff Dusek (he also coaches Wellselley)
 - b) O'Connor: I move that we accept their application.
 - (1) Assad and Weidenbacker: Second
- 2. Application by UMaine for Regular Membership

- a) Eric: We have sailed a few more regattas, and have worked hard on sailor retention as well as getting boats. We have a grad student who is coaching us, and have reached out to the high school to try to work together with them. We have a faculty advisor to keep the ball rolling when I graduate

- (1) Assad: I move that we accept their application.

- (2) Weidenbacker: Second

- 3. Application by UMass Amherst for Regular Membership

- a) Hugh: We were technically established in '95, and have been consistent for the past 10 years or so. We have up to 30 consistent members, and have just acquired 6 FJs. We are looking to move to a body of water with more consistent wind. We have graduate student involvement, but are trying to build. It is in our budget every year to get a coach, but are looking to find someone who will make the commitment to us.

- (1) Assad: I move that we accept their application.

- (2) Weidenbacker: Second

- G. One important thing for these smaller teams: when we go to these ICSA regattas, we cannot have students from different schools competing under the same team (even if their colleges have an athletic agreement). We can do it at the scrimmage level, but not for ICSA registered events.

- H. NEISA Annual Awards

- 1. NEISA Honor Roll

- a) Recognizes performance after college sailing.

- b) Nominees:

- (1) Dylan Whitcraft (Bates '19) - Currently racing for Thailand in 49er worlds

- (2) Robyn Lesh (MIT '16) - Working with American Magic on the America's Cup

- c) Winner: Robyn Lesh (MIT '16)

- 2. MacArthur Service Award

- a) MacArthur volunteered countless weekends to judge in New England, and was very involved in frostbite.

- b) Winner: John Moulthrop (HWS)

VIII. Date of Next Meeting: TBD by Graduate Secretary, sometime in January after the ICSA Meeting.

IX. Adjournment