<div align="center">

NEISA Executive Committee Conference Call Meeting Notes
November 12, 2020

</div>

Action Items
1. ***NEISA Specific Action Items***
2. ***NEISA Action Items involving the ICSA***
3. ***ICSA Action Items***

Motions
1. None

Next Call: AGM on December 5th

Meeting Notes:

I. **Meeting called to order at 1:00PM**
   A. Roll Call: Mike Kalin (Commissioner), Frank Pizzo (Graduate Secretary), Taylor Martin (Maine Maritime), Doug Clark (CGA), Cori Radtke (Bowdoin), Moose McClintock (URI), Diana Weidenbacker (UNH), Zach Leonard (Yale), Ken Legler (Tufts), Mike O'Connor (Harvard), Dave White (SHU), Caroline Patten (UVM), Justin Assad (Dartmouth), Greg Wilkinson (BC), Preston Anderson (At Large), Jared Reineck (Wentworth), Lizzie Russell (At Large), and seven unidentified callers

II. **Discussion of New Tiered Classification System**
   A. *Kalin:* This is turning out to be a more controversial meeting than we anticipated. The purpose of this is to assign a membership category to all members. We already voted to abandon the previous membership classification and now we need to vote on how we want to relocate teams. This is the first year doing this, so we hope to clarify some questions here. Diana sent a good email with questions so we'll answer those first. I'm going to pass it off to Justin for some background
   B. *Leonard*: At the ICSA Meeting last year, they voted to change to this system after the consultant recommended this.
   C. *Weidenbacker*: I agree we should make NEISA as professional as it can be but I'm concerned as to the impact of smaller, developing teams and club teams. As everyone here knows, there are more club teams than varsity teams in ICSA by a considerable margin.
   D. *Leonard*: I should point out that two club team leaders were on the committee.
   E. *Unknown caller*: But how many people were on the committee?
   F. *Leonard*: There was either 4, 5, or 6 I don't remember.

G. *Martin*: What we're doing today specifically doesn't change our scheduling. It won't change what regattas club teams will be able to register for any more than they were already affected.

H. *Kalin*: This is an annually fluctuating classification so teams can move around and move up or down. If you feel like your classification is unfair, you can appeal this and the committee is happy to look over your concerns. Is Cori on the call? Can you run us through the criteria?

I. *Radtke*: There are a few key things to point out. First, I want to reiterate that this is an annual process. Every November, we're going to look at these lists again. Second, appeals can be brought by the ICSA Executive Committee by December 1st. One thing that was missed in the email is that the cross-regional is laid out pretty clearly, but it should be noted that those criteria waterfall down. Fundamental is just the same criteria stepped down to lower levels. You can see this chart here and you can see that a conference or fundamental member still has access to regional regattas and in-conference events. These classifications also change your dues. Those are a few things that I wanted to reiterate. The criteria talked about demonstrated consistency and continuity and scheduling commitments.

1.

J. *Legler*: This is going to be the hardest year to do it because it's the first year doing this and also because there's no 2020 data. We're basing this on 2019 and 2018 data. Fall of 2021, we're going to have data and that's when we'll see the biggest changes. We'll also know after 2021 what the criteria is for teams to move around in the classification system by 2022.

K. *Radtke*: If you really still disagree after this conversation, please talk to someone who was on the committee so we can submit it formally by December 1 (Callahan, Radtke, Mollicone, and Legler).

L. *Kalin*: Another clarification is that this list is only the recommendations that come from our conference. The ICSA can change this around, but we hope that they align with our thoughts. We focused more on the operational and the performance

whereas ICSA will go strictly on performance on techscore. I thought the criteria was a little ambiguous. There are examples of teams having very strong off-shore teams, but we want them to continue to compete at appropriate levels. It needs a little bit of clarification on that end.

M. *Martin*: Yeah, that was my big question for us and Mass Maritime.

N. *Kalin*: We're not 100% sure the best way to figure out the classification of those off-shore events, but we'll work on that.

O. *Assad*: I just wanted to reiterate that if people look functionally at the events they've been attending and you look at the new events you've been attending. You'll notice it doesn't really change anything. It's actually a better deal to most mid-level teams with one or two exceptions.

P. *Kalin*: That goes to answer Jared Reineck's point hopefully.

Q. *Reineck*: Yes, I agree. There was just a lack of information previously.

R. *Weidenbacker*: Why go with the top 16 in Cross-Regional, not 18.

S. *Legler*: It wasn't about numbers, but more about criteria. We do have much more teams in cross-regional status than any other conference.

T. *Weidenbacker*: If I understand correctly, this system shouldn't impact the power of any team to move within the categories or their ability to schedule an event in-conference.

U. *Legler*: You're 99% correct. Regional teams can schedule inter-conference still through the draft. The conference teams are historically not going out of conference anyways.

V. *Weidenbacker*: How is that going to affect Dave White's SHU Invite?
    1. Assad: Any cross-regional or regional team from MAISA can attend and any level of NEISA team can attend because that will likely be a regional event.

W. *White*: There's always been a rivalry between Fordham and SHU, so we'd love to attend the Jesuit Open. Can we still attend?
    1. Assad: Likely yes because it'll be a regional event.

X. *Reineck*: I don't know if this is a very good idea to cut off lower level teams could be disparately impacted.
    1. *Assad*: I think we're going too much on a case-by-case basis and we need to look at the 10,000 foot view.
    2. *Reineck*: I think my team will agree with that fact that my schedule won't change, I'm just looking out for the smaller teams not on the call.

Y. *Kalin*: The spirit of mobility is in the system and people can argue their way out of their group if they feel strongly.

Z. *O'Connor*: We need to add a step in the process for possible petitioning from teams.

AA. *Martin*: Yeah, last we spoke we decided to vote on a slate of classifications all at once this first time. But in 2021 will we vote on a slate designed by the committee or will we be voting one-by-one on each team.

    1. *Kalin*: I don't think we discussed that specifically, but that makes sense because that's the way we assign provisional, associate, and regular membership. I think we might not vote on every team individually, but only on the fringe cases.

BB. *Clark*: I understand the criteria, but it's not really clear how we give incentive to fundamental or regional teams to move up. What do they need to do to enhance their ability to move up before they petition?

    1. *Assad*: I don't think we want to incentivize anyone to move anywhere. We want to make sure teams are happy with the racing they have. Teams that aren't in the cross-regional level aren't necessarily looking to compete at a different level. This is a cheaper way for them to compete at the same level that they were already competing.

    2. *Clark*: I think that's not true for everyone, Justin. I would love to see some conference teams move up to regional teams.

CC. *Radtke*: There are a few different things to look at. Let's take a fundamental team for example. If you're consistently beating fundamental teams and you have continuous leadership, then that's a strong petition to move up. I'm just curious about the vote, Mike? Are we looking at specific teams now, or are we still going to vote on this?

DD. *Reineck*: The first question I have is can we get some data published on the dues structure. Can we find out how much the dues will go down to for some teams? The other question I have is: the fundamental teams don't have ICSA voting rights. It seems like we're consolidating the power to make decisions to the teams at the top.

    1. *Kalin*: My understanding is that cross-regional will bear the brunt of the cost with cross-regional teams paying $1000, regional paying $500, and fundamental paying $250. That's just my best guess from the conversations I've heard.

    2. *Wilkinson*: The only people who vote anyways at the ICSA are board members. Regional and cross-regional members should hold board seats at the ICSA. There's no impact here on NEISA voting.

EE. *Kalin*: Does my dues guess sound accurate?

    1. *Wilkinson*: The intention is for cross-regional to be double of what regional is and fundamental to be nominal. But don't forget that COVID put a dues freeze on all NEISA teams.

FF. *Kalin*: Diana, did you get all your questions answered?

1. *Wiedenbacker*: Yeah, I think so. But I just want to make sure that our lower level teams are getting the opportunity to grow their skills and compete against stronger teams so that they can continue to grow in strength and depth.
2. *Wilkinson*: Access to competition at a NEISA regional regatta will remain unlimited. Any NEISA team can compete at a NEISA regional regatta. There are restrictions only at the cross-regional regattas. Cross-regional regattas can only be sailed by cross-regional teams. Outside of New England, fundamental teams cannot travel outside their conference to compete in NEISA regional events. NEISA fundamental teams cannot compete in regional regattas in other conferences.
3. *Weidenbacker*: That begs the question: what if there are open spots at a NEISA cross-regional regatta and it goes to NEISA to fill before other conferences. Does that leave open an opportunity for a non-cross-regional member to compete there?
4. *Wilkinson*: My gut feeling is that the answer is "no." But that's a valid concern and I'll make sure that gets floated.
5. *Martin*: What the rules say are contradictory, we should follow up on that, Greg.
   a) *Wilkinson*: I'm writing it up now.

GG. *Weidenbacker*: I just want to make sure teams that aren't on this call can get all these details. I know this may or may not pass, but it's only fair to the membership that everyone has the information before they sign on the dotted line.
1. *Kalin*: Yeah, I think more information is best. This zoom recording will be made available for anyone who would like to see it. Also, we do have a bit of a deadline coming up. What would be the way forward if this didn't pass, Diana?
   a) *Weidenbaker*: I'm not really sure, and I think we should default to the 10,000 foot view like Justin said. I just want to make sure that teams that don't have the opportunity to be on this call, have access to information.

HH. *Kalin*: I'll divide up sections of this call and ask people to write a summary of the questions and have that sent out with the voting link.

II. *Unknown caller*: How much movement will the ICSA have after we vote to pass this? Can they rearrange all of the assignments we recommended?
1. *Martin*: That was brought up at the winter meeting and the guidance we got on that was that their goal is to defer to the slate of recommendations that they receive from conferences. Has that changed?

a) *Wilkinson*: The ICSA competition committee is deferring to the conference recommendations as it relates to operational excellence and levels of team organization. The ICSA can only edit it based on performance criteria on techscore.

JJ. *Kalin*: Don't forget that this has already been passed. This vote is not a referendum on the system, just how we want to allocate teams within the system. The system is already in place.

KK. *Martin*: What's the deadline for the ICSA receiving our slate?

1. *Kalin*: ICSA wants it by November 15th. They will have it completed by December 1. All appeals due by December 1.

LL. *Kalin*: For appeals on our end, we need to have that done by November 15?

1. *Wilkinson*: Yes, they want a final list by the 15th.

MM. *Martin*: What happens if we don't have a quorum or a "yes" vote on this?

1. *Wilkinson*: We're a membership organization. We have to fit into a membership category. Without a yes vote, we'll defer to classifying each school individually. If we don't have a team get voted on or show up then they either wouldn't be a member of NEISA or will be penalized with the lowest rank.

NN. *Anderson*: Will the next meeting be the AGM and will it be the first Saturday in December?

1. *Kalin*: Yes to both.

III. Meeting adjourned by Kalin at 2:07PM
IV. Next Meeting Time: December 5th for the Annual General Meeting

	Approval of the Slate of Teams for Cross Regional/Regional/Fundamental	
		Yes/No
	School	
1	Amherst College	Yes
2	Bates College	Yes
3	Bentley University	Yes
4	Boston College	Yes
5	Boston University	Yes
6	Bowdoin College	Yes
7	Brandeis University	Yes
8	Brown University	Yes
9	Connecticut College	Yes
10	Dartmouth College	Yes
11	Emmanuel College	
12	Fairfield University	Yes
13	Harvard University	Yes
14	Maine Maritime Academy	No
15	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes
16	Massachusetts Maritime Academy	Yes
17	McGill University	Yes
18	Middlebury College	Yes
19	Northeastern University	Yes
20	Olin College	
21	Providence College	
22	Roger Williams University	Yes
23	Sacred Heart University	Yes
24	Salve Regina University	Yes
25	Tufts University	Yes
26	U. S. Coast Guard Academy	Yes
27	University of Connecticut	Yes
28	University of Maine	
29	University of Massachusetts at Amherst	Yes
30	University of Massachusetts at Boston	
31	University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth	Yes
32	University of New England	
33	University of New Hampshire	Yes
34	University of Rhode Island	Yes
35	University of Vermont	Yes
36	Wellesley College	
37	Wentworth Institute of Technology	Yes
38	Wesleyan University	
39	Williams College	Yes
40	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Yes
41	Yale University	Yes