

NEISA Annual General Meeting

December 7th, 2021

Action Items

I. NEISA Specific Action Items

- a. If you are interested in the Treasurer role (replacing Mullins) to take over at the end of 2022, reach out to Mullins or Kalin.
- b. Need guidance from the Competition Committee prior to scheduling on the process of how teams will qualify for the Women's Team Race Nationals Qualifiers at the Dellenbaugh Trophy in the spring 2023.
- c. NEISA Awards Committee requests more participation from coaches and students for nominations for Sailor of the Week awards this upcoming spring.
- d. Championship Committee seeking three new members to join the committee. Reach out to David Thompson if interested.
- e. Students interested in participating in coming up with an experimental set of class rules regarding Rule 42 to try at a few B-level events in fall of 2022 should email Fran Charles with notes and thoughts on what should and shouldn't be done regarding these experimental rules.
- f. Electronically vote whether or not accept the Landing School for fundamental team status.
- g. Electronically vote regarding the NEISA Honor Roll and MacArthur Service Award.

II. NEISA Action Items Involving the ICSA

- a. Bring proposal to the ICSA to move the selection date for team race nationals for this year.
- b. Bring a suggestion for change of dates to the ICSA regarding Nationals 2022, and/or set up time for Sonia Lingos-Utley to connect with Charles Higgins (Tulane University).
- c. Bring experimental class rules to the ICSA Winter Meeting for a vote from the ICSA on experimental regattas.
- d. Bring proposal for National Tournament for fundamental and regional teams to ICSA as a spring regatta.

III. ICSA Action Items

Motions

- I. Motion to change the language of second team rules per Rule 7.7.4 according to the NEISA Rules and Regulations as detailed in the Scheduler's Report to say that "Fundamental and regional regattas shall not be limited to one team per school but cross regional regattas will be limited."
 - a. Proposed: Taylor Martin (Maine Maritime Academy)
 - b. Seconded: Justin Assad (Dartmouth College)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 30-1
- II. Motion to make all two-day NEISA regattas that in-conference 14-race maximums except for NEISA championships including the Schell, Urn, Singlehanded regattas, Larry White, spring national's qualifiers, Atlantic Coast Championship, and Atlantic Coast Tournament.
 - a. Proposed: Taylor Martin (Maine Maritime Academy)
 - b. Seconded: Mike Kalin (MIT)

- c. Result: Did not pass by vote 14-14]
- III. Motion to move where NEISA takes automatic qualifiers from for nationals from the spring to fall weekend 8 for fall 2022 which is currently the Schell and the Urn weekend. Along with moving, for spring 2023, the NEISA team race national qualifier to weekend 13 in the spring.
 - a. Proposed: Taylor Martin (Maine Maritime Academy)
 - b. Seconded: Mike Kalin (MIT)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 16-7
- IV. Motion to pass the findings and changes by the Performance Ranking Committee to the Women's Performance Rank to upgrade the Regis and the Toni Deutsch regattas to A-level events and downgrade the Women's Atlantic Coast Tournament by taking about 10-12% off the score.
 - a. Proposed: Mike Kalin (MIT)
 - b. Seconded: Jeff Bresnahan (Connecticut College)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 34-1
- V. Motion to remove the points from sloops from the NEISA performance ranking.
 - a. Proposed: Matt Lindblad (MIT)
 - b. Seconded: John Ingalls (Salve Regina)
 - c. Result: Did not pass by vote 12-22
- VI. Motion to adopt the Draft Committee's Report as written.
 - a. Proposed: Frank Pizzo (Bowdoin)
 - b. Seconded: Preston Anderson (Bowdoin)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 32-1
- VII. Motion by the Championship Committee to decide between MIT and Brown University as the host for the Coed New England Dinghy Championship in 2023.
 - a. Proposed: David Thompson (Coast Guard Academy)
 - b. Result: MIT won the bid in a vote of 14-11 against Brown
- VIII. Motion to suggest a change of dates to the College Sailing National Championship for spring 2023 by NEISA to the ICSA board to look at the current dates and have a potential change in dates due to conflicts with graduations and finals. No specific dates suggested.
 - a. Proposed: Sonia Lingos-Utley (Yale University)
 - b. Seconded: Nicole Moeder (Boston College)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 24-7
- IX. Motion to bring regional and fundamental culminating regatta to the ICSA Winter Meeting. There would be both a coed and women's regatta as detailed by the proposal and would be hosted by Salve Regina for just regional and fundamental teams at the end of the spring season.
 - a. Proposed: Jack Valentino (Bates College)
 - b. Seconded: Preston Anderson (Bowdoin College)
 - c. Result: Passed by vote 30-0
- X. Motion to accept the Landing School for fundamental team status.
 - a. Proposed: Mike Kalin (MIT)
 - b. Seconded: Jeff Dusek (Olin College)
 - c. Result: Not passed by vote 22-0, in need of more votes to pass

Straw Poll

- I. Discussion regarding changing NEISA in-conference specified regattas to a 14-race maximum as compared to changing Sundays at events to an earlier cut-off time.
 - a. Change to 14-race maximum in NEISA for specified events: Not supported by vote of 11-14
 - b. Change to an earlier cut-off time on Sundays: Not supported by vote of 7-16

Meeting Notes

- I. **Call to Order – Preston Anderson**
 - a. *Anderson*: NEISA meeting is called to order at 4:02 ET.
- II. **Roll Call of Executive Board**
 - a. Full meeting attendance is available [here](#)
- III. **Additions to the Agenda**
 - a. *Kalin*: Any additions to the agenda to be reasonably put in at this time? Please put them in the chat and we can find time for it.
- IV. **Approval of Fall Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**
 - a. *Kalin*: I'll approve the fall executive committee meeting minutes.

NEISA Committee Reports

- I. **Commissioner's Report – Mike Kalin**
 - a. *Kalin*: Thanks everyone for carving out the time, I know this is a difficult meeting at this time of the year. The 4-7 window is at sailing practice timeframe so hopefully everyone can carve out time and thank you all for being here. This is only a 3-hour meeting, these are traditionally 4 hours, so I'm going to try and be as punctual as possible and it would be helpful if everyone follows etiquette of raising hands and not speaking out of turn and being considerate of the enormous agenda we have to get through and we don't have to explore every idea to the last possible limit. There will be additional meetings where we can explore them in detail. I can give a brief synopsis of my report, and if people who made reports can also do that. Everything is posted on the website now. My observation was, it was great to be back on the water and student athletes were excited to be back. I've never seen kids who have embraced and love to sail as this current group. I think we're doing a lot of things right, and I think this new system has had some increased feelings of stress and burnout with the feeling that every weekend counts, so maybe we can work out that sentiment in the future. National's dates are in the Commissioner's report – they're different this year. There's Women's Team Race Nationals April 23-34, during out regular season. Going on to the traditional nationals block outside of the regular season, starts with Coed Team Race, May 16, and ends with Women's Fleet Race on May 26. A note on these dates, NEISA doesn't control these dates, and there is a long procedure and process that goes through many levels of approval to come up with these dates. There is a window where these events have to line up and that gets approved. Every year we've hosted Nationals, there are always student athletes who are put in a bind of dealing with conflicts of exams and graduation. There are some students who have to make a difficult decision of whether to attend graduation or nationals and it's always a tough decision. I think in the future, hopefully the Nationals block can be shorter. Zach will speak about this later. I bring this up

because there will be some discussion later on about a petition to move Nationals, but I wanted to give a little bit of background in the selection process and guidelines and effort that has gone in considering all of these things with other boundaries that might be particular to the hosts. Upcoming challenges, we are adding to our sport without subtracting. Women's team racing is great and exciting, but hosting on a weekend in April is not a feasible long-term solution. It's not fair to our sport and women's team racing. Fine for this year, but in the future should be given the same treatment as Coed Team Racing. Another big challenge is we all want to expand team racing, but we have a limited pool of umpires currently. So, anything teams can do to reengage student athletes to become umpires for events. Team racing is fun and exciting until it's not and becomes a giant fight. Umpires are crucial in making team racing enjoyable. Upcoming opportunities, NEISA VP Jack Valentino will present an opportunity for fundamental and regional teams. A small committee did some great work on preliminary details on a potential spring finale for fundamental and regional teams to offer a great culmination of the sailing season in the spring for teams who didn't do a whole lot of team racing or didn't make New England Championships. Then, first ever women's national team race at Brown will be great. It's an amazing part of our sport and amazing area we can grow. Ultimately it makes all of our team practices more enjoyable where everyone can do the same thing. One final thing, the ICSA executive director search – originally the plan was to have someone in place around now and this has been pushed back 6 months so far. Budget wise it doesn't feel totally feasible after the pandemic here, so the coffers aren't quite as full as they would like them. Now moving forward with a May 1 start day with a representative from each conference to be part of the hiring committee. Nominations for those by February 15. Looking like that will pick up again in the spring, but not in place at the originally intended deadline of about now. That's all I got.

II. President's Report – Preston Anderson

- a. *Anderson:* The president's report is up on the NEISA website. NEISA had strong showings at all the Nationals this past year. Roger Williams finishing second at team race, Boston College finishing 3rd and Brown finishing 4th at Women's Nationals. Yale, Coast Guard, and Bowdoin representing NEISA at Match Race and that's the first time we've had 3 teams at Match Race Nationals which is partly due to the selection committee which is really exciting to see. We also had a significant number of NEISA sailors at singlehandeds, and it was great to see Sophia Reinecke of Boston College finishing 2nd in the women's division at that event. I'm really looking forward to seeing how NEISA benefits from the selection committee this coming spring. College sailing wouldn't have been back without the work of Greg Wilkinson and the COVID medical panel, so huge thanks to him getting college sailing back. That really speaks to the NEISA leadership as a whole, and NEISA has been in the leadership position for college sailing, and it speaks volumes to how much we love the sport. It's not just the graduates leading but also the undergraduates. We had a significant number of undergraduates on the executive committee step up to do a lot of work for NEISA. Whether it's Julia Reynolds getting on as an at-large undergraduate for the ICSA board, Jack Valentino helping with the NIT, Declan and Molly and Ally and Carter Brock working on the COVID vitality committee, or Nicole working on the Instagram takeovers this past fall. Undergraduate leadership has

been phenomenal and shows how much excitement we have for the sport, and this leadership will be super important for college sailing. So as long as we continue to engage undergraduate leaders, undergraduates will want to give back to the sport in a meaningful way. I'm proud to have served as NEISA president this past year, and am excited for the winter meeting to be back in person. Overall, we've done a lot of great work over the last year.

- b. *Kalin*: I've never seen someone put so much effort into a volunteer role. I've never worked with an undergrad who is so on top of their stuff, and thank you Julia and Jack and everyone else on the undergraduate executive board. It was a fantastic group and hopefully you've set the bar high, and hopefully we'll pick up and continue the sport forward in great fashion.

III. Treasurer's Report – Ryan Mullins

- a. *Mullins*: Quick update from the treasurer's seat. No surprise this year that it was good to get back on the water. The worst-case scenario I laid out was last year didn't come to be. A couple highlights from an administrative perspective, last year at this time we thought ICSA would bill for dues, and those dues were subsequently waived. Everyone should be credited for 2021 dues for dues they paid from 2020, and those dues will just roll forward into 2021. You'll notice in the bills you didn't have any ICSA dues because they were filled at the beginning of 2021. Expenses, no surprises there that there are some unpaid and unbilled expenses that are lingering, such as umpires who haven't submitted expenses yet. At some point those will not come through, but we've accounted for that. On the umpire front, these people have been very reasonable in expenses they've submitted, and this year we got one or two large unsustainable invoices for expense reimbursement, so that prompted discussion that going forward we will make it more clear about what the expectations are. Just to continue the program as it is we just need to make that very clear. Not necessarily an issue, but something to be mindful of going forward. More about making things sustainable. Going back through individual expense requests, the vast majority don't even come close the limit. We'll make sure the expectations are understood. On the cash front, we are just shy of \$25k and executive stipends will go out in the next few days. Would appreciate everyone to push their departments to dispense the checks and get those over so we can clear those out. A few smaller accounts, about half of the balance was more current than less. Not particularly concerned about collections but a few smaller accounts make up a chunk of AR that I'll go through and we'll connect with those teams to figure out what to do going forward. Those situations are not dramatically affecting NEISA's finances. I expect to get the spring bills out in January. We've got the information we need to send them out at this point. We'll get those out and give everyone plenty of time to get those in. The focus there is about getting those in timeline here in anticipation of Nationals hosting down the line. That's sort of what we're trying to gear up for on the financial side. We'll talk more about that but it comes down to liquidity on hand to manage the events. The last time we hosted, the overall expense of the conference was relatively minimal. It did require significant interim liquidity until we could get reimbursed by ICSA so we might need to prepare for that. It's critical that balances are paid on time. 2022 budget assumes a 42-team conference. Largest expense

is umpires which is consistent with pre-pandemic practice, and the assumption here is we have 103 umpire weekends. I would be shocked if we fill all of those umpire spots. Already touched on the membership fees for ICSA. There are a few other changes to the final 2020 results. I had included inadvertently a revenue item for events we had actually already billed for, so that was good news and cleared liability on our side. Reflecting the update for the removal of the ICSA fees which is essentially just a pass through. Final item I'll close on, and I haven't gotten great clarity on this, there was discussion on a levy on each of the conferences to fund the executive director on the ICSA level. Something on the magnitude of \$275 per team. I don't know what that will end up being, and when I have more clarity on what that amount is I'll pass that through. That concludes my update, with nationals on the horizon, we'll have further discussions later this year about liquidity potential supplemental funding that would be required. I do plan to stay on through this year, but recently just had twins so I do plan to step down at the end of 2022. Just thinking that as we get into later next year, if there is someone interesting, could be helpful to include them on the process into the fall so they're not stepping into the job cold come spring ahead of nationals.

- i. *Mollicone*: Congrats on the twins! I'm starting to get Women's Team Race Nationals put together soon and want to start thinking about support from NEISA and ICSA as well and how much sponsorship money we get or money from entry fees. Just putting it on your radar, we will need to bring in umpires and maybe an outside PRO, so let me know how if you have any insight on how much money we can expect to get to front the cost.
- b. *Mullins*: John made sure the contribution for the last nationals we hosted was something on the magnitude of \$18,000-\$20,000 and John kept that to \$5,000 or so for the conference. What you mentioned rolls into the conversation for what NEISA's ambition is for supporting these championships. We do have cash on hand to manage the day to day but the last year at away at that a little bit, but we can connect offline and want to be thinking, what level of support from NEISA is appropriate for all of these types of events. The expectation is \$20+ thousand and the conference is in a position to be doing \$5,000 so we all need to align on our priorities.
 - i. *Reineck*: Question on surcharge for the executive ICSA director, will that be the same charge for all membership levels or varying?
 1. *Mullins*: Greg may have a view on that. I understood it being the ICSA would bill all teams on the same level.
 - ii. *Wilkinson*: What got passed was developing a cash reserve of \$40,000 through a one-time assessment of not more than \$300 to cross regional members and not more than \$125 for regional members. The final number hasn't been set, but it won't be the same for all members.
 1. *Mullins*: Do we have an indication of when that will be voted on?
 - iii. *Wilkinson*: It was supposed to be assessed in the fall of 2020. I think at the upcoming meeting. It got passed winter of 2020, then pandemic, so at this winter meeting it should get sorted as to when it will get levied.
 - iv. *Mullins*: I've asked for a heads up on when it hits the bill so I can let everyone else know it's coming.

- c. *Kalin*: Our next slate of spring championships is the spring of 2025, so we have a little bit of time to think about budget and an approach. As an aside, I would guess John Mollicone isn't interested in all of the championships again, we can talk about it later, but in 2024-25 block it will be split up with individual hosts.

IV. **NEISA Scheduling Coordinator's Report – Taylor Martin**

- a. *Martin*: I have a scheduler's report and a report from the scheduling committee this fall. I just sent out the questionnaire which has been a little delayed this fall as we try to sort out whether we want to make substantial changes or not to the schedule going forward. The draft will take place a week from today and the draft committee, which will propose some things coming up will have some changes on how that draft will take place, but not substantially different than any other draft, so three separate drafts. Lot of changes to the schedule this year as we transition some our regattas from NEISA only to regional and cross regional. It was a little bit challenging to handle how berth allocations worked for those. NEISA ended up reclaiming a majority of the berths that we were worried about surrendering to some of those mid-level regattas. Ended up with some availability and second teams for those. That was a positive for the NEISA teams that were worried about scheduling those events. At the cross-regional level, everything was mostly well allocated save for a couple of COVID drop outs late. Teams were wanting those berths to NEISA events which is good for NEISA. We'll see moving forward as we get more teams back online and as we do a season of selection with this process how teams decide to schedule differently and whether those berths change or not. We had some confusion about second teams this fall, I don't want to rehash out our rules here, but that is rehashed in the report. I have a couple of changes for second teams. One is clarifying language and two are codifying how the process has been working. We have to change the language to take out "interconference regattas" because we have differentiated interconference regattas into regional and cross-regional levels. In rules and regs we need to change, "Interconference regattas shall be limited to one team per school" in 774, to "Fundamental and regional regattas shall not be limited to one team per school but cross regional regattas will be limited." That was passed by the interconference regattas committee last year and by the ICSA board, so it needs to be reflected in our rules and regs. The other language I want to add to our second team rules is clarifying when second teams become a priority – "prior to the drop deadline which is 2 Fridays before the weekend of the event, the priority is first teams, and teams can request second teams that will be added to the alternate list. After that drop deadline, second teams will be added from the alt list via a normal scheduling process". The alt list will be honored straight through as first come first serve for after the drop deadline. Clarifying for third, fourth, and fifth teams that those teams may be bumped for first and second teams. None of these rules are new, it just hasn't been written anywhere so needs to be added to the language. We have a handful of proposals, and everything I just said is proposal number 1. I motion to accept the proposal by a second team rules under proposed changes.
 - i. *Assad*: Second
- b. *Martin*: This is the first of the proposals and we have some discussion points.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: After a second, there should be discussion.

c. *Martin*: Any discussion?

i. *Bresnahan*: For the second teams in the category of say, the O'Berg, I know that the interconference committee had decided to limit those from second teams. Can we go back to that committee, I know Justin's on it, and ask if there's a slate of NEISA regattas that would have been better filled?

1. *Assad*: In September we moved with the interconference committee to ensure regional events permit any second teams. Now it's just cross regional events that live under the old interconference policy, which in the ICSA is to allow one coed team and one women's team. Functionally we've traditionally discouraged a second team from the same college at cross regional events in New England. You don't see that happen very often in MAISA either. Outside of NEISA and MAISA it's more common. Everyone can have at it with regional events in the future which is the good news.

2. *Martin*: And that was the case this fall. There were second teams at regional events, the priority is to fill those events.

ii. *Leonard*: I'm not understanding the change associated with requiring the second team to be a women's team.

1. *Assad*: That was historically the policy for any interconference regattas. At the old Moody, which was an interconference regatta, you could feasibly enter a second team if it were an all-women's team. In the smaller conferences this was a strategy to fill out their events without multiple teams. I don't think there's a real change for us as we discourage New England teams from doing that at our interconference events and we normally fill those anyway.

iii. *Martin*: The proposal is that this fall, any time a second team was at a regional event, it was breaking our rules and regs because they were written before cross-regional and regional, so we're adding language so we can do what we did this fall correctly.

iv. *Thompson*: I know there's some discussion about figuring out a less cumbersome method of dealing with second teams. I know the NEISA draft committee was looking at this and it may put less onus on Taylor. Either now or later would be a good time to chat about.

1. *Martin*: One of the jumbles this fall was in timing. People were adding second teams pretty well before events. Our goal is to fill events with first teams first and second teams second once the drop deadline has expired. That was the biggest juggling around I did this fall. Other than that, there weren't major second team issues this fall and we had to use our second team rule for the first three weekends of A level events for the first time in a while and so that was some of the confusion because we historically didn't have to do that.

v. *Bresnahan*: Are you saying you don't want the supplemental draft? Cause I saw the second team issue as a problem in the process? We spent time working on a streamline that made sense.

1. *Martin*: This doesn't supplement anything that the draft committee worked on. This is just to add working rules for all of our regattas across the board. The draft committee will talk about this.
- d. *Martin*: If there's no other discussion, we can go to vote. This is one per school.
 - i. ****Motion passed****
- e. *Martin*: While this voting is happening, we're going to move on to some of the changes that happened in the schedule. We've added women's team racing so our spring block looks different. Team Race Nationals is weekend 12, Women's Team Race Conference Championship which has one automatic qualifier to nationals is weekend 9. A couple of changes to the fall. One is, the Smith Trophy and Sister Esther Trophy, as of now, we're planning on swapping weekends. As of recently, weekend 2 hosts have all agreed to host those events as one-day events with 10 race maximums.
- f. *Wilkinson*: On the voting tab, there are two columns, one is for graduates and one is for undergraduates. I think the voting procedure needs to be clarified and what the motion is.
- g. *Martin*: The motion is to accept the proposed changes to the rules and regs visa vi second teams. It is everything under the proposed changes in bold on page 1 of the scheduling report.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: And there is only one vote per school right.
 - ii. *Kalin*: Yes, that's what I'm seeing.
- h. *Martin*: We are halfway our ACCs host rotation. For Coed Round 1, NEISA hosts, and it's at Harvard and MIT. For Women's, Yale hosts Women's ACCs and Brown hosts Women's ACTs. This is on a rotation approved in 2018. The rotation was written through fall 2023, and we need to reassess if we want to start the rotation over, and if there are other hosts in that time period, but we have two more falls with the current rotation that was voted on in 2018. The national's rotation, we are slated to host in spring 2025. Frank and Mike and Justin and I worked on a lot of scheduling stuff. One of the primary things we're looking at is how the selection process affects how teams schedule themselves and whether or not that affects things in a drastic way and whether or not there are ways that we can substantially change the schedule for the better. One of those that Mike brought up is switching for this spring women's and coed championships for spring 2022 and the goal there was to reflect the nationals order, which is not reflected in our current spring championships. If we want to switch those, we would have to vote on that. I know teams have already put in bids for the dates that they exist, so I'm not sure how feasible it is to switch at this point. One thing we need to look at is whether or not we want those qualifying processes to line up with nationals or not. I don't want to make a proposal on this unless there is someone on the call that feels that we should or shouldn't, but is just a conflict our committee discovered.
 - i. *Kalin*: Currently Women's New England's are April 16 or 17, and Women's Nationals are May 23-26, and Coed New England's are April 29-30 and Coed Nationals are 2.5 weeks later. So, it's a substantial gap for women's and less of a gap for coed.
 - ii. *Ott*: Do the other regions do it how they reflect what it's at nationally?

1. *Kalin*: We don't look too much to other regions. We want what's best for us.
- iii. *Leonard*: The order of nationals has been different many different times, and it's a pretty big change when we move our schedule about because you have to move all of the intersectional at the same time. And I also think that we will be talking in a minute about the committee the ICSA made to look at the national's clock, and there will probably be changes to that format anyway. It seems like taking this on now would be fighting something that might change.
- i. *Martin*: We'll move on to one of the issues we worked through this fall is having a 14-race maximum on some regattas this fall but not all of them. Our committee thinks there should be a 14-race maximum for all two-day regattas except for our championships. This would either be implemented through our NEISA rules and regs, or we would require teams to add that to their SI's. I think we want to make a motion on this where we motion to make all two-day NEISA regattas, in-conference, 14 race maximums except for our championships.
 - i. *Anderson*: Second
 - ii. *Leonard*: Does this include NEISA intersectional?
 1. *Martin*: That was the intent, yes.
 - iii. *O'Connor*: Would we still have a 10-race per day limit?
 1. *Martin*: This is not designed to change that, but that is something that can be changed in the SI's.
 2. *Assad*: I don't think so, I think you're wrong about that.
 - iv. *Kalin*: This would include regattas such as the Danmark, Hurst, Schell, Urn, right?
 1. *Leonard*: We're not allowed to do this for the semifinals for the ACC's are we?
 - v. *Kalin*: Taylor is saying anything hosted at a NEISA site under this rule would be limited to 14 races.
 1. *Anderson*: Wouldn't this not include the Schell or the Urn?
 2. *Kalin*: If I'm understanding Taylor correctly, anything on NEISA soil is a 14-race event.
 3. *Martin*: Except championships. Schell, Urn, and the spring national's qualifiers and singles and sloops.
 - vi. *McClintock*: Having seen this during the fall where we only get 10 races in and come back the next day, drive an hour and a half, and only sail 4 races, what exactly is the reasoning for limiting to 14 races?
 1. *Assad*: It can result in a shorter sailing day for athletes. We only ended with 18 races through an arbitrary measure based on the size of the fleet.
 - vii. *McClintock*: We spend more time driving than we do sailing. All it is is a shorter sailing day, so the day is shot anyhow. What is the reasoning? I understand we've had this conversation that the student athlete wants to get home earlier to study, but the day is already completely taken up. We had a couple days, like at MIT, where we've had some beautiful sailing, and the second day is great, but oh, we're only sailing 4 races. There are a couple of times where we get in really

crappy racing trying to get 10 races in on one day. I don't understand why we don't just sail rather than worrying about how many races get done. Once you're committed to going somewhere and sailing, I don't understand why we don't just sail rather than worrying about having races that are good. We have a time limit. Why don't we just have a time limit and can get in as many races as you want. Limiting the number of races where you sail one day and it's sort of crappy the next day, why are we telling the kids no, we have to go home? They've already shot the day, and my team doesn't like driving for three hours to sail for two.

1. *Assad*: Everyone lives in a different reality. We moved that time to be 3pm and some teams are fortunate to be in a scenario where they can go home in a half hour, others can be 90 minutes.
- viii. *McClintock*: We're making a leap for the entire district based on a couple of teams. If they come and pay for a night to sail four races and go home, we've had enough bad sailing the last fall. But we've had a couple of days with beautiful sailing conditions and everyone went home. My team thinks this is a complete waste of time. To go to 14 races why even do two days if it's that big of an issue? Why then don't we just do one day and have the whole second day off? You have time limits during the day, and if you have good conditions, just sail. I understand where you're coming from, but if a team decides they're going to drive 4 hours for a regatta, I would assume they're going to stay overnight. If they stay overnight and only sail 4 races the next day, that's not very fair to them. For a one-day regatta going someplace, that's their decision. What we want to do is make it good for the sailors. We're making decisions based on a few teams.
- ix. *Pizzo*: Thank you for your point, it's well taken. We need to keep our comments short. Well heard, thank you.
- x. *Assad*: There are some people in this room that are convinced we should sail all weekend as many races as possible, and others think we could shorten the competition time and have plenty of racing to declare a winner, and what we're trying to do is figure it out. At the Singlehanded National Championship, we only sail 14 races and declare a winner. At Doublehanded National Championship, we sail 36, but maybe we could sail 28 and still declare a winner. We think it might take less time on the weekend.
- xi. *Kalin*: I'll add that collegiate sports are traditionally governed by a maximum amount by a number of hours to compete and everything in your sport. That guideline is 20 hours. If you think of where sailing fits in with other sports, it's a huge difference. The NCAA has done a lot of work balancing student athletes' lives, and we're off the charts.
- xii. *Clark*: It was confusing this fall, and is still confusing. To me, it's still not very clear and whatever we do in the championships should be what it's like across the board.
- xiii. *Pizzo*: In the past 10 years of college sailing, at least at the top level, they are all two fleet regattas in NEISA. MAISA does not have that. There are still some 2 on

2 scenarios off in the MAISA schedule. For the top NEISA teams, both men and women, are sailing days that are significant. That's important to acknowledge. We don't have to sail bell to bell every weekend to have a really quality experience. We often go into one weekend scenarios where we could've been sailing more here. On the aggregate, we burn out sailors and it's not good. There are weekends where we can probably consider sailing a maximum number. We don't necessarily need to do that all the time. We could make regattas more efficient. Travel time has nothing to do with competition time. Many sports play for one hour and like at Bowdoin, drive a 12-hour bus ride. If we operate under that assumption, we're going to hit 20 hours every weekend.

- xiv. *Bresnahan*: I agree with Frank, Doug, and Moose. From my point of view, we're in this NESCAC D3 world and the never ending, now with two fleets of boats, the never-ending two-day regatta where 14 races made sense so we could get back. It's not necessarily getting back to campus to study, but about quality of life. I'm on the fence that both sides have to come. When I started, we all did 28 weeks driving to Navy 10 times a semester. If we can go to one day events in September and two-day events in October to get to this level of race. We can go to 10 races and it should be the conditions that dictate the number of races, not the number. Maybe we can get to some point in September where we're maxing out and giving some Sundays back, and October becomes the two days. As far as the travel and money and coaching, we've never been this far apart with D1s and D3s. We're going to have to start addressing that or the D3s will start going away. We should appoint a super-subcommittee for all of those people doing the work. Let's get some new people on those committees to figure out how we can make this work for everybody.
- j. *Martin*: The motion is to have a 14-race maximum for all two-day NEISA regattas except our NEISA championships, including Schell, Urn, Singles, Larry White and our spring national's qualifiers. That may change, but those are the regattas as it currently stands.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: Singles is already at 14.
- k. *Martin*: The intent with this proposal was the also have ACCs and ACTs be 14 races. If this proposal would pass, if we altered it and included those in the exclusions, we can make an amendment. The intent was to have NEISA hosted events be 14 races.
 - i. *Leonard*: Those events are more championship-y than anything we do.
- l. *Assad*: If that's going to be the difference maker for people then we would change it and have three weekends. I don't know.
- m. *Martin*: I amend my motion to state that the 14-race maximum for all two-day NEISA events except for championships listed and for ACCs and ACTs.
 - i. *Kalin*: Second
- n. *Martin*: We've had a lot of discussion so I'd like to vote on this.
 - i. *Legler*: Just to clarify, the events not part of the 14-race max would be Schell, Urn, match racing, and Atlantic Coast qualifiers and championships?
 - 1. *Martin*: As well as spring national's qualifiers.
 - ii. **** Did not pass ****

- o. *Martin*: We have a lot to talk about. We looked at weekends 1-3, in-conference only period, would be one day, Saturday only events. There was substantial support for changing our MO for running regattas early season. I don't think there was substantial support for making a slate change, that was all of those regattas, one-day, Saturday only for all of those weekends. What we came to was that weekend 2, not by rule but by host participation, will be full of one day only regattas, Saturday only, 10-race limit, with the intent being that we think this is a good idea in terms of managing student athlete hours, and we want to see how that goes for the fall of 2022. There is no proposal related to that. We have looked at that.
 - i. *Dusek*: Is it one day regattas or one day regattas only on Saturdays? Because I think for a lot of my players, Sundays are actually better for one-day only regattas.
 - 1. *Martin*: It would be one day only regattas on Saturday for the point of having Sunday as a dead day. There was consideration that Sundays are sometimes better but the goal was never to get rid of Sundays across the schedule. We looked at fall, in-conference only period, weekends 1-3 in the fall. We did extensively talk about that and will do it on weekend 2 only this fall by host participation.
 - ii. *Thompson*: Will that be for singlehandeds as well, for the one-day event?
 - 1. *Martin*: No, again, not by rule change, so I'd say probably not. If we vote on this then potentially. When we looked at this, we looked at excluding championships from that, and singlehandeds is the outlier in early season championships.
 - iii. *Mollicone*: Is the Hoyt still the ACCs qualifier?
 - 1. *Martin*: Having the Hoyt be the full sail-in was a COVID era thing. I think it goes to PR rank and two final sail-in slots from the Hoyt.
 - iv. *Legler*: On weekend two in the fall with just Saturday only events, to me it looks like there's simply not nearly enough regatta capacity for everybody on our team, and I expect some others teams are big enough where they're not going to get everybody sailing that weekend with so few one-day events. Can we do some one-day events on Sunday?
 - 1. *Martin*: We're not currently changing the capacity of the schedule.
 - v. *Legler*: Well, we are if we're making everything one day regattas. We would send different people both days, now we can't.
 - 1. *Martin*: I guess for your team Ken, the capacity would change.
 - vi. *Legler*: Other teams are also running against capacity cause they've gotten bigger. We want more experiences for kids on our roster.
 - 1. *Pizzo*: We wouldn't add events on Sunday. To add capacity, we'd have to add other events.
 - vii. *Legler*: Then there need to be more regional events. Another reason why people like two-day events is because they're traveling anyway, even if it's two, one-day events. However, with Saturday only events, maybe there should be more events in Southern and Northern New England for those teams that want to race there.

- p. *Martin*: Potentially that might be the case. We're using this one weekend as a test case for a concept that did have support for the fall, in-conference only period. It is not our recommendation to do one day then add more regattas at this point. We'd like to see how one day regattas for this one weekend work for this upcoming fall. This is not a change that will substantially change New England college sailing for the foreseeable future, with the understanding that it might not be great, and then we undo it. There was no motion related to that, just a point of discussion. The last point of discussion which may require a motion is that it is the opinion of the scheduling committee that our dinghy automatic qualifier berths should come from the Schell and the Urn in the fall. As a reminder, that is two berths only that are automatically qualifying for our fleet racing women's and coed dinghy championships. Currently those are coming from weekends 11 and 13 in the spring, and we would like those to come from the Schell and the Urn in the fall. We looked at a lot of the regatta results, and it was far and away that the people finishing first and second at the Schell and the Urn were going to be selected for Nationals no matter what, and anyone close to finishing first and second at the Schell and the Urn who might be worried that they're missing out on half a season to qualify their teams, are going to be selected to nationals anyway. It is our hope for teams that are in the potential top 5 definitely and top 12 potentially that are getting selected to nationals can understand that they are at this point looking at the CSR and selection process for singles, that we are trusting that selection process and moving the automatic qualifiers to the regatta where they make the most sense.
- i. *Bresnahan*: My only question with this, I know that we did a lot of work to make sure the Schell and the Urn aren't totally taken away from Harvard and MIT, I think that if that is where the automatic qualifiers are going to come from, we might need to go to every third year guaranteed to the river because it's a major championship. It's probably the right event, the rotation then becomes a problem.
- q. *Martin*: That's definitely something we looked at. We gain the possibility to expand our spring team racing schedule a little bit, because right now we don't have much of a regular season for team racing in the spring, it ends pretty much by weekend 9 or 10. Our goal would be to expand that a little bit because there would be teams that want to shift back to fleet racing. Hopefully if we do this selection process earlier and we see that teams are confident after they're fall that they're going to be selected, we no longer have to sail in 9 teams to nationals from the last weekend of our spring season. Historically those regattas for 9th and 8th place have been barely competitive, so there was a lot of merit to sailing them as late as possible so that teams had enough time to sail as much fleet racing as possible. It's still going to be competitive for those spots, but those sports will be 11-14 for NEISA and those teams will have solidified their chances to be compared to other teams early enough in the season so we don't need our qualifier to be the last regatta that happens in the spring.
- i. *Wilkinson*: The ability to have a longer team race season in the spring hinges on the ICSA moving the selection date of team race nationals, way more than it hinges on us moving our fleet racing championships to the fall. That doesn't really work. If we want to fix the team racing component, we need to focus on

fixing the selection date. Back to moving the conference championship to the Schell and the Urn weekend because the coed and women's conference championship are the Coast Guard Alumni Bowl and the Reed Trophy, so the Schell and the Urn would presumably become something else.

1. *Martin*: Yes, that is semantically correct.
 2. *Assad*: Or you could still sail those fleet races in the spring, but we control how we select your automatic qualifiers so you could select them from the performance rank or at different regattas.
- r. *Kalin*: In your impression, do you think this is something that's negotiable with the selection committee? It seems strange that they're not amenable to change.
- i. *Wilkinson*: They're not amenable to change on it this year because it was set and the conditions to nationals are set by the Board of Directors a year in advance. It's rare we change them within the competition year. In this case, by the time we went to ask them for a change, a lot of conferences' schedules had already been set. In terms of a future date change, NEISA must get the selection date changed.
- s. *Legler*: I worry about losing the Reed and Coast Guard Alumni Bowl. Those are important championships in themselves, even though it's clear beforehand who most the qualifiers are. If we move them to the fall and eliminate the Schell and the Urn then they have to be separate and that's problematic. Lots of changes that create new problems and we have to be careful with these new solutions.
- t. *Leonard*: To me it seems like that having the selection committee date is important. Would us voting now to change the next year date of our Team Race New England championship help to make the argument that they need to push back their selection?
- i. *Wilkinson*: I think we should do all of the above. I think it's important that before the winter meeting we send to the Competition Committee a request to change the selection date in 2023 and get that on the agenda for the winter meeting. If that were accompanied by the fact that our conference championships would be on a different date it might be stronger. If we do it a full year and 3 months in advance, I think it should be ok.
- u. *Martin*: Zack your question was the next point we wanted to bring up, which is team race qualification weekend. Is there other discussion about moving our fall automatic qualifiers to the fall for women's and dinghy nationals? Taking away the language of Schell and Urn and Coast Guard Alumni Bowl for now, but weekend number 8.
- i. *Thompson*: And we're making them concurrent at the same time?
 1. *Martin*: There's potentially merit to splitting them up at that point. I'm hopeful that as we watch the selection process take place, teams vying for first and second at those regattas are confident they will be selected anyway. Any downside to having them concurrent, the nationals' qualifiers have been so heavily de-weighted at this point that people will see that it is wildly beneficial and not damaging to NEISA. They've been so de-weighted that I think we can have concurrent qualifiers and it's not an issue.

- ii. *Thompson*: There's some relevance as we're moving a well-established regatta to the spring that is non-concurrent and good for teams' CSR rankings and eliminating that opportunity and changing it to a regatta that is now concurrent is a pretty drastic change. I think it affects more than just teams one and two and is weighted pretty high in the CSR.
 - iii. *Martin*: It is weighted high in the CSR as far as final CSR score goes. I think that we can look at bolstering the spring opportunities for CSR scoring and moving another high caliber regatta later in the spring. None of this is to the detriment of NEISA teams trying to qualify for Nationals. Often, we use NEISA as a test case for trying to change ICSA rules. This and the next discussion point are two opportunities to begin to use NEISA as a test case for greater change.
- v. *Assad*: The nice thing about the new schedule which mattered if the events were concurrent, because the 9th place team might have a women's skipper needed to get 9th at the Coed Fleet Racing Championship, so they couldn't have that woman sailing on the same weekend, but now they have 18 weekends to demonstrate what their women's team can do at full strength and what their coed team can do at full strength. The massive change was the selection criteria and the move in how nationals are selected. Now it's more about having our schedule make as much sense as it can under the new set of rules.
- w. *Leonard*: I'll lend some color to the idea of why it's beneficial to NEISA to push the team racing back a bit. This is a competitiveness vs. other conferences and our ability to show how strong our teams are before selection. Every other district that we generally compete with can start sailing earlier than we can because of weather. We're doing early season team racing regattas in SAISA and MAISA where our teams haven't practiced at all. That wasn't an issue when we were qualifying through our New England championship. Now, if someone goes south and competes in late February and doesn't perform very well, they're disadvantaging themselves and everyone in NEISA with selection, because if they go and beat other NEISA teams in the next weekend, they are then inheriting that record. We want to race more when we've already practiced. It's important we get more of our team racing season pushed later in the year where we've been practicing and do less against teams that have been practicing earlier in the year.
- x. *Kalin*: There's been a lot of discussion here, and we need to wrap this up.
- y. *Martin*: I don't know if we had a motion, we were ready to bring or not. The motion would be moving where we take our automatic qualifiers from for nationals to the fall to weekend 8 which is the Schell and Urn weekend, and moving for spring 2023 our NEISA team race national qualifier to weekend 13. These things would have to happen simultaneously for fall 2022 and spring 2023.
 - i. *Kalin*: Second
 - ii. ***Motion passed but under review***
- z. *Martin*: We also need the Competition Committee to give some guidance on the Dellenbaugh, which this year is the qualifier for Women's Team Race Nationals. So, we need some guidance on how we are qualifying teams for women's team race nationals' qualifiers. There's not very much regular season women's team racing, so we need

some guidance on how that process should work. That is needed before the Dellenbaugh, so by March 1.

- i. *Wilkinson*: Wouldn't it be needed before scheduling?
 - ii. *Pizzo*: Yeah, we would want that ASAP.
 - iii. *Wilkinson*: By Saturday pretty much.
- aa. *Martin*: Potentially, there's not very many ways you can do it, so yes, ASAP, but the choice won't be drastic.
 - i. *Martin*: It sounds like you guys know ways to do it, so could you just forward it on to the competition committee for review?
- bb. *Martin*: Yes. And that is all.
- cc. *Kalin*: So, Taylor one clarification, what's the fleet size at Dellenbaugh?
 - i. *Martin*: I believe it's 10.
 - ii. *Mollicone*: When I made the proposal, I had proposed 12 teams, 10 NEISA and 2 invites and after discussion we wanted to make it NEISA only. I thought we said 12 NEISA teams.
 - iii. *Assad*: Yeah, that's what I thought.
- dd. *Mullins*: I'm just realizing the treasurer's report didn't get onto the website. The motion is going to be to post that and then have the 2022 budget approved at the next executive committee meeting.
 - i. *Kalin*: Ok so we'll push that to the next meeting we have.
- ee. *Wilkinson*: We're in the process of voting and discussing at the same time but there's some stuff coming up in the chat about moving the fleet race national qualifiers to weekend 8. But the proposal is the move the fleet race national qualifiers out of the spring, so I assume top teams would be doing something else on that weekend. The proposal is also to move the team race championship later in the season so that there can be more team racing. I don't know how the answer to Jack's question could not be that there would be less fleet racing.
 - i. *Pizzo*: There's not a ton already. I think there would still be teams sailing the Thompson and the Owen and the BDC and those style events or they would be sailed in by different teams in NEISA. I don't think we would reduce the number of fleet race regattas in the spring because some teams will potentially be chasing that prize. We've talked too about having an event later in the season fleet racing wise with MAISA with more cross pollination of teams vying for those final spots. I don't think that would change.
- ff. *Bresnahan*: I think Greg's thinking the same thing I was. I love having more team racing, but we won't be able to have enough judges. There's not going to be enough team race regattas for people's second and third teams, so there will have to be regional fleet racing.
- gg. *Assad*: People will still be looking for opportunities to sail against like competition who is also trying to qualify and prioritize fleet race nationals.
- hh. *Thompson*: We are now making our coed and women's championships concurrent, which we've done in the fall, as not our national opportunities, so I think this is an interesting change that we're talking about here that isn't well established right now and I think that's dangerous.

- i. *Pizzo*: It's not necessarily an apples-to-apples comparison, it's just for the automatic qualifier spots. We've gone to a much broader spectrum of events that go throughout the whole year. The same weekend, if you looked at data and winners from the Schell and the Urn the past few years, and the winners have been at nationals. It's just picking a small sample.
 - ii. *Thompson*: But you are devaluing any spring championship, and there probably won't be one is what's going to happen. That's the bigger change we're talking about here.
- ii. *Martin*: The only thing this would change is when we select our two automatic qualifiers from. Everything else is still the same, and you can still sail fleet race regattas in the spring, weekend 13, they just won't be where we select our two automatic qualifiers from.
- jj. *Kalin*: I think we got to this place because Greg was looking at the chat and wanted to address something there. Ok so we're going to move on.
- kk. *Anderson*: Wait Mike can we have that straw poll. Voting is still deadlocked. So, the straw poll would be to propose an earlier time limit cut off of either 1:30 or 2:00 and the other would be a 14-race maximum. So, either an earlier sailing cut-off time or a 14-race limit maximum.
 - i. *Bresnahan*: This affects three different groups differently. The voting itself is a total failure because what we're trying to achieve here is teams that are sailing way too many two-day regattas that some people are saying we can't afford this and we're looking for some relief to be able to count, but the motion itself is flawed and deadlocked 14-14 and yays and nays are voting for different reasons.
 - ii. *Moeder*: The undergrads all came to the agreement that there should be some adjustment in the length of Sunday for travel and school, but we were exploring the idea of not having a racing maximum because that could take away from sailing in good conditions on a Sunday, but rather an earlier cut off time so teams could get on the road. We just wanted to throw it out to the group as another alternative to improve quality of life for the students while maximizing the number of races.
 - iii. *Bresnahan*: Nicole I appreciate your candor. The reason why we're in this one- or two-day is if you keep on shortening the day, we're not going to get the breeze we want. Why not just make better time of one-day events like noon to 6:00 and get 10 races in. The whole getting on the road before 3:00 is cutting yourself shorter on the possibility of sailing at all.
 - iv. *McGranahan*: Undergrads are saying you could have a Saturday without great conditions but the regatta wants to get races in, so you sail 10 races in not great conditions, and then you come around to Sunday and you only have four races left but end at 11:30. The Urn at MIT with the 14 race shenanigans, we would've ended at 11:30 but it was a great day of sailing, so it was good we extended it with more races to happen in a reasonable time period. Everybody wants a better quality of life, so maybe by shortening the time period we can still get 16 good races if we have really good day on Sunday it allows for good racing.

- v. *Callahan*: I want to throw out an alternative idea, last spring we did 10 races on Saturday and most of the sailors were pretty dead at the end of the day even though we weren't coming back on Sunday. What about shortening the day Saturday and leaving Sunday as it is?
- II. *Kalin*: This discussion could go a lot longer. When I originally went for this last year, the people objecting was that you don't want to be hamstrung by a cutoff time, and that's one the reasons why we didn't go with a cutoff time. It's 14 races, and you get there when you get there. The 14 is the best of all worlds and gives flexibility and it seems to have some validity. Let's do your straw poll Preston.
 - i. *Anderson*: It would just be interesting to see how many people are in favor of each one.
 - 1. *****Change to 14 race max resulted in 11 yays and 14 nays*****
 - 2. *****Change to earlier cut off time resulted in 7 yays and 16 nays*****
 - ii. *Ott*: I feel like I'm not remotely qualified in sailing experience and it is a big decision because you have three divisions of student athlete and it all affects us a different way.
 - iii. *Reineck*: How does this then affect Sunday only events? Moving the cutoff to 2:00 makes a really short day for a Sunday only event. For a two-day event it makes more sense. Would that be split into a different discussion?

V. NEISA Awards Committee Report – Rebecca McElvain

- a. *McElvain*: Moving forward to the spring we're going to go back to the status quo and have a NEISA watchlist announced like we've done in the past and have an All-NEISA team again which we didn't do this past spring. The one thing we want to bring to everyone's attention, this spring moving forward, we want to have some more participation from coaches and students on nominations for Sailor of the Week awards. This past fall we only had one outside nomination. It gets pretty tricky in the spring for us as a committee to distinguish how to award that without outside nominations, with team racing and so many different competitions it's easier if we have outside input for us to make the decision on weekly awards.
- b. *Kalin*: Bill is the chairman of that committee, and thank you Rebecca and Bill for serving on the All-American ICSA committee and we're happy you've taken on that responsibility.

VI. Judge Coordinator's Report – Amanda Callahan

- a. *Callahan*: With the exception of singles, we had just about all of the umpire judges spots filled for last spring and this fall. As Ryan alluded to, we did have a lot of hotel costs, so I will do a better job communicating to those folks who signed up to umpire what is reimbursable and what the limits are. Moving ahead, I'd love to hear from more coaches contact information from their recent grads as I had little response there. Continue to provide more training and mentorship to younger judges and umpires so they feel confident on the water to make those calls. Thank you to Sam Ott who put suggestions on the Slack to use technology for more options for remote protest hearings. We probably need to get a whole new NEISA flag kit as we're missing a few flags. Maybe not a discussion for now about how we can do a better job training umpires and judges with Rule 42 stuff so as sailors and coaches we feel comfortable that they made the right call

consistently. There's a list of priority events, those are the events I focus my time on scheduling, the Women's NIT was on the slate, we need to make sure we still will stipend the Women's Team Race qualifier in conference. Right now, that's not on the list of things we would pay a stipend for but I think it should be. Also, I've been doing this for a couple of years now and we have a pretty good system in place for communication and centralized contact and who's slated to judge and umpire. I don't need to continue doing it, but I'm happy to. But if someone else wanted to do it let me know but I don't need a monopoly on it.

- b. *Kalin*: I would certainly want you to continue Amanda, unless anyone else is dying to jump into those shoes.

VII. Performance Ranking Committee Report – Mike Kalin

- a. *Kalin*: We took the input of several coaches and heard some criticisms of the performance ranking system in NEISA. We heard it 2/3 of the way through the season that things don't look right or aren't weighted correctly, but I was reminded by people on the committee to wait it out and see how it all ends up. At the end of the year, I think things sorted themselves out. As things shook out it became more obvious that they accurately represented the rank of our conference. In summary, the coed system looked at the weighing of sloops and ACC vs. ACT weighting and something else that's in the report, and decided no changes for Coed. We also did a comparison for NEISA performance rank system vs. ICSA CSR system and they're remarkably similar, and the only main different is that NEISA includes singles and sloops so one place here or there shifts. There might be a future where we could eliminate the NEISA performance ranking busy work for the ranking if the CSR seems better. On the women's side, we decided to make a few changes where the first two regattas of the year were B level events, Toni and Regis, and we decided to make them A level events to more closely resemble the coed ranking system. The other weird thing about the women's system is that the B level events were weighted very high compared to A level. As a consequence, because the women's Atlantic Coast Tournament was weighted as a B level event, it got an extraordinarily high rating that didn't really make sense. I know MIT won the ACT and got a keeper score out of that. It was the equivalent of finishing 6th at the ACC and the committee didn't think that was quite right. We're proposing to change that level, and I think it was worth 7 points to win the ACT, and we're proposing it be worth 6 points. Not a drastic change but it is a change and will hopefully make that better. In both coed and women's ranking it's important to note that even though certain regattas are in a category of scoring, they're not equally challenging or competitive. Like the Danmark is the most competitive event, way more than Harry Anderson or Hatch, but it's the same score. We often get in the weird comparison of how it computes to ACC then you're going to find yourself making weird comparisons. Comparing regattas to other things than the ACCs is a useful thing. I would like to make a motion to pass the findings and changes to the Women's performance rank to upgrade the Regis and the Toni to A level events and downgrade the ACT for women. The scoring table is included in the report which takes about 10-12% off the score.

- i. *Bresnahan*: Second
- ii. ***Motion passed***

- b. *Lindblad*: I submitted a proposal that does kind of affect this, and I don't want to take much time, and it would remove sloops from the scheduling rank. It doesn't really affect anything at all. The decent teams that don't sail sloops aren't affected. If your sloop team outperforms your dinghy team significantly, you're slightly affected. One of the big problems with sloop New England's and how that's counted, if you finish 6 or 7 or 8, you still get to keep a score that looks like getting 6, 7, or 8 at the Hoyt or Harry Anderson or Danmark, which are hard scores to get. If your dinghy team isn't able to do that but you have a sloop team that could, you get an artificial boost just to be at that regatta and not do very well.
- i. *Bresnahan*: My work on the committee found that it has been very difficult to make it into sloop New England's. This year we had a couple of teams that were ineligible because of COVID and some teams were recreating their sloop team. Matt's data is correct about a team gaining some points because they're not necessarily a great dinghy team and their score gets inflated. At the same time, it's one of our national championships and one of our prongs of college sailing. If this happened back-to-back years, then I think our committee would address it. We didn't address it this year on my recommendation because one school made it to New England's because other schools were COVID restricted or who normally sail it didn't sail it. That's how we came to the conclusion to keep sloops in the rank.
 - ii. *Thompson*: I find it hard to take regattas where we're sailing New England Championships and National Championships in our regular season and remove their weight from the performance rank. I think that is a pretty big change when you're talking about a lot of teams' strong players. As long as it is a national championship, it should be counted.
 - iii. *Reineck*: This is still an issue with all B level events with fewer than 16 teams. The same thing happens in the lower level where teams on the bubble of getting into the Schell can go to B level events and get a lot of points for those events and it's not just sloop events but at dinghy events as well.
- c. *Wilkinson*: You have a motion on the floor that was seconded.
- d. *Kalin*: I think we take that to a vote for now and see how that goes.
- e. *Ingalls*: Somebody made the comment the same thing is happening at B level events for dinghy regattas. The scoring system set up by NEISA was based on the difficulty of the event, A, B, or C level, and then you take into account the number of competitors in the event. When we don't have 18, the ability to score points is reduced. NEISA has decided to make it a high-level event, even if there will only be a few boats showing up, we'll score it as more boats showing up. To me we're violating our own rules and I don't understand why we would want to do that. We're saying that a team that has the opportunity to win the Match Race Nationals is a good team, and they're saying they want to get that event, but just in case they're at another regatta that same weekend, where they might not get the dinghy points, they need, so we've decided to reward them and say since you're a good sloop sailor, we'll count that towards the dinghies. They should get the points based on the number of teams at that event, not artificially allowing a team that finished DFL to get points that equivalent to winning a B level

event. My personal experience with Salve Regina is we were not qualified for the Schell until the last weekend, all because of the teams at the bottom of the two sloop regattas. I think we were fortunate we had a good performance at UNH the very last weekend, and I don't think that was an accurate reflection on the performances of the teams that were in front of us based on the sloops.

- i. *Reineck*: John, this is happening because those are B level events and the B level events are scored out of 16 teams, never less. Any combined division B level event in dinghies, the same thing is happening. If you finish last in 9th, you're getting as if it was 9 out of 16. This problem isn't isolated to keelboat events.
- f. *Martin*: I think that for the small amount of data that Matt Lindblad has presented, there isn't a substantial benefit to removing sloops in the performance rank, same as the case for adjusting a lot of the things we talked about. The NEISA performance rank does a relatively good job at what its job is, which is to provide a general, relative rank of teams for scheduling purposes. The difference between being 15 and 16 in scheduling is not major or 17 and 18. It is scheduled in chunks and the performance ranking does a relatively good job at deciding those chunks. The argument of moving up and down one place but to David's point, as long as sloops is a national championship, it should be ranked and not devalued. The committee discovered, looking at all the data, that at the end of the day it is doing a relatively good job of providing that rank.
- g. *Wilkinson*: We're getting close to voting. It's important we understand what we're voting for. Mike Kalin made a motion and it was seconded. All that has happened since is discussion. There is still a motion waiting for a vote.
 - i. *Bresnahan*: I just want to table Matt some place so we get back to him.
 - ii. *Kalin*: He can make a subsequent motion.
 - iii. *Pizzo*: If the report fails, then we can take an amendment to it. Right now, we're looking to approve the committee's report.
- h. *Kalin*: Motion to accept the committee's report and accept the findings.
 - i. ****Motion passed****
 - ii. *Lindblad*: Two motions have been put out there. The first is the performance ranking committee's report. The second is the motion I submitted to NEISA yesterday.
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: That would need to get seconded, it's already been discussed. There's one motion on the floor, and it's Mike Kalin's.
- i. *Lindblad*: Does anyone second my sloop proposal motion?
 - i. *Ingalls*: Second.
 - ii. *Lindblad*: I think we should vote on the committee's proposal first.
- j. *Assad*: Mike, I think many of these votes were meant to have two votes per team, one graduate and one undergraduate, except the scheduling.
- k. *Callahan*: If we were doing this in person there would be a finite amount of time to vote. It seems like it's very open.
- l. *Pizzo*: It's 30-1, I think we can move on.
- m. *Lindblad*: I think that leaves us with just voting on my proposal and then we can move on.

- i. *Thompson*: We're addressing that just sloops needs to get removed but we're not saying anything about the other B things? Correct?
- n. *Lindblad*: Correct, that's the only proposed change.
 - i. ****Motion did not pass****
- o. *Wilkinson*: Did the performance ranking committee this year dig into this floor issue that a bunch of teams are bringing up on the B events thing? It came up a lot on this but I don't know if the committee had a chance to consider this floor thing.
 - i. *Kalin*: We've talked about it in the past, one of the reasons why that exists is to incentive teams to go and get points.
- p. *Wilkinson*: Is there a mathematical way to accomplish both things by keeping the floor but zeroing out last place? That seems like the real thing here. I'm wondering if there's this outstanding issue that maybe the performance ranking committee could drill down on and figure out this floor issue, which also seems to be tied to one of the gripes of scoring at the sloops, the other gripe being that it is sloops and shouldn't count. Is this an issue you guys need to wrestle with?
 - i. *Bresnahan*: The discussion on B's and the sloops are similar has happened before. John Ingalls said it best, that they went to UNH and did what they had to do to qualify. There were other opportunities to score points, they were just sailing in different regattas not scoring points. At any given time, everyone looks at that schedule and all of a sudden people start picking apart the schedule. Ultimately the rank did exactly what it was supposed to do. You can't just stop the clock on this rank because it's a guide. As far as we're concerned, the system worked.
- q. *Reineck*: If you're trying to use smaller B level events to encourage people to chase points, there needs to be more opportunity for that, there's not a lot of capacity there. Events fill and teams in similar position to mine that could benefit from getting points, it's really a struggle to get into those events. The access just isn't there and not in easy to access locations for most of the conference.
 - i. *Pizzo*: I just don't think that's true; a lot of the B's weren't full and a lot had second teams. You have to get in the car and go places, and that's part of our sport. The Bs were not full this fall. If you want those you have to chase them.
 - ii. *Reineck*: I'm looking mostly at Callaghy Ross and PBO because those are combined division B level events and you are getting a lot of points for coming in last at those events.
 - iii. *Wordell*: I think I sent three teams to the Callaghy Ross this year the week of because it was so under subscribed. The B level events didn't have a lot of teams. We were outside looking in, but I think sloops should count. I think it sucks this year that it had a bunch of glitches, but it is what it is.
- r. *Reineck*: Looking at who's going to events this year is not a great representation of the situation because we're still dealing with the implications of COVID.
- s. *Ingalls*: I might not understand exactly what is up with B level events, but weren't the scores adjusted appropriately as if only nine teams were there?
 - i. *Reineck*: No because all B level events have a minimum scoring threshold of 16 teams.

- ii. *Ingalls*: I feel that the sloop regatta which had 6 teams up in Maine, so you finished last out of 6 teams and get 4 points doesn't make any sense. The team that finished last finished last in every race except one, I just don't understand how you give them points at all. I appreciate Jeff's flattery, but it was a matter of circumstance and we just pulled it off.
- t. *Martin*: The committee looked at all of this. We can send out the data that we ran through where we are changing scoring tables and what counts and what doesn't and we can publish the results of the potential changes. We can talk about individual events, but when we make the changes, they are not substantial enough to warrant blowing up the whole system. We can send out this data that actually shows our points so people can see for themselves what we use to make our recommendations, and hopefully that will help people understand the perspective the committee has on this.
- u. *Weidenbacker*: I think it has nothing to do with that. I think women are ranked as a women's event, sloops as a sloop event, singles as singles, and coed as coed. At the end of the day, it's a regatta you do well in or not. I don't think scores should carry from one discipline to another. We don't do it for women's, why do we do it for any other discipline.
- v. *Pizzo*: If people have input for the performance ranking committee, we do appreciate that input and can make adjustments in the spring, but this session is going to take forever.

VIII. Draft Committee Report – Frank Pizzo

- a. *Pizzo*: The draft committee worked on our draft report which should be on the website. Quick context, we had a modified draft this fall because we had to use the performance rank and tried to make a more inclusive draft. This draft goes back to what we did in 2019 when we drafted for 2020 before COVID. We have a team race draft, a women's draft, and a cross-regional regional draft. There are a couple points I'd like to highlight. The team racing, we intended to include everything the spring that NEISA has berths at. There were two exceptions, one being the Herring Pond Team Race which we would continue to fill in reverse performance rank order. It's for teams outside of the top 16 that want to team race a little bit. The other one we propose to not be in the draft would be the Marchiando which is hosted by MIT. There is some weirdness with MIT not being a top ten team in the performance rank and this event being an important event, we think it shouldn't be in the draft because the teams in New England's are locked by the time we get to the Marchiando, so we would recommend 10 top teams, the 11th berth would go to the host, and the 12th berth would go to the first place Staake team, and the second place Staake team would be the first alternate. We thought that was the most equitable and it's likely the second team from the Staake would get into the event. We proposed that for team racing. For women's a lot of the women's events have gone to team racing so there's more berths in the women's draft than there have been in the past. We have a draft order as outlined there. And then finally, we have the cross regional stuff and regional events in the bottom draft order. There are a couple of weird things for this one that are worth talking about. We've done this in in the past for the Owen which has some teams that are traditionally in that event, and we would treat those teams as host berths. So basically once, two teams select that event, then the

traditional rivals would have the first right of refusal to select the Owen or pass their host bid, and I think a lot of them have done that in the past and hopefully that addresses the Owen challenge. Another thing our draft committee discussed was the host berth allocations. In the past we have made the host pick their events when the lowest number of berths at a NEISA event came up. For instance, the Moody has only 7 berths, so in the past we made everybody choose after 6 picks at their event so all the hosts are treated equally. We thought that was not necessarily a good thing to have every host do that because there's a big range of NEISA berths. For fleet racing, we came up with that the host should pick after 9 other teams have selected their events for fleet racing, and for team racing we came up with after 5 other teams. So, we tweaked when the host will pick their events, not to disincentivize hosts from hosting regattas, but also not giving hosts a huge bonus either. My final thing for the draft is we talked about perhaps having another draft to deal with second teams. We talked about it but didn't come to a conclusion, but our preliminary thinking was we could pick a date in the spring, a few days after the one month drop deadline for ICSA events so we know when all of the out of conference teams won't be playing in NEISA events, and then we could have a draft where NEISA teams could select a second berth. That could be a good way of spreading out second berths. We don't have a concrete plan for that but could be something to explore. We thoughts about doing that for the fall as well. As a scheduler, a lot of teams usually want second berths in December and that causes a lot more work for the scheduler. When they actually have to send teams to events, a lot less people actually want to do that so we would be doing it once in the spring and once in the fall when coaches have a sense of their rosters. We don't have a definitive proposal for that but I wanted to mention our thinking. For the drafting and the draft order, this is something we've done quite a bit over the years so it's not totally new.

- i. *Dusek*: Looking at the draft order, I'm just wondering if there's an opportunity for one of those rounds to go deeper than the top 18. I know in our case I have a group of players that would love to get involved in team racing, and right now there's not a great way to draft into it. There will be some berths available in some events, but it's hard to plan for that. Looking at the draft, is it possible for say, the 1-18 to go down to 1-however many teams there are. I feel like there should at least be the possibility of getting into the draft.
- ii. *Ott*: Last year I remember, for this fall's draft last year in the spring, it went column 1, 2, 3, and I was wondering when they would call WPI. It felt like everybody above us was getting regattas and berths they wanted except the lower portion of the list.
- b. *Pizzo*: I think that is absolutely true. It's by design and maybe that's too on the nose, but team racing in particular, it's a discipline that you have the opportunity to get into. You have to finish in the top 16 or 18 at the end of the fall to get access to those events, and there are opportunities to sail-in to team races. There's the Herring Pond, there's an event at Bowdoin that never fills and there are often other events you can get into. Each time has an opportunity to get into this, it's a matter of playing into it. There are other schools that say, wanted to run a lower-level team race event, they can put their hand

up and we can put them on the schedule do a reverse performance rank thing, I think the scheduling group is happy to do that. I think we're targeting the group we need to.

- i. *Ott*: Yes, sailing is a competitive sport, but the lower ranked teams want a taste of it, maybe to just see, oh do we want to pursue this, or do we want to focus on the fall season.
- ii. *Dusek*: Frank I appreciate that and I'm just wondering if there's a possibility to, say, have that 1-18 round extended out a little bit. What's hard with team racing for a team like ours is we don't potentially see the water until April, and so the number of berths available are limited by factors beyond our control. Having more control about possibly being able to get into some events would be great and if some things open up at other events too that would be fantastic, but it's something I would just like to raise for consideration.
- iii. *Valentino*: I wanted to clarify that the team racing opportunities for teams south of 18, are Herring Pond, and any remaining berths open out to the draft?
- c. *Wilkinson*: One possible solution to teams past 18 is to host events amongst like teams, but the other slightly strange thing with team racing is, typically if we have 40 teams in New England, all 40 teams are clamoring for fleet racing opportunities, but what we have usually seen in NEISA, is not much further than 16 teams are usually clamoring for team racing spots. I understand that's probably one of the reasons the draft committee put the number at 18, but we could also maybe take the temperature a bit, and my guess is that once you get past the 18th team, there just aren't many teams that have the actual interest, but we should probably keep our finger on the pulse of how many do. The solution is probably for those teams to host some events amongst each other, at least as a temporary solution.
- d. *Leonard*: I think this is great and a good problem. I don't think we were hearing this desire a couple of years ago, and maybe the answer is simple. And maybe for the Herring Pond, I don't know about this reverse schedule, maybe it should start at 18 and go up from there. Maybe we should get two more of those on the schedule and see if they fill, and it would be good if some of the teams that are going to participate in them could host them, but this is great.
- e. *Martin*: We have not sailed a spring in 2 years as a full conference, so it's worth nothing that despite the seeming inequality in the draft, there is usually berths available at all of these events. So, we're happy to host a lower-level team race if the capacity is full already, I would recommend sailing this spring. It would be cool if there are an additional 4 or 6 teams that want to sail 4 or 5 team races this spring. If that's the case and there's not capacity, we should revisit this and it's something we can do in season if there's a huge waitlist at every event. We haven't done this in a while, so I'd say let's remember what the capacity usually looks like and have a little patience.
- f. *Pizzo*: Motion to adopt the draft committee report as written.
 - i. *Anderson*: Second
 - ii. *****Motion passed*****

IX. Championship Committee Report

- a. *Thompson*: Championship committee solicited bids for the New England Championships. We have one vote to do for the Coed Spring Dinghies. It's between MIT and Brown.

Motion to vote between the two. After that, our committee is looking for more members, so if you're interested in being on the championship committee, we're looking for three new members who basically solicit bids for championships and we also help with NORs, SIs, and making sure we are aligned with both the ICSA championship committee conditions for national championships and spring championships, and also making sure those regattas are run very well. That should be a vote, one per team.

i. ***MIT won bid for Coed New England Dinghy Championship***

X. TIDE Update – Preston Anderson

- a. *Anderson:* Quick report, we're going to have new leadership in 2022 for NEISA TIDE. The Chair will be Izzy, our Vice Chair will be Tyler Miller and Johnathan will be the NEISA Rep. Johnathan will try and give the monthly TIDE reports to the NEISA exec board. If a senior on your team is graduating this fall or spring and they're your current TIDE rep, they will need to be replaced with a new TIDE rep that is not graduating. Izzy has been coordinating all that. Over the past year we have had a lot of initiatives worth commenting on. Last year we had a bunch of education initiatives with NEISA and ICSA, we had a big bylaw change allowing us to have a NEISA TIDE rep on the NEISA exec board. There was a Sailing World article written about us last spring. I was able to participate as a TIDE representative on the US Sailing stakeholders meeting, and the culture and demographic survey was released. There are still a few outstanding projects and articles that will be released over the next few weeks that will be communicated out. We had a Sail Newport collaboration last fall with Brown and URI. They worked with Sail Newport and participated in an introductory sailing event with Rogers High School in Rhode Island. We also recently released our education program so teams can do it any time in the remainder of this fall, or they have the opportunity to engage with it this coming spring. Part of the bylaw change this spring is that we're not mandating education by a certain time, but strongly encourage teams to do our education program which is centered on team culture. There will be a couple of proposals submitted at the ICSA Winter Meeting. Part of the discussion on the ICSA task force have been kind of renaming coed regattas to open, partly because it's more inclusive language especially for those that are gender binary. There is also a group working with Amy Backus and a few others on transgender athlete recommendations for the ICSA. I have also been serving as the ICSA TIDE task force vice chair and will be stepping down at the end of this calendar year as I will be graduating in the spring. We also have two NEISA TIDE reps actively working as DEI interns this winter for US Sailing. I'm excited to see what new leadership will bring for the next year. The educational information has been emailed out to every TIDE rep. Your TIDE rep should have the education program. That is my TIDE report.

Old Business

I. Announcement of NEISA Executive Board for 2022

- a. *Kalin:* You ran the election for undergraduate leadership in NEISA. I think everyone here has been notified, so congrats to everyone on your new positions. If you didn't get elected, college sailing is always looking for people to be on committees and to get involved otherwise.

- b. *Anderson*: I emailed this out, but the President is Molly Matthews of Roger Williams, Vice President is Ted Lutton from Bates, Secretary will be Marbella Marlo from Harvard, Undergrad Northern Regional Rep will be Katie Kurtz from Bowdoin, Undergrad Central Regional Rep will be Jack Plavan from Boston College, Southern Regional Rep will be Sadie Thomas from URI, At-Large NEISA TIDE Rep will be Johnathan Chance from Bowdoin, At-Large Awards Assistant who also does social media for NEISA will be Emi Ruth from Brown. Congrats to all of the new elected leaders.

New Business

I. Discussion of undergraduate petition to move dates of College Nationals – Sonia Lingos-Utley

- a. *Kalin*: Sonia you can present your petition to move the dates of college nationals.
- b. *Lingos-Utley*: I'm assuming most people on the call have seen the petition or heard about it and know the dates of nationals have changed a lot from the standard. The link to the petition, which has the spreadsheet and the 605 names signed. 16 of the 38 teams total that competed ACCS, Women's ACCs, and the Atlantic Coast Tournament have graduations during the currently stated nationals, as well as two more have graduations that day before the beginning of team race and have more than 2-3 seniors on each team that would be competing at national and would have to adjust their graduation. That's a total of 18 schools that would have to adjust their graduation plans or miss them completely, 7 more have finals during that period of time so that adds up to a total of 25 out of 38 teams that competed at these championships that would either have to miss part of nationals or part of graduation, or take finals at nationals. The proposed dates start on or after the 24th, where 6 of these 38 schools would overlap with Women's Nationals, either semis or nationals. 4 of those schools who do overlap did qualify and compete at Women's ACCs with a total of 7 seniors who sailed during the potentially impacted dates. We understand that Memorial Day is May 30th and we understand that is a big event for Southern Yacht Club and we are willing to be flexible around that. We also realize some schools have always had to miss graduation or take finals during nationals, and we are in no way trying to negate their experiences, but we're bringing up a point that the drastic number of sailors and schools affected are much higher because the dates are much earlier.
 - i. *Kalin*: Thank you for presenting that and having such compelling evidence.
 - ii. *Bresnahan*: I do think that things like this affect so many students, I'm not here nor there, we do, as an organization, need to start looking at all of these aspects of things. Besides baseball which is basically professional, lacrosse is the only one that goes to Memorial Day. How far do we have to go? It affects so many people that way, so I want it to go the other way and have nationals done before all the graduations and finals like most spring sports. I'm not in support of keeping it or changing it, we'll do whatever is best for the students. These problems are real and coming out of COVID, we're just getting farther and farther apart.
 - iii. *Callahan*: Do we have any options? What are the options? Does it come down to NEISA having to offer to host it? Is there anything to be done?

1. *Lingos-Utley*: This vote is to have ICSA reconsider the dates. I'm not sure how all the details of rescheduling nationals are, but it would more so be if we support changing the dates or not.
- iv. *Moeder*: We are very understanding of the logistics and planning behind nationals. That's why we're having this discussion, and we're asking that we at least have the opportunity to say how important it is that we get to engage in both graduation and nationals, especially coming out of COVID it was painful for the class of 2020, class of 2021, and also the class of 2022. It would be unfortunate to not try to find a compromise so we get to experience some of both. A lot of people on my team were appreciative of the petition.
- c. *Pizzo*: If we do come forward to reconsider, it's 11 days and it's going to overlap, there's going to be other people that miss graduation. I know maybe less, but that's a hard thing, especially because people have been operating under these dates. If dates do change, other people are impacted. The Bowdoin team has been impacted by this quite a bit, and overlapping with team racing is the hardest one because everybody's good at team racing. I think if we do move forward, there needs to be real thought about what the solution could be, not just that there's a problem. There will be new losers if we do go forward.
 - i. *Lingos-Utley*: It was not made aware to many of the seniors until a couple of weeks prior to my petition. A couple of seniors I know in college sailing, their families have also already planned for it and the assumption is terrible and I want it to work out for everyone but just wanted to draw attention to the fact that everyone was under the assumption that we would get to graduate as of two months so everything's already booked.
- d. *Kalin*: Just to be clear, NEISA can't control this, but it would help your cause to get the backing of the conference. You're looking for NEISA support to bring this to the ICSA.
 - i. *Lingos-Utley*: It's up to teams and your positions and it's not perfect for everyone, but it's up to our decision to decide whether or not we want to move forward to the next step to discuss potential solutions, which would be changing the dates.
- e. *Lingos-Utley*: Motion is to move it to ICSA discussion?
- f. *Wilkinson*: This is a board level decision at the ICSA. I don't know how many undergrads are intimately familiar with how ICSA works and I don't really think Sonia knows what has to happen from here. What would need to happen from here is one of the NEISA board members would need to propose at the board meeting a date change for this to be actionable. It's a board level issue at the ICSA.
- g. *Anderson*: Do we have new dates proposed for this event?
 - i. *Pizzo*: I think we need to get NEISA to buy in to a date change first. The graduate and undergraduate rep can't just go ahead without NEISA support. We need a vote first.
 - ii. *Assad*: They can go rogue but we discourage that.
 - iii. *Martin*: I think the vote is if we're directing Mike or our undergrad rep to take this to the ICSA with new dates, whether NEISA supports that or not.

- iv. *Dusek*: You said to go to the ICSA with new dates, or saying that we should look at new dates?
- v. *Martin*: I think that NEISA can't just go to the ICSA and say that nationals' dates should change without proposing an alternative.
- h. *Lingos-Utley*: I've looked in to the other academic schedules at other schools, and it's unrealistic to have them any earlier than the current dates as they're already more than 7 days earlier than usual and would overlap with more schools' finals and classes. I think that it would probably end up being moved later based on academic schedules.
- i. *Weidenbacker*: Can you propose a motion please whether it's a straw vote or a vote?
- j. *Lingos-Utley*: I propose a motion to suggest a change of dates by NEISA to the ICSA board to say we need to look at this and have a potential change in dates. We are not suggesting dates. They can deem what should be appropriate if they think change is needed.
 - i. *Moeder*: Second
 - ii. ***Motion passed to present idea to change national's dates to the ICSA***
- k. *Kalin*: Brief discussion I guess, are there any additional points?
 - i. *Assad*: The end of the national's block window is the Friday after Memorial Day which is when we're not supposed to host nationals after. I think that tries to keep us in line with when many internships and other commitments begin in June. That's one relevant data point.
- l. *McClintock*: Without being able to offer an alternative, I don't know how we can support this? We're basically saying, don't do this, we can't just say we'll support something without having an option. The event will be held no matter what. It's incomplete.
 - i. *Lingos-Utley*: I don't think we reached an agreement to the dates. The dates I initially proposed in the petition is beginning any time on or after the 24th which would end on the 3rd to correspond with the fact that a lot of colleges are starting their second semester later and in the past summer and this upcoming summer internships are starting a couple of days late than usual because academics are starting later. COVID shifted the timeframe a little bit. For reference, 4 or 5 years ago we started and ended on about the same dates.
- m. *Anderson*: It seems like we have two issues with the current proposed dates based on my discussion with other graduates across the ICSA. One, Southern Yacht Club absolutely said they cannot host over Memorial Day weekend so we would need an alternative for that reason alone. Second, the nationals window ends on the third. Because Southern Yacht Club can't host on that weekend, we'd need to extend nationals further on which conflicts with our national's window.
 - i. *Leonard*: I had a Southern Yacht Club member at my Thanksgiving, and that's not the case. There's not a conflict. There are three days when Southern's motorboats wouldn't be available, because they're running a not so big event. So, it would be hard for them to run team racing over those three days, but it wouldn't be too difficult to run fleet racing over those three days.
- n. *Bresnahan*: I feel like maybe Mike or someone close with Charles and Sonia should have a conversation with Charles. Say this is Sonia's proposal and asking if there is wiggle room as opposed to just going to the board. Sonia's got some good data and I'm sure

someone here can set up a call with Charles and see if he doesn't get blindsided about us trying to take over his company.

- i. *Kalin*: I think that's smart Jeff. Charles would certainly dig in his heels harder if he just learned of it at the winter meeting.
- o. *Lingos-Utley*: I just thought that this would be the best place to start.
 - i. *Bresnahan*: Whether it's Greg or Frank, just let Sonia talk to Charles. If you come with data there is wiggle room. We complain about this stuff all the time, but for NEISA to move forward we should put you in front of Charles and just have a chat.
- p. *Assad*: In 2017 we had the same problem with nationals with Charleston and they were able to move it but we had a little more flexibility with the venue. Do we want to adjust the front end of the national's window in the future? Should we lock it in on Monday, two weeks or a week before Memorial Day?
 - i. *Kalin*: I think one of the surprises this year is that it was a week earlier.
- q. *Assad*: Yeah, and the window allows for that. So, if every time it comes up it's going to be an issue, we probably should pursue trying to change the window.
 - i. *Kalin*: I would agree with that.
- r. *Wilkinson*: The voting is clear that NEISA wants to do something with this, so should Sonia sit with Charles and Mitch?
 - i. *Pizzo*: Charles may be on the board, but the ICSA won't even budge on moving when they announce teams past weekend 10.
 - ii. *Wilkinson*: It's highly unlikely they'll move it.
 - iii. *Bresnahan*: This isn't even a board discussion. Out of respect for Charles, he needs to vote with us. We just have to have a closed-door discussion with him. If he's not on board we shouldn't do anything.
- s. *Weidenbacker*: I don't think it's about opinion, but it is about process. I agree with Greg that there should be a discussion. When you approach someone who has a lot going on, the best way to manage this is to ask questions and present information and have a discussion rather than rattling a cage and attacking. Having a conversation might be enlightening. I would also do it with Mitch on board.

II. Rule 42 Trial Events – Fran Charles

- a. *Charles*: Mike, Matt, and I have talked about how to properly pull this together just to try it out. We were all inspired by watching the Olympics this past summer, and seeing how essentially the class rules allow the race management team to turn on or off Rule 42 depending on the conditions. We'd love to try it and felt we had too much on our plates this past fall with huge changes in the ICSA to even consider throwing that in. But fall of 2022 we should try it at a couple of B-level events, the Smith and the O'Berg in October. It would be nice to have the students decide how we should go to ICSA to ask for an experimental set of class rules that we can change to for these events. Essentially everything comes out of class rules when you do this sort of thing and class rules come from the sailors in those classes. They decide on the wind threshold, and you can do anything. I'm looking for a body of students interested in participating in coming up with an experimental set of class rules to try at these regattas. Students, please email me and send me notes with what you think we should or shouldn't do. I hope we can have a

proposal by the ICSA Winter Meeting to carry forward and give it a try and see what happens.

- b. *Kalin*: People were interested to see what would happen, so this could be a good opportunity to try stuff out.

III. Fundamental and Regional Regatta – Jack Valentino

- a. *Valentino*: This was initially started when Preston and I met with undergraduates around the country from regional and fundamental teams to talk about opportunities for a culminating spring regatta and came up with a proposal to bring back to NEISA regional and fundamental coaches. In a group spearheaded by Diana from UNH encompassing most if not all NEISA regional and fundamental teams. We tweaked our proposal and pared that group down to a group consisting of myself, Sam Lowry from McGill, Jared from WIT, and Diana from UNH, and are proposing a promotional ICSA regional and fundamental team championship to be held weekend 12. The benefits would be to offer regional and fundamental teams a culminating event to athletically and organizationally work towards whether that be fundraising, recruitment, retention, school organization, things like that. It gives teams not in contention for ICSA fleet race nationals the opportunity to have an interconference high-level culminating event. A lot of the details are yet to be worked out and the information will come out through questions, but Diana did a great job of summarizing everything in the proposal that was put on the Slack.
- b. *Anderson*: This is coming out of discussions with Jack and Justin and other undergraduates, and this will be a great event, but it needs to be paired with the fact that I am worried that we will have more teams that are lower tier cross-regional across the country. I think we need to say that if you want to participate, be a regional team if you don't think you're going to be a contender for nationals. If we want to be able to reach the teams that this event is going to reach, we need to explain why we decided for a regional and fundamental championship. Tell them that if they want to participate, they need to reclassify, and give them reasons why that benefits them. Second point, from my discussions with Mitch, some of the fundamental teams don't require a declaration of adherence, because some of the teams in the ICSA don't technically have the right approvals to represent their school's name, so if they want to compete in this event, they need those signatures to be able to compete.
- c. *Valentino*: A crucial part of the timeline was that Diana did have a meeting with Mitch and Mike I believe, but there was a blessing from Mitch that he thought this was something worth pursuing and that Diana should send out a survey. We had been gathering details from a nationwide perspective of teams we would be targeting. There is broadscale support for this from regional and fundamental teams across the country and even at ICSA levels. All the details are in the works of being ironed out.
- d. *Weidenbacker*: Mitch is expecting us as a committee to bring a proposal to the Winter Meeting. It would be nice to have a straw vote. It's non-binding, and we have a venue for the spring, both coed and women's. So, I would love to hear from coaches and other students on the call in terms of support or lack thereof, and any clarifying questions.
 - i. *Martin*: What is the venue?

- e. *Weidenbacker*: Both would be held at Salve Regina on weekend 12. Could we get a straw poll for this proposal?
- f. *Assad*: Carter brings up a good point in the chat. Greg emphasized that for women's teams almost everyone will get into the actual national championship. So, what do you think Diana, is there demand below that level?
 - i. *Weidenbacker*: So far there is, but not much. Not 18 teams so far have said, "hey we're not in the top 36". There are 63 teams that are ranked CSR, and out of those 63 teams if 36 go to semis, there are enough teams left that may be interested. Obviously in working out the detail our focus is mainly on coed, but we want to be able to offer that opportunity. If we find we don't have those teams after further polling, then we would just keep it as a coed event.
- g. *Kalin*: Is this happening under straw poll or the voting sheet?
 - i. *Weidenbacker*: There wasn't a proposal but it would be nifty to have more than a straw poll.
- h. *Valentino*: I propose we bring this document to the ICSA winter meeting with NEISA's support.
 - i. *Anderson*: Second
 - ii. ****Motion passed****
- i. *Weidenbacker*: Thank you everyone, that's a great indicator. I will say that Jack and everybody else has put in a ton of hours in the past two and half weeks. This was pretty exciting and we want to mirror how other national events are done, and we hope we have a good plan and certainly are consulting with a variety of other coaches to make this be an event worthy of a national event. We can't use the word national because Mitch said it would raise too much ire with people. That's why the title is the way it is. We're just focusing on regional and fundamental teams because everybody else has a playing field they can jump in and out of. That's why it's allocated to those two groups. At the end of the day, it's only 18 teams here, we hope to develop a team race or a semis next year. It will be a rotating event around conferences, and uniquely I think Jack would say, we're going to be using three teams in NEISA to further develop this, and people from around the country have volunteered to do what it takes to pull this off.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: I think there's wiggle room on the name.

IV. Membership Status Reports

- a. *Kalin*: Is there a representative from the Landing School here? I know our bylaws only allow for new members to be at this meeting and no others. Is there another way to do that or are they out of luck for the year?
 - i. *Weidenbacker*: I would hate to see that be out of luck for the year. They were trying to get the documents in under the wire and I think they were able to get them to you. I don't know what the proper procedure is but they had a team and they only have a two-year program, so they're really trying to push to regenerate their team, and I really hope we can support that opportunity for them and see them work to make this grow.
- b. *Assad*: I don't think there's been precedent for a change in the procedure and there's a reason for that. The count for the number of teams was so directly connected to the national championship so I think that's why the structure is so rigid with when teams are

admitted. One good thing is they can start participating in fundamental events even before they're in New England. There's a pathway to get there through a few regattas, and Mike maybe that's a discussion again at the board level about whether we can change the terms of membership because I think that's set by the board. Why don't we just vote them in. In the big picture adding fundamental teams, like why wouldn't we do that.

- c. *Kalin*: I make a motion to accept the Landing School for fundamental team status.
 - i. *Dusek*: Second
 - ii. ****Motion not passed because failed to reach 2/3 vote****

V. ICSA Committee Representatives – Mike Kalin

- a. *Kalin*: Frank do you think we can appoint ICSA committee reps? We're just going to pin it on people anyway so there's not a whole lot of need to have group discussion on that.

VI. NEISA Annual Awards

- a. *Kalin*: People might be so fried they can't properly do justice to the NEISA Honor Roll or MacArthur Service Award. We could potentially do that on Slack or does that have to be a vote? Oh, ok it has to be a vote. Could we do an electronic vote?
 - i. *Wilkinson*: Yes, we can do it electronically.

VII. Adjournment

- a. *Wilkinson*: I do think it's worth going over what we've done. When we don't do this, we land at the 2021 Schell and Urn. We voted to change NEISA regulations 7.7.4 twice. The competition committee needs to review how we're going to qualify people for the Dellenbaugh and report back within three days. We're going to move our national's qualifier to fall weekend 8, so from there, I don't know where the Schell and the Urn go but the Coast Guard Alumni Bowl and the Reed Trophy move to fall weekend 8. We are moving the team race champs to spring weekend 13 starting spring 2023. We'll bring a proposal to ICSA to move the selection date for the team race nationals for this year. We voted to change the performance rank system that will have to be updated on the webpage or in the NEISA regs. Changes to the draft will have to be updated.
 - i. *Kalin*: Did you just say "change of dates for the team race nationals"?
- b. *Wilkinson*: Team race nationals selection dates. That thing we voted on to move – so we have to bring that to this winter meeting. I think we're bringing experimental class rules to the winter meeting for a vote from the ICSA for experimental regattas, and I think we're bringing the National Tournament to the ICSA. We have to change those regs.
- c. *Kalin*: Some clarity on the 14-race showdown here that did not pass. I think the default still, just so expectations are there, is that in the schedule, with the Notice of Race and the SIs of regattas on the first three weekends, the hosts have control of that, but those will be 14-race regattas.
 - i. *Martin*: Hosts are allowed to change the SIs if they want.
- d. *Kalin*: 14-race thing was defeated for all NEISA events, but the hosts have all agreed that in the first three weekends, the hosts are having those as 14-race regattas.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: They will need to put that in their SIs.
- e. *Kalin*: Did Landing School pass? Oh no they didn't because we need to reach 2/3 vote, so we may need to do an electronic vote for that. We can send that out by email and finish it up. I make a motion for adjournment.

i. *Martin*: Second