

May NEISA Executive Committee Call Meeting Notes

May 28th, 2021

I. Call to Order

- a. *Kalin*: Alright, so it's 11:00. Small audience so far, so hopefully people trickle in. I think the most important part of this meeting is going to be what Greg and Justin present about the National qualifying system. We're also recording this, so it will go up on the website, so if teams have questions about that, hopefully everything will be answered in his presentation and they can refer to that so they don't bother Greg and Justin after all of the work they put into that. So, we can get all the questions out and totally understand it before we move into next fall. Is Moose there? Hi Moose, I just wanted to publicly thank you so much for your efforts at Singlehandeds. That was an incredibly meaningful event for all of College Sailing, and I know to take that on was a massive undertaking and it was hugely stressful, and there was a lot of challenging moments, but from all accounts it was awesome and it was a fantastic event to kickstart normal sailing and normal life. Thanks for everything you did. We greatly appreciate and acknowledge your efforts on that.

II. Roll Call of Executive Board

- a. Full meeting attendance and voting is available [here](#)

III. 14 Race Format Next Fall at NEISA Controlled Events – Mike Kalin

- a. *Kalin*: A little bit of history about this. The topic is having 14 races be the number of races that a college sailing regatta is. 18 races is a bit of an arbitrary number. 25 years ago, a typical regatta had one fleet of boats, with teams switching off and it took an extraordinary amount of time because the boats were uneven and it just took forever. Now, we're finding that fleets are evenly matched, and more than that, the demands on student athlete's time are far greater. They're doing a lot more things, they're preparing for their career. Things just seem a bit different after the great recession. Student athletes are more focused on their career now than ever. As an organization, I think we can offer a little better bang for your buck. We can offer the same sailing experience and cut out some of the things that were costing time. That will be left up to each individual host, but I think if we minimize some of the rotation and try to get through the 14 races as efficiently as possible, I think everyone wins. Keep in mind, this proposal has been agreed on by all hosts for next fall for certain events. It's not being imposed on anyone and every host has agreed to do it. It's only going to be for the events that NEISA controls – this isn't an ICSA thing. But, hopefully we can kind of spread it to that level just by demonstrating that our events are better. It's really a marginal change. I've looked back at the data, and it's pretty rare when we get in greater than 14 races, but I think the returns are huge. I think it means that kids that are competing in all 8 weekends in the fall are going to have a couple

Sundays where they get home a little earlier and catch up on normal college kid life. I put the details of that in the email. Any questions or comments on this proposed change for next fall?

- i. *McClintock*: Looking at the idea is solid, but we all know, and just looking at sort of what happened at Tufts last weekend where they barely got any races in, what happens if you don't get many races in on Saturday and you're limited to only being able to sail 'til 1:30 on Sunday?
 - 1. *Kalin*: If you scroll down there on the email, there's some contingencies that everyone should understand. The goal isn't just to get out on Sunday as soon as possible no matter what. If there's been only 0-4 races on Saturday, it will basically be a normal Sunday: 3:00 cutoff time and a max of 8 races. There will probably be some cases with no racing or 2 races on Saturday, and then on Sunday we can do the whole thing. So that's for the Hood, I haven't actually spoken to Ken about that, but I think it's a 20-team event. This system is only appropriate for 2-fleet venues and the hosts have been contacted about this change. Ken wasn't part of that. Ken will run the Hood how he will run the Hood. If everything goes well on Saturday and Sunday, with continuous wind, we can just blast through 14 races and hopefully we can wrap up sometime around 1:00 on Sunday instead of 3:30 or 4:00. But that's kind of the intention.
- ii. *Martin*: Is the intent to allow other hosts and venues to opt into this? Or to discourage unless it's a 2-fleet venue?
 - 1. *Kalin*: I think I want to leave as much control to the hosts as possible to impose as little as possible. If they think they can run an effective event under this format, although I kind of doubt it but I'll be open to it. I think URI and Tufts would be reluctant to try to. I think the rules will actually apply to them. I doubt if you get really good wind on a Saturday, you're probably looking at 8A and 6B or something like that. That pretty much opens it up for 6 and 4 races on Sunday, which is probably about as well as you'll do. It kind of applies to them, but I don't think they'll be able to do... If they're running standard length races, even if everything goes right, I think they may have trouble making some of those targets. Well, I look forward to this. If we find that there's an agreement that we're giving up too much great sailing on a Sunday afternoon in September, then maybe we can go back the other way. I just think it's something to try. We tried this with a 10:30 report time on Saturday and I think by all accounts people really appreciate that. This is a small change, subtle change, that will go a long way.

- iii. *Assad*: Is there some easy way to notate this on the schedule? Like maybe it's called "experimental time"? Or may we just color it a different color but it's all standard?
 - 1. *Martin*: We can mark it as a 14-race max and just assume that everything else goes with that.
 - a. *Assad*: Yeah, 14-race max means we're playing under this set of contingencies. "Experimental 14-race Event" or something like that.
 - 2. *Wilkinson*: That whole system should end up in the Notice of Race of Sailing Instructions or something if it's not in any of our Regs or something. Sailing Instructions are probably easiest.
 - a. *Assad*: Let's just put it in the Regs as the Experimental System and then people don't have to have it written out in every Sailing Instructions.
 - i. *Martin*: I can also add a section to our schedule which is our NOR with all of this on there.
- iv. *Assad*: Are we allowed to do that at the Captain Hurst for instance, can we use that format, or do we need get approved by Mitch to go to 14 races and longer rotations and all that good stuff?
 - 1. *Kalin*: I think the longer rotations, yeah. Does he control the number of races?
 - a. *Wilkinson*: Number of races are in the procedural rules. You just have to read whether or not that's one you're allowed to change.
 - i. *Assad*: It is, you can change it, yeah.
 - b. *Wilkinson*: It's all in there. Some you're allowed, some you need to ask.
- v. *Mollicone*: I like the 14-race idea, but do we need to have all those stipulations? It seems like a little bit of a hassle to follow. But if we can get 10 races in on a Saturday say at the Hoyt, and the forecast looks great on Sunday, we could consider like a 10-10:30 report time, or 4 races starting on time on Sunday and we're out of there early? But do we need those stipulations? Can we just have it be 14 races and keep everything else as is? Obviously, it doesn't really matter to me, but I was just thinking whether all of those stipulations are necessary for Sunday.
 - 1. *Kalin*: Yeah, we discussed that a lot. Zack Leonard but a lot of thought into the Sunday contingencies. We just thought it would be good to establish rules so we all know what the intention is. I'll talk about it in a small group after. For now, I'll keep it, but I'm interested to hear more of what you have to say. I think the other idea is that in the old days, kind of the formation of college sailing,

that regattas were generally 10-14 races, so it's a range we're targeting. I also think it's important to note, this was the other option. A lot of people that sailed this spring experienced great regattas in 10 races. So, a lot of people were questioning, what's the point of even going back a second day? But I see your point. So, if there were 9 races on a Saturday and it's blowing 15 knots, why would we stop at 4.

a. *Mollicone*: If we could talk about it more that would be great.

vi. *McClintock*: When the kids get back to school on time is important, so rather than put a limit on the number of races, why don't we just put a limit on time you can sail each day? If you have great breeze and you're sailing, that's all good, and if it's not great breeze and you don't get as many races, that's the way it is. Ideally, the kids are there so you might as well sail. Why put a number on the races when your concern is how much time they're spending there?

1. *Kalin*: Jeff Bresnahan and you share a similar philosophy on that. I don't think everyone shares that philosophy about making it a certain time.

a. *McClintock*: That's not true at all. The fact that there's a time limit being looked at and having people out on Sundays, it's understandable. Preferably, and I've talked to my kids, they want to sail as long and as many races as they can. And I'd like to see that too. But there's been a big move from the spring to limit stuff because it was convenient for a couple of reasons. One, there's been no rotations at all. If you take rotations out of the package completely, particularly what we were seeing down at Coast Guard where you had people having to sail up to Coast Guard or back down to Conn College to do a rotation and come back, or do other stuff, that changed the dynamic a little bit. But if we don't do rotations at all, why not just keep sailing rather than limiting how many races you can do? If people are keen to get the kids out on Sunday as early as possible, why not sail as many races as possible up until that point? On a crappy weekend with bad wind, ok you don't get as many races and you understand what you're doing. Ideally, I'd rather see them sail 'til 5:00 but that's not how that's going to happen. If the goal is to get the kids time to get out and back to school, just limit the time and not the number of races.

2. *Leonard*: I can speak to why this started off being number of races. It's because there were a lot of complaints from sailors after days, in particular at Navy where they'd run 12-14 races in a day. The sailors couldn't even remember what race you were talking about and they were completely sick of it by the end of the day. It was too much racing to be productive. So, we came up with the idea that 10 races was a lot of races in a day at the right length, following the right length in the procedural rules, and we shouldn't do more than that because it's not really helping anyone. I see why people want one day, but I'll never be for that. We have a lot of days with no wind here. If you're going to have a big regatta with your best sailors, you need two days to do that in case there's no wind.
- vii. *Assad*: I personally think there's a good argument for certain one day weekends, and then big tournament weekends like the ACCs and other events. I agree with Zack and Moose in some ways on certain principles, but I'm comfortable with one day and 6 races per division, I'm ok with that as long as when we get to October tournament weekends, we know we'll be sailing 2-day weekends. In September I can live with a 6 or 8 race day and that being a regatta. I know not everybody's there.
 1. *Leonard*: I'm ok with that for minors, but not major regattas where you're ranking. I think there's place for one day regattas, just not for majors.
 2. *Kalin*: It's also important to note that these changes are only for 4 out of 8 events. A lot of events stay the same. In any given weekend, you can find someone wanting more, just like when you end practice there's going to be people that want to sail longer. There's a cumulative effect of occupying student athletes' time for so much on consecutive weekends. People have found towards the end of seasons and towards the end of the year that there's a burnout factor at the top of the game and we can control that a bit with minor improvements.

IV. ICSA Championship Report and Nationals Selection Process – Justin Assad and Greg Wilkinson

- a. *Wilkinson*: At tomorrow's ICSA meeting, the Competition Committee will present a new way to qualify for Nationals. Through the 2021 and beyond stuff, in the winter of 2020, the berth formula is meant to go away at this winter meeting. It's going to go from a participation-based system, to a competitively based system. There's documentation on the collegesailing.org webpage under "Meeting Minutes", and the Competition Committee report itself is there, and I recommend you read it, and there's also a PowerPoint there. I'm going to present

that PowerPoint today. The PowerPoint I'm presenting today will be longer than the one online because it pulls an example of selection all the way through. I'm not going to go through the Competition Committee report in detail but just to sum it up. What's being proposed for all 6 National Championships, is qualifying for every National Championship regatta: 5 conferences get one berth through their conference championships. When I say National Championship Regatta, we have fleet racing with 2 semifinals, so that would mean NEISA would qualify 2 teams through the conference championship directly to the National Championship regatta. That's true across all disciplines. Also true across all disciplines is that the remaining berths will be chosen by the Selection Committee. What the Championship Committee and Competition Committee has spent a year working on is how the Selection Committees will function. Until I was part of this work, I didn't realize what that meant and how significant it was, especially go way back, when we used to have at-large berths in college sailing and there were no parameters on that selection process. There wasn't even that you needed to select high-quality teams. There was nothing. So, we're going in way the opposite direction with highly structured selection processes. Read the Competition Committee report. For each individual national championship, there are selection criteria, which means, the events and performances that the Selection Committee is told that they should consider for that specific national championship. Then there are selection methods, the actual process the committee must follow to choose teams. Each national championship has its own criteria, the regattas the Selection Committee can look at, and its own selection process. The most complex selection process is in Coed and Women's fleet racing. There's a PowerPoint on the web page in "Meeting Materials Documents" I'm going to present today on the Coed and Women's fleet racing selection method. I suggest you familiarize yourself with the criteria and methods for all events, this one is the most involved. The Selection Committees, there will be two Selection Committees with five voting members, a minimum of two women on the Coed committee, and a minimum of three women on the Women's selection committee. The committee members will be selected by the Championship Committee. There will be one non-voting member serving on the Selection Committees, it's going to be a Championship Committee person who will basically run the process. There's going to be someone who knows the process, running the process. Some limitations on the members. Coaches can be on it but can't select their own teams, so we kind of doubt that coaches would want to be on it. Donors, alums, parents, have to disclose any affiliations they have just like we have to do with umpiring and judging, the fact that you went to Dartmouth won't preclude you from selecting Dartmouth. Undergraduates are not eligible for the selection committees. On the Women's and Coed fleet racing side of things, there is a significant component to selection being introduced

we've never had before. It's called a Competitive Strength Ranking. Don't think of this in terms of the NEISA Performance Ranking. Yes, it's similar, but not at all will be used in the same way. The CSR is designed to accomplish two things. One, to give the selectors smaller groups than 200 teams, smaller groups of teams to consider as they go through rounds of selection, and to have those groups of teams be relatively alike competitively. That's the intent. Right off the bat, when I tell you the teams are a smaller group than 200 and relatively close competitively, there's an acceptance that when we go to create a competitive strength ranking across the entire country with wildly different regattas, there's an understanding that this strength ranking can't be good enough to actually select teams to go to Nationals, but it can be good enough to get similar groups that are smaller than 200. That's what it's designed to do. The other thing it's designed to do is to make sure all teams in the country get a fair look. That when we're trying to select 36 teams, that we're taking a really good and fair look at enough teams. This is where you've heard how regattas will be graded and you'll earn points. This is how the CSR works. We've discussed this some: the conference recommends grading for their events, the Championship Committee reviews the grades, the events get scheduled, you earn points, and at the end, you're counting 6 events for Coed, 5 for Women's, and teams get ranked 1-200 or however many teams there are. Since events are graded, every event has a grading factor that figures into your point calculation. The selection process, based on competitive strength – no more participation numbers, no more size of conference, no more sign up for Nationals, none of that. It's going to be transparent, fair, and supposedly simple. The championship field gets filled through a lot of rounds. Every bit of getting into Nationals is considered a round. Round 1, the top two teams from the 5 conference championships qualify for the semifinals in Women's and Coed fleet racing. In Round 2, the ranking system doesn't come into play. In Round 2, you have 10 teams already in and the selectors do one round of selection where they choose teams that they believe are "Locks". So, say Dartmouth won every regatta this year but didn't finish top 2 at the conference championship, so everybody thinks Dartmouth definitely should go, I don't need to see the CSR or anything, I know Dartmouth should be going to Nationals. So, the five selectors vote in this round, and anyone who gets 80% of the votes, so anyone who gets 4 out of their 5 votes, gets in in this round. Direct selection to the championship.

- i. *Assad*: When Greg said earlier that coaches wouldn't want to be on the committees, this is why. They would need all 4 of the other committee members to vote for their team. That's what he meant about there's a natural disincentive for coaches.

- b. *Wilkinson*: Yeah, you need 4 out of 5 votes to get directly in. At the end of Round 2, you've got your conference champions, your direct selection, and then the structured process kicks in and the ranking comes into play.
 - i. *Martin*: Where does that list of lock teams come from? How does that actually work – does someone propose a team and then you vote on it or do you go through a list?
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: The five selectors write down the teams that they think should definitely be in the Nationals with no further review, it's just obviously these teams.
 - 2. *Assad*: One selector may have 15, another selector may have 8, another might have 12, but it's the teams that are on 4 of the 5 lists go to be the locked teams.
- c. *Wilkinson*: Here's an example where 10 teams come from the Conference Championships, 12 get direct selected as locks, and then from there we go into the selector rounds that are highly structured. We get 9 in the next round, then 3, then 1, then the final berth will be selected in the final round. In Round 3 and beyond, the ranking system comes into play, and based on the ranking system, groups of teams get identified and then considered by the Selection Committee, then rounds continue. In Round 3, you see how it plays out. Here's the sample scenario. 10 teams are in from the Conference Championship. The numbers here indicate teams' CSR ranking. The way the Conference Championships shook out, the #1 team on the CSR gets their spot through the Conference Championship, and so did the #3 team. So how would the #40 team earn a spot through this ranking system? They are just identified as the 40th team in the system, and perhaps they're in a smaller or weaker conference than NEISA and they just won their conference championship. In Round 2, the selectors vote on their Locks, and this is who they chose. Now, the process starts. In Round 3, there are 14 berths left to fill, and all the rest of the teams in the CSR are available. So, 10 teams in Round 1, 12 in Round 2, 22 teams are in and 14 remain. And the way the system is designed, when 14 berths are left, you consider double the number of berths left. Remember, the CSR gives us smaller digestible groups to look at. So, the full group of eligible teams is a ton. But we're allowed to take 28 teams to consider in Round 3, and they're the top CSR remaining teams. There are 28 teams. Now, the selectors get to work. Each selector takes the 28 teams and puts them "selector order." The result of that is over here on the right. The average selector had the 18th ranked team as the best, then then 20th. The selector's orders get aggregated by the guy keeping track of the rules. In each round of selection, we're going to fill one-third of the teams in the round. So, 9 out of 28 teams will get selected. This is the order the selectors came up with, so 9 get in, but it's not over. The teams in red, they're just not getting in in this round and we're going to Round 4.

- i. *Martin*: When the selectors get this list of teams from the CSR, do they get the list of teams and their CSR?
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: Yes, they get the list of teams and their CSR. The selection process is subjective within criteria and methods. You have to use the criteria and follow the methodology, but do not have to follow the CSR. You're given a chunk of teams based on the CSR, but you can use your judgement.
- ii. *Martin*: So, in this example, the #31 team made it in over the #29 team just because the selectors thought they had underperformed or whatever.
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: Yes, and again, this subjectivity is necessary. Creating the CSR and having it be good enough to actually choose is not possible.
 - 2. *Assad*: It's worth pointing out that the selection committee can go past those 28 teams if they feel like one team that deserves to be considered isn't in that block. So, they could bring in the #55 team, let's say Hawaii, who only sailed 5 weekends so they're missing a score, so their ranking is low but we know they did well, so they should probably be in the consideration even though they have a really lower CSR. It's either unanimous for 4 out of 5 vote to bring a school in, but there is a pathway for that.
 - a. *Wilkinson*: There's an unrepresented step where that would happen.
- d. *Wilkinson*: Here's Round 4 beginning. So, to review, 10 teams are in from the Conference Championship, 12 are in from direct selection, 9 just got in in Round 3. 31 are in, there's only 5 left. So, the rule tells us we consider 10, since we're considering 10, we're considering a third of them, so we'll select 3 in Round 4. Here's our Round 4 group. What's not presented here is, before we do our sort order, we do a little exercise – what Justin was just talking about – looking at the group and check if anyone is missing. The selectors would write them down, and if somebody gets 4 out of 5, they get added to the group. We're still only going to take 3. Now we do sort order. All selectors go in and re-sort. Maybe looking at this smaller group, the head-to-head comparisons get more accurate and maybe there's some shuffling.
 - i. *Martin*: But that didn't happen in the previous step? This Round 4 team is the top 10 left...
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: You mean the step that Justin was talking about?
 - ii. *Martin*: So, the yellow teams here are not in order, right?
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: They remain in their sort order. The CSR is basically used once.

- e. *Wilkinson*: There's our Round 4 group, now we do sort order and the rules person from the Championship Committee averages it out, and here's how it shook out. Again, there's how it shook out. Now three more are in the championship field. Now we're in Round 5 with only 2 berths left, so we consider 4 teams. We're only going to be selecting one of the teams. There's opportunity to re-sort, it looks like when they averaged it out there was a little re-sorting. But we're only selecting one. Now we're onto Round 6 with one berth left. So, we consider 2 teams, and the Selection Committee votes and chooses the last team. And that's it.
 - i. *Martin*: Does the opportunity for unanimous voting in of people not in consideration happen before every subsequent round after the direct selection?
 - 1. *Wilkinson*: Yes, I believe so. We're still only selecting one at the end.
- f. *Wilkinson*: That is by far the most complicated system. There's nuance in each of the systems, but nothing like this. Notable nuances, in Match Racing and Singlehandeds, the selectors cannot supersede Conference Championship order. So, if you want the 4th team, you have to take the 3rd team kind of situation. There's some nuance in criteria, criteria being the regattas you're allowed to look at. But this is the most complex one. There are a couple of things for NEISA to understand. One, our thing is called Performance Ranking and this is Competitive Strength Ranking, they're not the same. This CSR cannot be used to the depth that our Performance Ranking system used, and it's not designed to be. The other thing that's important from a NEISA perspective looking back over the past year is, because of how different things are around the country competitively, the idea of adding rounds to Nationals, so basically adding the ability to sail-in to the National Championship, there is no iteration of it that is good for the competitively deep conferences because, like everything we do, it has to cater to all. When you cater to all in this case, you end up sailing in not good venues, in not good boats, with not good race management, in faraway places. That's where all iterations of additional qualification events went in the Competition Committee stuff. Those are two super important things, and the final important thing, first I hope this passes, but from a championship perspective, and from access to championships, it should get us to the point in NEISA, that after our hard-fought Conference Championship, a few weeks later you're looking at the Semi-Finals and are sitting there knowing that are there NEISA teams that are at home, while there are teams at Semi-Finals that are nowhere near as good, I think that's coming to an end.
 - i. *Martin*: You said at the beginning you thought 12 of that direct selection in the first round is high? Have you been involved in sample selections or drafts?

1. *Wilkinson*: Justin did you do one? I didn't.
 2. *Assad*: Not really, no. I saw the results of them but I didn't do them. I don't want to provide too much assurance, but I've been pretty optimistic about how this is going to go down when we actually go through the process. We've got a pretty good weekend on the ACCs weekend of seeing teams going head-to-head. There're 36 teams making it, right, so I think for New England we'll be in good shape.
- g. *Wilkinson*: First question from the chat: How will notification work? I think it's the Tuesday after the Final conference championship. Instead of selection Sunday, we have selection Tuesday.
- i. *Assad*: They're not going to publicly announce who the lock teams are, and who makes it into the next round, they're just going to announce all 36 teams.
- h. *Bresnahan*: You used the word "re-sort" a few times. How are you defining that word? Are you re-ranking those teams, or are they staying the same number?
- i. *Wilkinson*: The number sign indicates that #17 is the 17th team in the CSR mathematical ranking. The selectors are given this group of 28 teams. The selectors now have to take those 28 teams and subjectively rank them. They put them into their priority order, and so that's how you get to this situation here, where, yes, the 17th CSR team according to the CSR was ranked higher than the 20th team, but in reality, the selectors selected the 20th team first. It's a subjective system.
- i. *Bresnahan*: The re-ranking is interesting. I think it's fine, first of all kudos, it's a great system, but when you do this and start getting rid of teams, you could be 17th and all of a sudden, all the teams around you are either selected or move forward and you're being compared against people that are really hard to compare against, but selective process. There are going to be people left at home and I'm sure that's ok, but in New England there will be a lot more people that get to go. It's not my complaint, just from a selection point of view, I wanted to make sure it was not re-sort but was it was re-rank.
- i. *Wilkinson*: The reason I'm using the word sort and rank, because mentally I'm trying to keep the selectors activity separate from the fact that there is this math driven data.
- j. *Bresnahan*: My other question is, last time we got on this call the ICSA Committee was a sh*t show. Have we made measures to make sure that the same thing doesn't happen where all of a sudden, this committee is torpedoing itself in front of us?
- i. *Wilkinson*: Justin and I are committed to making it not look like a sh*t-show.

1. *Bresnahan*: But it wasn't your fault, your reaction was to somebody. What do we need to do as New England to make sure that the other people on your committee are not having a secret meeting behind our back, so that we get to this meeting and it's a waste of our time?
 - a. *Wilkinson*: I actually think the best thing is that you brought this up now, so now all of NEISA can be on the same page going into the meeting, and so our voting members especially, Mike and Preston, are all on the same page. The Chairman of the Competition Committee, Callahan... one of the reasons for the blowup in the first place is that he took these steps the first time. He went around the room, one person at a time, "Any objections?" prior to the thing. He's done that again here, and I've had one email interaction that I question, but I questioned it and was reassured that everything was ok. To avoid the total sh*t-show this time, and to keep things in tact moving forward, if that happens again, rather than me and Justin blowing up, what we really need is for Board Members to not blow up, and dress down bad committee behavior. You guys aren't emotionally invested and getting screwed by anybody if this happens, so it shouldn't be hard not to act like a lunatic. If I have to address it myself, I will be acting like a lunatic, so I'm just not going to.
2. *Anderson*: Mitch has told me that there's no 2020 and beyond committee report. That hopefully solves a lot of the issues. I can also talk to a couple of other undergraduates on the board to see how they're feeling about the whole Championship and Competition Report.
 - a. *Wilkinson*: Debate and discussion and questions are all welcome, but what wasn't welcome the last time around was the alternative, the real alternative plan, yanking the rug out, and anything else.
 - b. *Assad*: The alternative that wasn't discussed and was the complete opposite of what we talked about.
- k. *Kalin*: Thanks Greg. One final thing – are there any coaching takeaways that we should have as we kind of strategize for next year? Is there anything that you think this system would bring out, like, Captain Hurst is towards the end of the year, what if my starters are toast and we just want to send some first years and they get last? It's not going to matter, right?

- i. *Wilkinson*: Do it. Do everything you've always done. This is all based on our long-term contention that we're the deepest conference in the country. I believe it, I think everybody on this call believes it. All this system is going to do, is measure what you do every year. It's just going to put a stamp on the fact that, yup.
- l. *Kalin*: But All-American, if you have someone go and tank in a weekend, you're disqualified. But, whatever, I digress. Alright, that's all great, I learned a lot. I was confused as of 2 days ago and now I'm crystal clear. Do we have to help – as a conference should we put forth names that might be good, knowledgeable people?
 - i. *Wilkinson*: Yes, around July 4th people can apply or be nominated and yeah, that would be great. It will come out around July 4th, there will be a simple Google Form application. We need a lot of women. I have to double check the makeup of the committees. It's possible the Women's committee is all women and the Coed is at least 2 out of 5 women.
 - 1. *Assad*: I don't remember it being 100% but it could be. I don't think so though.

V. ICSA Executive Director Selection Feedback – Jeff Bresnahan

- a. *Kalin*: One thing I found interesting was the job posting for the Executive Directors posted on the meeting agenda site. That's where you'd also find the Competition Committee Report on the collegesailing.org site. Jeff was there anything we need to discuss in terms of the Executive Director position?
 - i. *Bresnahan*: No, it's in the document, if anyone has questions just reach out to Fran and I, but this is a long-term thing that's been delayed about 18 to 24 months, but to be able to pass this and have someone in place by the winter. And one of the reasons it's the winter is because we're looking for it to be an 18-month cycle not a 12-month cycle. So, at our meeting we'll be announcing who the committee hires.
 - 1. *Kalin*: Who is the committee? Who is the hiring committee?
 - a. *Bresnahan*: We don't know that yet. That's another committee that has to be filled. Our group is just working on the job description and who are we trying to target and what it would take to be able to attract the top person for this job, and I think we're there. The salary is going to be very good. It is going to be somebody who's established in some type of job. I think, as past coaches, as people who have coached in college sailing and are doing other things, I think that the job becomes pretty attractive at that salary.
 - ii. *Kalin*: Has there been any discussion about broadening the pool of candidates to include people from non-sailing backgrounds that might

have really good skills sets in administrative duties and running committees and stuff?

1. *Bresnahan*: The person's job is to organize and kind of be the travel secretary for our committees. We're not looking for somebody to just come in, we're actually looking for someone that has a background in higher athletics.
- b. *Kalin*: Thanks Jeff and Fran, I know that document is really thought out and a lot of work went into that. How about distribution, where are they going to post and do they have a strategy to get the word out?
 - i. *Bresnahan*: Yeah, I don't have that. I'm sure that will be discussed at this meeting. Blain is the chair and he's doing a great job, but it really is a comprehensive thing where everyone pitched in.

VI. Other Items for Discussion before Saturday ICSA Meeting

- a. *Anderson*: There is currently no Laser Performance agreement in place, College Sailing does not have a contract with Laser Performance right now. The ICSA Exec Committee has discussed that any future agreements with boat sponsors should not have boat restrictions unless they could be provided if necessary. So that's currently where we're at with LP and I believe that will be mentioned tomorrow at the Annual Meeting.
 - i. *Assad*: Do we have any sense how this might impact Singlehanded Nationals in Seattle?
 1. ****No response****
- b. *Anderson*: If you look at the agenda right now, Dana has something in the agenda regarding recruiting rules. He felt that regional teams were put at a disadvantage recruiting wise and wanted to be able to provide recruits with stickers. His argument was that varsity teams were able to fly recruits into their facility and host them. I talked to Mitch about this, and Mitch is going to recommend that this goes to the Recruiting Committee and it will probably be stricken from the agenda.
 - i. *Assad*: I'm tempted to say that, say people can give out one sticker to a prospective? 3 by 5 inches, and write that in the rules the same way as the NCAA recruiting rules, and say that you can give out one piece of paper? I'm comfortable with that, I don't think we should be giving out flip flops, but if stickers are this big of a sticking point, we should just do it. Does anybody feel strongly that that's the wrong direction to go with that?
 1. *Anderson*: It should be noted that the NCAA rules do not allow gifts whatsoever. It allows students to buy gear from specific universities and schools, but teams are not allowed to provide free items to their prospectives.

- ii. *Assad*: The real thing was that Jacksonville was giving out flip flops. Stickers kind of got wrapped in with flip flops on this. I'm fine with stickers, I'm not fine with flip flops, or t-shirts, or hooded sweatshirts or anything like that.
 - 1. *Pizzo*: We have a committee that does this, so it should go to the committee. We shouldn't allow this to just come up.
- iii. *Assad*: I'm just asking the conference since we're all here, if anyone has any insight, and if we just put some paraments on it.
 - 1. *Bresnahan*: I just think if we go down that path suddenly, we're giving out stickers that double as flip flops. I think we shouldn't hand out anything. I think we should just follow rules.
- c. *Kalin*: I think that pretty much wraps us up. 6