

7 p.m. Mtg opens

On Call:

Charles Carlisi
Charles Johnson
Ryan Wheeler
Carlos Ablenado
Alexander Kossmann (Tampa Bay Fencers)

Present:

Sung Yim
Annie Kwong
Greg Arthur
Carlos Kuri & SwordMasters club dad
Jason & Jenny Seachrist
Kevin O'Connor
Ken Lauver
Daniel Bucur
Thomas Cheng
Leandro Durand

Revision of Code of Conduct

Jason S: Does division still have intention to deny anyone the right to fence if they don't sign the COC. Reason I ask is, I, right now, don't believe the division has any authority to supercede eligibility requirements put forth by the USFA. And USFA does not require anyone to sign COC in order to fence.

CK: I have a better question, 'Who wouldn't sign this?' It just says, "Be nice." Who would refuse to sign this?

Jason & Jenny S and GA: I would.

CJ: When I wrote that, I followed USFA's COC with a few minor rewordings to make it easier to understand. But it's basically the same COC as the USFA. And I do believe, Jason, that the USFA sent out a bunch of stuff for everyone to sign this year, and when you sign it's an understanding that you are following that COC. And they are getting stricter about that.

GA: Then why would we need to sign it again at a tournament?

(Unknown male voice from background): It's kind of a reminder.

CJ: Because people don't always read what is posted on the USFA website. And it's a way to reinforce the fact that people need to discipline themselves, they need to conduct themselves in a proper manner at tournaments. And you know as well as I do, Jason, that people don't always do that, and it causes problems and delays. People are rude to other fencers and directors. Most of the people at these tournaments are volunteers, who are running these tournaments, they don't need to be treated that way. Whether we sign it or not, that wasn't the important thing to me. That it's sent out to everybody and that everybody has an understanding that this is what we expect of them, the kind of behavior we expect, that's more of what I had in mind. My whole point of doing the COC is to try to get people to be more considerate of people around them and not act like jerks.

CK: At the end of the day, if this is the same thing the USFA is saying and they break it and you black card them anyway. Having a friendly reminder at the beginning of the tournament may save the drama.

GA: Or you can just display it rather than get everyone to sign it.

Jason S: (inaudible)

CK: (inaudible)

Jenny S: Are you going to deny sanctioning if we don't display it?

KL: That was in the original request. We had mentioned last meeting that we were going to have some posters created to post at the entrance to the facility.

GA: Why don't we just display the USFA COC? Why do we have to have our own version?

DB: What are the consequences if the COC is broken; or if there is an incident, what are the consequences?

CK: USFA rules.

CJ: What you would have to do is to follow the USFA ruling is on a particular action: Is a black card-able offense? Is it a warning?

Jason S: You would have to, you can't make up our own rules.

KL: Depends of the level of violation, you've got different levels of black cards. There was just a new rating issued by USFA that outlined what a 1 is, what a reportable black card is and includes exclusion from the venue in certain cases. If we just adhere to the USFA rules and report them as they occur, that includes exclusion from multiple events if they're offenses add up. I just would like to have a reminder. I don't think there's anything wrong with having a reminder at the entrance to the tournament, just in view at least, so they've got no excuse not to adhere to it. Lack of knowledge and police is one thing, but lack of knowledge and enforcement in something we're dealing with youth I don't think that is enforceable.

KO: Ideally where the people are standing to sign in. Will they actually have time to read it or just glance at it?

CJ: As soon as final version is approved, I will get posters printed and send them to all the clubs. If you're having a tournament, I can make them with easel backs so they can easily be displayed at the sign-in desk.

DB: If I understand correctly, this CFL Division COC is a short version of the USFA COC, right?

CJ: It's basically the same COC. Theirs is 3 pages, I just condensed it down and took the wordiness out. But all the meaning is the same.

DB: What's the justification of us having different one than USFA?

Multiple people: It's shorter. It's a summary.

TC: If you post 3 pages, no one's going to read it.

GA: I don't think it will alter people's behavior.

CJ: The USFA COC is awful wordy. It's too much to get on 1 poster and expect anyone to read it so this is a condensed version of it without taking away the meaning. It's easier to read in a short period of time.

CA: I have an idea, why don't we put a reference on the poster that this is just a summary of the USFA COC and basically let everyone know that everyone (coaches and fencers) is supposed to abide by it. If they read the reminder, it will be much simpler.

CJ: We can certainly do that if you all want to do that. I don't have a problem with that at all.

It might be a good thing and reinforce the fact that "Oh, maybe I should go to the USFA website and read the Code of Conduct." I can guarantee you that most people I've seen haven't.

GA: People are still going to behave the way they're going to behave. I don't think it will address the problem it's supposed to address.

SY: I think we are all going to agree on COC. The issue is whether we are going to make it a sanction requirement. That was actually my idea on the first meeting. That's what we are supposed to vote on, whether we are going to make it a sanction requirement or not. However, we all agree that we were going to put it on our club.

CK: If we all agreed to do it, we don't need to argue to make it an enforceable thing. Let's all agree to do it and it's a lot easier.

SY: Is that okay? No sanction requirement?

GA: I'm not for the, you know, not allowing for sanctioning because they don't put the code up ...

Jenny S: Are you asking us if we're agreeing to have our tournament not sanctioned if we don't post it?

SY: No, not the posting it, signing it.

CJ: I don't know if we can actually make it part of sanctioning or not. You talked to USFA about it, didn't you, Sung? Yes, they're OK with that. USFA is okay with the sanctioning requirement as long as there is a majority vote within EC.

KL: I propose we have 2 answers here: 1) We have to take a Y/N vote to sanction or not to get it officially in writing. And I propose we do that now. Do I have a second.

SY/CK: Second.

CJ: What was the motion? What was the proposal? I didn't hear it. I'm getting a lot of static here, guys.

KL: The motion is to accept the COC as is but not make it a sanctioned, um, lack of sanctioning an event for not posting it or not signing it.

Jason S: So it's not required to sanction a tournament?

Multiple voices: Right.

CK: But we all agree that we're going to post it. Why wouldn't we.

SY: Let's vote on it. Who wants to make it a sanction requirement?

Jason S: Not a sanctioning requirement.

KL: He's asking for yes or no.

CK: Everyone in favor of making it a sanctioning requirement? Raise your hand.

Ayes (SY) = 1

Nays = everyone else

NG: Are you saying that the sanctioning is (conditional) on the poster being visible in the tournament? Is that what I'm understanding?

TC/AK: No, signing it ...

SY: By the participant ...

Multiple voices: that's not what you just said ...

NG: I would amend that to be included in the waiver. That should be a part of the waiver. You have a waiver for medical and you have a waiver for adhering to the sanctioning. It should be on a form, not necessarily a poster. That's why I'm a bit confused.

GA: We came to the conclusion that we already signed the USFA COC, so why would we sign it again at the tournament?

NG: That's my question, that's why I'm a little bit confused. If the participants are signing it, are they signing in on a second sheet of paper or in addition to the waiver they are already signing to participate?

KO: Why don't we do 3 votes: One to sign, one to post, one to sanction.

NG: You can include both texts and just have 1 signature for both texts.

SY: It looks like this motion has been rejected by the committee, to make it a sanctioning requirement.
(Lots of overlapping voices)

CJ: When we signed up for USFA, everyone is agreeing to the COC. What we should do to avoid confusion, delay in process and have people sign extra things other than the waiver and so forth and more paperwork, is that on the front of the poster, we just reinforce that this is a condensed version of the USFA COC which you have already agreed to with your participation as a competitive fencer. And this is just a reminder that you are required by USFA and by the people who are running this particular tournament that this is the COC you are expected to operate under. And we put it on the poster and follow the same rules the USFA recommends for any violation.

NG: I'm good with that, but was confused when someone said everybody had to sign it.

GA: Coach Johnson, we decided we weren't going to have a signing requirement because we already signed it. Now what we're talking about is making it a requirement in order to have a sanctioned tournament.

NG: What's the requirement though? Is it having the poster on site or is it signing? ... that's the confusion.

CJ: What are the requirements for sanctioning, someone explain ...

GA: That you display the poster during your tournament. And there was 1 vote with 1 yay and everyone else was nay.

NG: Will the division provide the poster for each club or send out PDF for us to print?

Multiple voices: Yes, division will provide.

SY/GA: Let's have a count again...

On the phone:

GA: Vote for sanctioning requirement (your tournament won't be sanctioned if you don't post it)

Stoccata = yay
Coach Carlos = yay
Coach Johnson = yay
Coach Charles = yay
Tampa Bay (Alex K) = yay
RW = yay

Those present:

SY = yay
CK = yay
UDF (KL) = yay
DB = yay
LD = nay
GA = nay
JS = nay
JS = nay
SY: 9 yays, that's majority
SY: We will post the COC at the tournament to get sanctioned.
Jason S: Note: Sanctioning policy needs to be updated.

(EC members working together to tweak Coach Johnson's CFL Div COC on screen in live document)

SY: Introducing new Division Club from Naples, Coach Charles Carlisi, teacher & fencing coach at Mason Classical Academy, and new EC member

Long-term equipment purchase plan (Coach Nestor's idea)

SY & CK had 6 strips scrapped for \$564.92 (SY hands check to TC)
KL: Need to transfer industrial soldering iron over to Tampa facility, they do the strip repairs
SY: Cancelled storage account (\$61/month for more than 2 years) for 2 strips since July 2017. 3 new strips arrived in NJ port (25 Oct arrived) and will make its way to Tampa port ... I will keep 3 new strips at my club in Orlando. Other strips will be in Tampa.
GA: How many strips do we have now?
SY: I have no idea.
GA: We need to know that because in the past we had a hard time (inaudible) ...
SY: Need to set budget to see how much/what equipment we can purchase for CFL division. Coach Nestor, if you will, can you explain your idea for the plan?
NG: We have a number of boxes that are very old, what I suggested was that we have a 3-year plan that every 3 years we buy 2 to 3 machines and then over a period of 3 to 4 years we can phase out all those old boxes. And have new boxes for the division. And purchasing 2 or 3 boxes per year over 3 years will allow us to get new equipment and also not (incur) a high-cost expense right off the bat, but over a period of time to phase out all the old boxes.
GA: Kevin Smith has a set of 5 scoring machines with reels, strips, cables, everything, 4 machines are battery-operated, 1 of them has a remote w/ timer ...
Kevin Smith has for sale 5 machines with reels. Used for less than 20 tourneys. 660 per machine, reel & ground cables. 5 sets (machine, reel & ground cables) for \$3300. Favero reels, St George machines/boxes (updateable w/ chips & batteries w/ A/C hookups)
JS: You need to buy that for that price.

GA: You could offer up some of the reels and stuff up for sale to the division members. I'd be interested in buying a reel.

NG: Someone can set up an equipment auction later within the division.

Jenny: Don't recommend getting rid of the reels because they're always good for backups.

SY: I'd like to bring the motion to purchase this new/old equipment and let's vote on it.

NG: On that motion can we put in there that it's specifically to phase out old Prieur and Triplette boxes. I want to make sure we get those out of circulation.

Jenny S: Is the motion on the floor to buy these sets for \$3300 from Kevin Smith and phase out the old Prieur and Triplette machines, but maintain the old reels and possibly floor cables even though they'll go bad too; for spares and backups.

SY: Anybody object on this?

KL: Let's make it a motion to vote.

RW: Is there anyone against this?

All Yays Motion passed.

CFD Championship Points Calculation

GA: GA model encourages fencers to fence to earn points to fence for div championships

Coach Nestor: question was misunderstood, not points-related; Stoccata wants division to embrace inclusion of all weapons for all events; no event omissions. The size of divisionals has grown quite large.

KL: Just making a distinction between divisional qualifiers (events are all there to be fenced) and divisional championships (an optional event). Event offerings are based upon what host and venue can handle. I don't think there's any host in CFL who can handle every single combination of events in 1 weekend even. My only point is that if we say every event and every combination is mandatory, then we're going to be talking about multiple weekends and multiple venues.

CJ: Maybe we need to think about how we do the division championships. Maybe we need to do it over a period of more than 1 weekend or 1 day. Maybe we need to revise how we choose the awards and things. Because Ken's right, that's a lot of events ...there's probably not anybody who has a venue big enough unless you go to Lakeland and rip up the hall out there.

NG: I think we need to come up with a new format or rethink how we hold div championships. The way it's running, we're concerned that not all of the fencers who are CFL division fencers have the opportunity to fence in the championship.

CJ: Understandable concern. Maybe what we should do is appoint a committee of no more than 3 to come up with a new way that we can present at the next meeting of possibly doing the championship.

Jenny S: If you're going to plan it now, it should start next season. I think it's too late in the season to do it.

CJ: I agree with that.

NG: Per the USFA, CFL is either the first or second fastest growing division in the nation. We need to reevaluate how we do the division championships because we've outgrown them.

GA: What if we eliminate the championship and go to a points system?

SY: Committee to deliberate and plan out for next season.

NG likes Georgia div model

SY: Ask Coach Johnson to form a committee & start planning now for next season ...

CJ: No. Ask Nestor, Ray Blair and Ken Lauver to do it, they're the best qualified.

NG: I'll take lead on it if no one objects to it. Please email me if interested, and we will report back to EC.

New business: Maintenance of New Strips

SY: 3 new strips will be kept at OFA, new equipment purchases will also be stored at OFA. My question is, how much do we charge people to use this?

TC: There is a pricing spreadsheet.

KL: Let me just ask 1 question before we talk about pricing. Are we going to donate, cause this is a division thing, right? The division already has equipment in the pool of equipment that we manage for Colonel Dave's group/North Pinellas group.

GA: We have to inventory what's ours and decide what's usable & what's not usable. We should either get rid of some or sell to other members of the division for club use.

CJ: Get ahold of Dave Holsworth who did last equipment inventory with Chuck Allen. But there is a spreadsheet floating around somewhere.

TC: I have it.

Jenny S: NPG maintains all their own equipment, they do their own repairs, they do rentals, they get the money from it, they rent out the equipment that also belongs to the division to groups say like the Sunshine State Games, they actually are supposed to submit money back to the division for anything they rent that doesn't belong to them. NPG stuff is their stuff. It's theirs.

KL: Which they do.

TC: Like the Orange & Blue and OctoberFence tournaments, I got checks from them for our portion and he breaks down the spreadsheet by percentages.

TC: Chairman, are you asking for the new equipment we will be purchasing and the 3 strips we will soon be getting (in our possession) what the rental fees are going to be for CFL Division?

SY: Yes, I didn't know the costs.

Voices: That's already been established.

KL: Those prices were set years ago, doesn't mean we can't renegotiate them.

Jenny S: I think there should be a second set of prices for people outside the division using them.

I have a question about who is going to maintain those new strips.

CJ: Raising the prices is not a problem, things are more expensive nowadays & repairing and replacing equipment costs more. But I would be careful about raising it too much because I think 2 of the problems we had since that policy was adopted 6 to 10 years ago was that the rules for using that equipment became so complex that it was hard for people to follow. We do need rules and people need to return equipment in an orderly fashion. The other thing was some tournament organizers were reluctant to pay the price. And as a result, there were no strips on the floor at some tournaments because nobody wanted to pay for it. Refine/simplify equip loan policies & come up with decent prices for renting out equipment. Research what other divisions do in terms of equipment rental cost.

SY: Who's going to do it? Who's going to take the charge research and come up with new pricing?

KL: This is a CFL resource. Somebody on the EC maybe the Vice Chair, you guys need to tackle that because this is division policy.

SY: Tom?

TC: I can research & gather general pricing for EC for spreadsheet to see if everyone agrees.

Jenny S: Maintenance of new strips. Who is going to maintain brand new strips that nobody knows how to fix?

KL: Nobody's got experience fixing new strips with the plastic liner. You can't just solder like the old strips.

DB will find someone to maintain/repair new strips.

NG: Talk to Bruce

Enforcing 75-mile policy, limiting number of sanctioned events per club

KL: I'm not entirely sure who's giving permission to double do them, but we've had 2 events so far double stripped & we've got 1 more scheduled that's well within 75 miles in a weekend or two. So this will be our third set. So my point is, I understand that there's a need for clubs to make money by holding tournaments. I don't have an issue with that. What I have an issue with is that we're making fencers decide which venue to go to. We're robbing the fencers of an opportunity. If we take last weekend's

triple-up, if we had combined all those fencers into 1 event, we would have probably had 64 people. You'd have a doggone really good tournament that would give fencers more incentive to come, there would be higher ratings available, you'd make more money because you've all those fencers for that weekend.

CK: You're right, but we're missing some points of view there. First of all, not everyone who's doing an event is doing it for the money. We donated all our money to cancer. And the first event, we brought so many referees, we didn't make a dime. Because in my experience and given the business model I'm handling, the events although they could produce money, they are intended to maintain and grow the population of fencers. It's a service.

KL: Exactly.

CK: Now, regarding the triple-up of events, there were pretty much different categories & weapons.

SY: Yeah, they were.

CK: An argument can be made that you can fence above your category, well; yeah, a few fencers can choose to take that route, but you will leave most of the ones that won't do it, so you'll be favoring a minority and beats favoring a majority. We seem to be under the impression that if we take all of the fencers from the OFA event, my event and Jenny's event that if we make only one that all of those fencers will attend that 1 event. And that's not correct assessment. I can tell you that.

KL: Can you tell me why?

CK: Well, yeah. For instance, ...

KL: They're all within travelling distance.

CK: I loved the way it happened. It shows a growth in the division (as you were saying). And it's necessary because of the following ... (voice interjects ... inaudible)

GA: It's like what he was saying about the divisional championships, if we did every single thing, there's not a big enough place, so this way if you break it down & different people can go to a specific event they want to go to.

CK: But let's not forget something really important here, grassroots growth. You were explaining to me last time, Thomas, about having high-level events and if you divide the high-ranked fencers, some fencers they may choose not to go to an event, so you divide them. Which is a true argument, however, when you're talking about B & E events, B-rated fencers are probably not going to be a very big factor in an E or D-rated event. So if we can consider these events that are D and E kind of like a nursery for new fencers, they don't need to be limited.

GA: And youth ...

CK: Maybe Cs, Bs and Es, because they have a higher requirement, but Ds and Es don't. They're meant to give service, to create new people, to give a local service to the fencers that are not that familiar yet. So that's what I am proposing. Last time I suggested getting rid of the rule for good. I understand your points. I think a good compromise would be just to get rid of the rule for the E- and the B-events, that way we allow the local growth of the clubs.

SY: E1, D1 and Div 3 events (inaudible; multiple voices talking over one another) ...

CK: Correct, because those events don't really get affected. Actually, you can say, "No rated fencers in this event." That's just for the local population.

Jenny S: But that's not true, it does get affected.

KL: Who has held a tournament and an unrated fencer has come out of it like with even a C or a B? I've seen that happen dozens of times.

CK: Right, but you're talking about a minority. We're servicing a very small group of elite fencers that are very good fencers. And we're forgetting the growth of all the new fencers who are not there yet. This will not hurt the high-ranked fencers. If you let it grow now and in 6 months or 12 months ...

KL: You can't make new high-ranked fencers unless we have enough people at the event to qualify for the ratings.

CK: For an E1 event, you need 6 unranked fencers. If we have 5 E1 events at different clubs, I don't see why that will affect B- or C-rated fencers. Let's have those high-level events have their own unique weekend.

RW: Sorry to jump in, the problem I see with that is ...

SY: Carlos hasn't finished yet, Carlos has the floor.

CK: I just want to make a distinction between the service tournaments and the grassroots-growth tournaments. If we don't start servicing the new fencers and allowing them an opportunity to develop a love for the sport (in) their neighborhood, we're losing a bunch of new fencers-to-be that will lose interest. That is the reason why we don't grow because we're only caring about the very experienced fencers. But we don't have to choose, we can service them both. That is a great compromise that will really help the growth of the division.

CJ: I can see both points. I can understand Ken's point perfectly well. And I also understand that when we divide up into groups like this where we have 2 tournaments and even though they don't have similar events, part of the problem is having enough directors to around. But I can see Carlos' point too, if the lower-ranked fencers are made to fence the higher-ranked ones all the time, they get discouraged after a while. I'm not sure there's a good answer here.

GA: Here is the problem, the third part of the problem. This is one of the fastest-growing divisions in the country. We have in the past 2 years, 4 new clubs in the division at least.

SY: Yep.

GA: At some point, you're going to have to parse up certain things in order to allow that everybody has tournaments. Right now, the way it looks, we're generally booked up the whole month, every month with tournaments. So what happens to the new club that wants to have a tournament? And they don't have a date for them to have a tournament?

Jason S: I'd like to request to have the floor when it's my turn. We're waiting now for Ryan, I think.

RW: My only concern on some of these unrated tournaments is if they're held too often, it kind of looks like a ratings mill. And that's bad practice, it happened in South Florida, especially if it was interclub and not publicized very well. You're just pumping out ratings. And you get a bad rap for that.

CK: We can publicize it, so it's not perceived like that. Just make it public, and everybody is welcome, but you service all areas.

RW: Listen, that's something you have to look out for. At the same time, I am the one who sanctioned them, sanctions events, and I strive to not to sanction anything if there's crossover in events. By crossover, I don't mean something like if someone's doing a junior and someone else is doing a div 1. Yeah, it's the same age, but the div 1 event is very different from a junior event. So I do allow if something like that happens. But I think we need to get back to and if you go back to the policy section on the website, there is a list of items there that people need to be sending in when they're requesting to sanction a tournament. And unfortunately, I don't think that's been happening.

SY: Ryan, we can talk about that a little bit later, can we just focusing on this 75-miles rule?

RW: It needs to happen. If it's within 75 miles, and there is 1 identical event within 75 miles then the request should be denied; policy needs to be enforced. If you look at the policy, part 3 of part 2 is if there is at least 1 identical event and it's within 75-miles, the request should be denied. When people have sent me things to be sanctioned, I've looked and seen which events they're trying to do. And there hasn't been really a crossover. If there has been, then I apologize. Or people are adding things on AskFred.net after they've asked for sanctioning, so I think we need to go back to part 1 where "name of the competition" & name and address of the venue, the events that are going to happen, whether the grounded strips are used or not and the name and FOC (Fencing Officials Commission) rating of the head referee. And I haven't been seeing that in emails, so I need to get stricter about that. So anything moving forward, I'm

going to be requesting that or I'm going to deny sanctioning straight out. If you don't have those 6 required items, I'm not going to sanction a tournament.

SY: Okay.

RW: That leads us up into the new year because we already have some things sanctioned. Anything moving forward I'm going to be stricter on because I think we need to have that.

SY: Okay. Coach Jason, you have the floor.

Jason S: I agree completely w/ Ryan on that regard. We need to enforce the rules that are there. I was actually on the board that drafted those rules, so was Ken and so was Charlie. This was years ago. So just a little bit of context to find out why they're there. Back then, we had more premium tournaments, and we didn't have these tiny tournaments all over the place, so there were a lot fewer on the calendar. And what was happening periodically was you would have 2 clubs near enough to each other throw a premium tournament up on the same weekend. So what was happening was we were getting complaints from parents & coaches saying "Look, there's not that many tournaments out there, we're having to pick which one we want to go to. And now we want our fencer to do both because they're in it, they're training, they want to go to NACs. They wanted as many fencing opportunities as they possibly can." So the entire EC drafted up what we currently have, voted on it, put that in place to prevent that from happening. Now we're flipped. Now, we have no premium tournaments left. Now it's all small tournaments, and they're easy to throw.

Jason S: The universities are the exception. They're the only exception.

CK: I have the RYC coming in February.

GA: USF has big tournaments.

Jason S: The universities are the exception. They're the only exception to ...

CK: I have an RYC in February.

Jason S: I got it. I've got the floor. Let me finish, okay? Universities are the exception because they have the resources to do it. None of us are throwing huge tournaments on our own the way we used to, you have to agree with that. Those huge tournaments are gone. Now we've flipped. I ran some numbers from this weekend. The Sword Masters had 23 entries, 87% were from your club. The Trinity one had 52 entries, 46% were from your (OFA?) club. And ours, we had 38 entries and 36 were from our club. Kind of going to what Ryan was saying, I hope those who've been doing this for a long time will agree with me, having a ratings mill those ratings just aren't as strong. You've got your own students cannibalizing their own classmates. It's not as strong a rating as you've got if you have people coming out and pushing them hard to do better. There are some exceptions of course, but generally speaking, that's how it goes. I think there needs to be a little bit more cooperation. We are overcrowded. And the one thing I have heard from some of our parents is that it's too much. They can't go every weekend to tournaments, it costs a lot of money to do that. With that I'll yield the floor.

CK: I see your point, in the spirit of building that's where I'm coming from. If we limit this, we will never get there. I don't think we're taking anything from anybody.

KL: That's a prime example of doing what you're talking about, I defer to Nestor right now on the phone. Nestor is holding a bunch of younger student tournaments that are nonsanctioned one month or week or however you're doing it is like foil, the next one's saber for younger students who aren't going to be intimidated by fencing a 60-year-old guy fencing epee who looks like he can't move. But they're fencing younger students, and they're getting that experience of fencing other clubs that doesn't have to be sanctioned to get our youth fencers experience. The sanctioning is part of what the issue is. Is there really a need to sanction a U20 event when it's not going to add to their national point values? We have left out a demographic. We have a lot of kids we have fencing for, and then all of a sudden you go from 13 years old to getting tossed in with all the adults. I agree that we have a need for the junior and cadet tournaments, but they don't have to be sanctioned. So to have a bunch of fencers who are Us and whatever, get together and have a tournament, award medals—that's a great way to promote fencing, but

it doesn't mean you have to conflict with another sanctioned event to get experience for younger fencers. And I want to ask Nestor, "How's your attendance on your revolving circuit?"

NG: We've had people come up from Miami, Tampa, because we're offering events for the younger kids, those other clubs are looking for events for the young kids. That was the whole idea behind our youth duel was we're not going to sanction if they don't need to sanction, and there's no rating to be given out of them, but it provides a forum for those little Y10 and Y14 fencers to fence among themselves, get the fencing experience, get the tournament experience without having to jump into a div3 or div 2 event to be overwhelmed. That was the mindset that we had when we proposed our youth tournament and not sanctioning them.

KL: I think this will be a good option. Youth, Y10, Y12, Y14 & unrated fencers do not need to fence in sanctioned events for tournament experience and crowd out/compete for sanctioned events dates

GA: This all seems to revolve around youth fencing, so maybe ...

CJ: I agree with Nestor that the younger fencers kind of get trampled on when they have to go to an event where they're new and they're facing up against an A or B. We need to keep developing stuff for the younger kids is what I'm saying.

Jenny S: I think all clubs who have been around for a while do club tournaments that benefit their younger fencers. I do some that are for my kids that have just literally just come through the door 6 weeks ago.

This is what a tournament looks like, we stop and we talk to the parents. It doesn't have to be a sanctioned event, we do them all the time because they're training tournaments for our fencers. The issue that I have right now is the conflict in tournaments. A division 3 tournament for anybody is in direct conflict with any junior division 3 event, the reason is because in order to be a junior, you have to be at least 13 years old, that's how you become a junior. Born between 2000 and 2006. So if I'm holding a division 3 tournament like I did at The Great Pumpkin and somebody else is holding a division 3 junior event all of those people, all of them are competing at different events and all can be fencing at the same tournament. That is a direct conflict. And the very idea that just because somebody is 20, 25, 40 and is unrated and is too scary for a 13-year-old to fence ... they're the same unrated, they're the same beginner, they're the same level.

CK: We come to the same problem believing that just because there's going to be 1 event instead of 3, we are assuming that all are going to go. The event that you are mentioning, I had to cap it. It was the first one I made, and I didn't understand just how many people were going to respond, and I had to cap it. And I received at least 20 to 25 (inaudible) from people who wanted to come, and I said no, and they still didn't go to the other events.

Jenny S: That's okay.

CK: My point is, there's more than enough. We are denying them by saying only people who can actually go in this weekend in this place can go to this one. We are just putting an additional barrier & again this is the beginning of a fencer and if we don't give them this ability to participate, if we tell them, 'you're not training, you're down there' wait until you're a grownup to come with us, it's just discouraging.

Jenny S: Nobody is telling them they can't do that.

CK: No, but it's implied.

Jenny S: No, it's not even implied. My Great Pumpkin tournament, I had to get my date in with the city months beforehand. I put my tournament out there months ahead of time, I get one date with the city a year. Y'all are talking about giving money to clubs when they need money and all this stuff. I lost money hand over fist from that tournament because there were other tournaments on the same day.

CK: (inaudible)

Jenny S: You can not believe that all day long, if you looked at the registration from the year before ...

CK: Because people have the ability to choose what they want to consume. And if we tell them you can only consume this, it's called a monopoly and that's not a good market practice.

Jenny S: It's not a monopoly unless one club is doing all of them.

CK: It's a monopoly if it's forced by policy that you cannot do it but one person.

Jenny S: (inaudible CK & Jenny S talking over each other)

SY: All right, guys.

Jenny S: I'm not saying that, but we're staying within 75 miles of each other.

TC: There's too much polarity ... are we revoting, what are we doing?

Jenny S: It should have been enforced.

CK: That is right.

AK: Yeah, Ryan, what do you say to that about the enforcement issue cause it obviously wasn't enforced this time around.

RY: I say that it's my fault, I say that the things that were sent to me and I was told that, one, that there would not be competing events. I need to enforce that.

CK: (inaudible), but they were junior and senior ...

TC: Let's let Ryan talk please. Go ahead, Ryan.

RW: I'm just saying that I need to enforce things more moving forward and that I will not be sanctioning things unless I get all 6 of these points of information that I mentioned earlier, which we already have in the procedures.

NG: I think that will address a lot of issues. It's just making sure we follow the policies that are already established for sanctioning. I think this is one that fell through the cracks and a conflict occurred. I don't think that was intentional, and I don't think Ryan meant it to be intentional. Ryan is acknowledging that more oversight was probably needed, and I think we need to give him the benefit of the doubt on this and just maybe going forward make sure submissions are done correctly and completely. And hopefully that will cut down on all the conflict.

CJ: I agree with Nestor.

CK: I don't think there was a confusion ...

SY: Hold on, guys. Carlos, go.

KL: There was confusion.

CK: Last time we had clearly agreed on the meeting that junior and senior events were not competing. So there was no confusion. There was no mistake, Ryan. There is an argument being made that if you can't go from junior to senior that's conflict. In that case, then nobody can do anything. There's just too many people to limit it that way. There's not a mistake, there's wasn't an error. That's the way we clearly addressed it, and you made no mistake.

RW: I feel like I made a mistake here. Moving forward, I need all 6 points, and I need to have that in writing just in case people are posting things to AskFred.net and changing things afterward. I need everything in writing moving forward.

SY: Ryan, are you implying that Coach Carlos (Kuri of Sword Masters) changed something on his tournament?

RW: No, I'm not. I'm not implying anything like that.

TC: Potential ... future ...

RW: I'm saying that people submit to me "I'm holding a tournament on these dates." I'm like "Cool," and I check the tournaments calendar and I respond back, "OK, there's someone else holding something this date and what are you doing?" But I may not have that from person A and person B. I'm not implying that anybody is doing anything wrong here, I'm just saying in the past, we had to have all 6 items. When I first started running tournaments 9 years ago, I used to have to submit all those things, so I know that. But back then there weren't that many tournaments being ran and so ...

CK: I propose that for this year—almost if you want to take it as a test run—allow me and everybody else to try to grow the numbers in the division by eliminating the rule just for E and D events so that we can have grassroots growth. This is not going to affect the B and high-ranked players as Thomas was

explaining to me last time, just let's see what happens. This is not going to affect that much, I guarantee we can double and triple the number of fencers that will eventually become very competitive.

SY: For how many months would you like to do that, to test that out?

AK: No.

SY: No, we can vote for it.

CK: I would like to vote.

AK: But he's not seeing that there's other options, you don't have to sanction your event, you can have internal training tournaments not on the calendar.

TC: Why are we creating a new vote? This has been voted on last meeting already.

SY: This is something related to the thing we voted last time, but he wants to make changes on that ...

CK: Listen, guys, I want to grow. It's not because I want to be stubborn.

SY: As a business ... actually, as a consumer, I like to see different options in the market, right?

AK: You can do internal tournaments not on the calendar.

SY: So my point is this, let's say as a consumer I like to see different product on the market. So what's wrong with giving different options to the consumer and let them choose? That's what I see.

Jason S: We don't have thousands of consumers, we have a very small pool of them.

SY: I understand. We should create thousands of consumers.

GA: Actually, we have the top-growing divisions and it's growing and it's going to continue to grow, and what's going to happen is through necessity you're going to have to try to decide that 2 different clubs at 2 different places want to have ...

Jenny S: Within 20 miles of each other is a little ridiculous. No lie, this weekend, when we had a tournament, I had a young lady in my building, we had our 15 people, we had our C1. This young lady left my building went to another one and dropped my tournament just like that and went to the other tournament. And made theirs a C2.

CK: But if our objective is to grow the number of fencers & have people fencing, what does it matter what tournament they go to?

Jenny S: So, yeah, it does affect. It affected everybody in the building who has already paid, who was ready to go, who saw what was going on and this young lady left. And it dropped the whole event just like that.

CK: If the objective is to have more people fencing in any one event not just making money for a club ...

Jenny S: It's competitive, it's crap.

KL: In the interest of time, are we actually proposing to scrap what we voted & approved to keep the 75-mile rule.

AK: No, we voted on that.

SY: Hold on, guys. Stop. What Coach Carlos is proposing is this: We going to have 75-mile rule, however, for div 3 event which is D1 and unrated event, he likes to have the freedom of having a ... just to do his event ... that's reasonable.

CK: It's a nice compromise. Let me show you how much we can grow the business.

SY: Carlos, stop, please.

CK: Sure, sorry.

SY: So let's vote on it if everybody agree on it. 75 rule stays for other event except for div 3 and unrated, good? No no, we can just vote on it that's all.

Jenny S: You can vote. I'm going to vote 'No.' If you were limiting it to possibly an E1, maybe, but you're still creating a ratings mill.

AK: Yeah.

SY: What's wrong with that?

KL & Jenny S: What do you mean 'What's wrong with that?!'

AK: You're creating weak fencers and embarrassing your state.

SY: So what? What's wrong with that.

TC: Those fencers are going to get destroyed at higher-level tournaments.

Jenny S: We're creating a state of weak fencers, not just a couple.

AK: Yes, precisely.

DB: Vote on it, let's go.

Jenny S: Then when they go out of state, they get devastated with a C from Florida coming in at the bottom?!

Multiple voices: Let's vote on this.

TC: Let's vote on this, whatever it is, it is. Next EC meeting we don't revisit this to try to change it again.

SY: Yeah, okay.

AK: Why are we even trying to change it in the first place when we voted on it last time?

KO: Was the vote last time really valid or was it invalidated?

Multitude of voices: It was valid.

SY: It was invalidated.

KO: I saw the emails, and I thought it was invalidated.

SY: Guys, we're not trying to undo it. We just want to modify it.

KL: Everybody in the room, there's people on the phone, they want to interact.

RW: This is Ryan Wheeler, I'm moving a motion that we vote to keep the policies intact as they are now which is 75 miles of each other, 1 identical event (inaudible) ...

AK: Thank you.

SY: Motion was proposed by Carlos first, he wants to keep 75-miles rule, but except for the div 3 and E1.

CJ: Does anybody second the motion from Carlos?

KL: I second it just so we can vote on it.

Multiple voices: Let's vote on it.

KL: The motion is to adjust the 75-mile rule to not include D and under events in the 75-mile limit. Is that clear enough?

8 nays / 4 yays ... motion is denied.

Penalties for organizers in not turning results in timely manner

Sanctioning and results not submitted in timely manner; hurting our fencers

CJ: Propose that would like to put in the form of a motion that if tournament results not turned in within 7 days ... (inaudible as Nestor chimes in). If they haven't turned in their results within 7 days and they apply for sanctioning on another tournament, they won't get a sanction.

RW: 1st offense double tournament fees to \$40, 2nd offense, double again to \$80, 3rd offense denied tournaments *for the season*. I'm bringing this to the committee so we didn't have a long discussion or an argument is that they have 7 days, if there's any issues they have 12 days. This encourages them to turn it in within the first few days. Business days was my proposal. If they turn things in within the first few days, it gives them even longer to correct any issues. The first offense \$40 per sanctioning, the second offense doubles it to \$80, the third offense you do not get any more tournaments this year, wait until next year.

CJ: I'll second it.

NG: I'll second it. Now with the automation of the Fencing Time and the software, there really is no reason why we're not turning them in quickly.

KL: The reason why Ryan is adding the extra days to 12 is that in some cases you might have messed up you have a fencer who signed up and given you a bad USFA number and it doesn't go through when you submit the sanctioning. That happens fairly often throughout the year. We put the 12 days in if there's issues, so that takes care of that issue. But there is an issue which is guaranteeing 7 days. So I like the proposal as it stands.

GA: If you're denied being able to have tournaments just for that season, right? Not never ever ... because you can't deny somebody having a tournament forever. You can't do that.

RW: My proposal was for the season. The doubling of sanction fees, it all resets at the beginning of each year.

Move to vote ...

Proposal is if tournament results are not turned in within 7 days (12 days should issues arise) and they apply for sanctioning of another tournament, they will not receive sanctioning. Penalties will then be levied: The first offense \$40 per sanctioning, the second offense doubles it to \$80, the third offense you are denied tournaments for the remainder of the season this year.

Adding bylaws (if time permits, otherwise discuss next mtg) for vice chair to sanction events

SY: Ryan, there's nothing to add on to bylaws then?

Jenny S: I think that the rules about changing bylaws that need to be looked at before you can change bylaws.

Formation of long- and short-term vision for the division

Coach Daniel Bucur: If we don't have a clear vision, we're bouncing all over the place. We need to implement clear vision that encompasses everyone for how to move forward as unified division.

DB: For example: Mission statement: CFL Division exists to promote the sport of fencing and develop ... whatever ... and the vision is: this is how we're going to implement that ...

KL: Here's a challenge: Submit to Coach Yim their recommendations for what should be included in the vision of the division.

DB: The cool thing about the mission statement and the vision is that it changes according to the need. The needs the division had 5 years ago are different to the needs of this division now. In my opinion, it is the purpose of this body to take the temperature of the division and adapt the changes that occur.

KL: Good job, Daniel.

CK: Perfectly said.

TC: Everyone can read the article 2 objectives. All the mission statements are in there as baselines. And then you can modify and add to it.

SY: I think what Coach Daniel wants to do is come up with a specific concrete plan ... the task ...

DB: For instance, the mission of CFL Division is to raise our Olympic-level fencers. Everything on how to will focus on that. If the mission is we want to promote the sport, ain't going to do with Olympic games and all that, it's totally different than everything else that we do and so it kind of falls under that. Everything else that falls outside of that is not our goal, so we're not dealing with that.

SY: I need someone to take on the task and start something. Coach D, why don't you take on this task and come up with a concrete plan/task on what we need to do. We can talk about it at next meeting.

DB: We can also think for the next meeting, what do you see the purpose for this division should be based on the growth, the lack of equipment, whatever you see that that is ... we should focus on exactly how are we going to move to accomplish that? In concrete steps ...

SY: I'll give you an example, Back in the day when I was a fencer in NYC, every high school had varsity team, so we didn't need USFA. We were able to compete against each other, very competitive. That's why I started the high school program at Orlando Science High School and now we're expanding into Trinity Prep High School and Olympia High School. We have to start at a younger age, we don't have grassroots high school league or middle school league and what are we going to do with the elementary school? That's something we should be focusing on & come up with some plan.

DB: That's something that would meet the need of the youth and (inaudible) but may not have anything to do with USFA. But it has a lot to do with the fencing and promotion of it in our division, anyway ...

KL: You're doing a great job. Are all 3 of those high schools in the same county? There's a statewide rule: you have to have 3 schools in the same county to get a letter to make it a letter sport and get recognized. And USFA has a new high school program. The problem is just coaches, right? So we've had coaches in the past go to different high schools. ROTC is a good way to get a program started in the high schools. Almost all ROTC programs have a fencing program in their charters. I highly encourage high school fencing.

GA: Coach Bucur and I had started a thing in Brevard County, and we actually had high school championships. What Coach Yim had come up with is rather than us going to each high school and doing that was to have students of your own who are already in high school find enough of them to create a team and come to your place and practice. And they would represent their schools, and then we would have squirmishes.

KL: It just can't be an official letter thing yet.

GA: I'm just saying that it's more practical if they come to the coach rather than the coach go to each high school. It's a good way to advance that.

CK: I'm pretty advanced on the website (though it's lacking in content). It's almost ready to be launched. (Carlos is asking EC members to feed him content, news about your club, fencing news, accolades/champions, new programs to put on the website to promote fencing)

SY: I've set up college tour for the high school fencers.

17, 18, 20 Jan 2020 ... college fencing tour □ juniors and seniors only

17 Jan 2020 □ Columbia University visit to meet coaching staff and see the UPenn Invitational

18 Jan 2020 □ St John's University

20 Jan 2020 □ University of Pennsylvania

If anyone of you has high schoolers interested in going, let me know. If a spot opens up, I would love to take your fencers there, but I cannot handle so many fencers at this time.

Secondly, I'm trying to form a Florida High School Fencing League right now. I'm talking with some of the coaches and trying to come up with a framework. Those (inaudible) items don't have anything to do with CFL Division by the way. Once we have more solid plan, I will let everyone know. Once again, if your high school fencers would like to join our new league, then they're welcome to.

KL/CJ: Just be careful that your students you're talking about visiting 5 different schools. That's 5 different NCAA visits, that they're only allowed ... There are rules about how many. You need to look up the rules for the NCAA visits, they're complex.

SY: So far I have confirmation from 4 schools: Columbia, NYU, St John's and UPenn. Planning another one for spring break in the Boston area, going to MIT and Harvard. That hasn't been planned out yet.

KL: I'm just suggesting that the university requirement is that you can only visit that student once.

But the student requirement may be less than that number of schools. So be sure to research that.

NG: If the student asks to see the coach, there is no violation. But the coach can't approach the student.

But if the student is visiting the campus, the student can ask to see the fencing facility. And at that time because was student driven, they can talk to the coach and the coach can talk about the program. But the coach can't talk to students and seek them out.

CJ: He can't recruit.

KL: I'd also like to encourage you because I'm also saying it's unrealistic to expect your fencers to be picked up by those Ivy League schools. Visits to FSU, USF, and maybe Miami has a small club and USF, UCF of course. That would be more realistic, but ...

SY: I will think about visiting those schools with the club. For the first trip, I would like to go to the NCAA teams.

KL: Robert's rules of order, I move to adjourn.
TC/LD: I second.

Next meeting will be in 3 months in Q3.
Meeting adjourned 9:15 p.m.