Referee Committee Minutes - FINAL
January 27, 2021
7:30 PM EST

AGENDA

1. Welcome (Lyn)
    a. Call to Order – *7:32p E*
    b. Committee Roll Call – *Bob Appleyard, Dee McComb, Derek Blazo, Elaine Roden, Howard Meisner, Jessica McAlear, John Musial, Kris Thorsness, Terry Friel Portell, Lyn Wylder. Absent: Eric Weir*
    c. Staff – *Sarah McAuliffe, Jules Zane*
    d. Guests – *Annette Forster, Sheila Tolle, Rachel LeMieux, Doug Jones*
2. USRowing Update (Sarah and Jules)
    a. General – *moved to later in the meeting because of possible Executive Session matter.*
    b. Other Items from January 13th Meeting – *Bob said that The College is expecting to make this year's clinic available in early February. He brought up that standard practice in the online world for completion of a course, is to provide a certificate to the students. To obtain the certificate for our course, there will be an assessment (10-20 max questions) asking about the content presented. The College would like to find a word that is not "test" because of the connotation of "test". However, the committee discussed at the last meeting that we did not want a test at the end of the course because if we did an in-person clinic, we wouldn't have a test. Yet, the normal method of online learning is to have some sort of response/assessment which would be required. An analogy would be SafeSport. In a well-written assessment, questions would be designed to be the main takeaway points of the module. The College is going to build the questions and make them part of the modules; The College wants the assessment even if the Committee does not for their information on how well the referees absorbed the critical points – basically a way for the College to determine how well they designed the training. The College can offer to make available to the Committee the completion info so it can be used to meet the clinic requirement, but the data would have to be transferred into RefCorps. The Motion that was voted on at the previous meeting: ["The completion of all modules is sufficient to grant the certificate of completion and there is no assessment required" by Howard. Dee seconded. (The education system will log that the person was connected.) All in favor. Motion Carries.]*
        - *Kris wondered if for consistency sake, we should consider testing at the end of all clinics.*
        - *Dee clarified that there are 4 courses and 6-11 modules for each course and each module would have a knowledge check (the points you should have picked up.) At the completion of all of the modules, there is an assessment (10-20 questions) spanning the content of all modules. This would require the 75% score to pass. Dee asked if there is any interactive learning. The platform has a discussion option where all participants can participate in the forum discussion. There would be an option to contact Ref College for a question or comment.*
        - *Jess suggested that since we voted already, if someone scores under 75%, it triggers a notification to the College which then goes to the Regional Rep to link the person to a clinician to go over those areas. Bob said one of the goals of the College is to test the functionality of a retake. The College committee/team would like to see the certificate used as the clinic requirement.*
        - *Terry asked what happens functionally when someone does not pass the assessment. It is not like SafeSport where you are bumped back to the beginning. You can go back to any*

module to review or you can take a new test right away or you can move on to the next course.

- *Dee asked if the person will know what they got wrong. Yes, each time an answer is submitted it is thumbs up or thumbs down.*
- *Derek said he just wants us to move forward and use online education.*
- *Lyn asked how we know if someone completed the class? They can pull a report to see the progress of everyone. College has not been able to figure out how to grant access to everyone to see the report for themselves. College "staff" can check the log will tell that someone logged in and accessed and how long, but not necessarily that they participated or paid attention.*
- *Dee asked if there will be any statement that people can use other resources for the assessments (such as Rules of Rowing). That content will be part of the presentation. And yes, it is open book assessment.*
- *Kris clarified if regardless of what the committee decides, there will be an assessment? Yes, there will be, as part of the education design.*

In CONCLUSION: How does the committee want to know to satisfy clinic attendance? The testing and certification will happen as part of the education whether the Committee wants to use that for clinic attendance, or not. Think about it and we'll address it at next meeting.

3. Update on IOP Rewrite (Kris) –
   a. Disabilities/Abilities – *Have been having a very difficult time to connect with USRowing attorneys to get their help. Dealing with this topic has lots of legal issues intertwined. Kris and Lyn spoke with Jules about this and he will take it up the ladder to get some movement and Kris will lead the group when it can get off the ground.*
   b. Rank/Structure (Annette Foster) (see Attachment IOP Working Group Ranks & Evals) – *Annette said that the group has been working since last summer. The document appendix shows the group of individuals who have been working on this. Phase 1 has been examining the impact of the rank structure and Phase 2 will concern the Evaluation process (not begun yet.) DISCUSSION – John asked who is going to execute all this especially the regatta tiering and manage it? Annette said with the regattas, it should be pretty clear – National Championships are what they are and duals and tris etc are lower, everything else is in the middle. In the early years, it could be up to the Chief. Shouldn't be too many regattas that fall in the gray area. As far as tracking the regattas worked and meeting the requirements, hopefully that would be captured in RefCorps. So hopefully that wouldn't need a lot of work from the Coordinator. A lot of the 'how?' was waiting for approval on this plan. Doug said there can be automatic approvals or tiered approvals built into the RefCorp system. Jules also asked about who would tier the regattas. The Associations which have a national championship would be an A. Questions about how many L2s and L3s could be at each level regatta. Dee asked about moving between levels and moving down and then back up. She also asked if Emeritus but Emeritus is now not a licensed ref. Bob pointed out that what this proposal is talking about is a change of mindset we all would need to make – people can move up and down and there is no punitive comment attached to that. Dee asked about if someone backed down to L2 but was then asked to chief if that would be possible. Yes, because Chief would be a lateral endorsement available to L2s and L3s.*
   c. *Kris made a **MOTION** for adoption of the proposals in the presentation (p4). Seconded by Terry. DISCUSSION. Derek said he is for the least amount of complexity and we should think about how to implement this perhaps in phases. Lyn said this is not about implementation but hopes the committee will come with some recommendations on that. Dee said she feels a bit rushed because she just got this deck a week ago and as we move forward she'd like to see more info as the working group moves along. 8 Yes, 1 No. MOTION CARRIES.*

      Guests Sheila Tolle and Rachel LeMieux left the meeting.

   d. Complaints/Investigations (Jess) (see Attachments) – *Part of IOP 25, 26, 27 and 11.*
      i. *Code of Conduct - Derek said he is not in favor of there being a separate code of conduct for referees from the Code of Conduct for USRowing. Kris was told that in 2019 a new ethics policy was adopted by the board. The large working group reworking the IOP thought there*

were large gaps in the IOP. Is Derek asking us to take this all out and if there is any issue it just goes directly to the Board? Kris said we (referees) asked to be included in the process when the new USRowing Code of Conduct was created by the Board and we weren't included. Terry clarified that the Referee Code of Conduct which was voted on a few years ago was not in use and Kris said that was not ever adopted by the Board. Kris said our referee code of conduct is the USRowing Code of Conduct (referees are specifically mentioned there.) John asked what is the appeal process – what we have as a committee or what the Board says? Bob said he's hearing three elements: the Referee Committee, the Board and CEO, and a Code of Conduct. He read the proposed revision for IOP 25, which are very different from the behavioral code of conduct used in the past. We need to define what is code of conduct. IOP 25 is very specific to our functions as licensed officials. This defines our Code of Conduct? Does the proposal attached propose adding the new (black text) to what is already there (red text)? Howard asked what the relationship between our IOP is and the USRowing policies. Is our IOP document considered USRowing policy and thus enforceable? We can write down great things, but as we saw in the past in situations with needing to limit referees, the lawyers told us our document isn't good enough. Jules said that referees are also members, if referees are members (and also might do other things by virtue of being a member such as be a rower or coach), there are policies in place that allow the Board to revoke membership and thus a referee license. If there are unique write-ups in the IOP that are specific to referees, we'd have to see if there maybe is a bylaw change to say that referee conduct is under the conduct of the IOP. Can you revoke a license over conduct when they are not acting as a referee? Jules is trying to figure out. Howard asked if we have people who don't meet requirements and want to pull a license, someone at the Board level could maybe say 'that's not a reason to pull a referee license, it's not in the bylaws'. Bob said we have case history where under the former Committee structure revoked a license because that person was not meeting minimum standards for a license. It is an endorsement, has nothing to do with the membership of the national organization. As a member of the national organization, (this was when the committee was granted the responsibility to grant and revoke the license) the person could file an appeal of the decision made by the Referee Committee. We have had people whose licenses have been revoked and one who had their USRowing license lost the FISA license as well because they did not have a USRowing license. We need to be clear about the two levels of membership – referee and USRowing member.

e. *OVERARCHING QUESTIONS – 1) What is the relationship between the Board of Directors and this Committee? 2) what is the relationship between the governing documents of the organization and the IOP? We are trying to become a more professional group and USRowing is too and we need to make sure these groups are in parallel.*
f. *Jess said to proceed now, we could IOP Proposal Paragraph 25 and suggested that it be only the first sentence. All changes in the IOP first pass were approved by Susan and she took it to the Board. And the first pass changes were approved by the Board. Further changes we make to the document are subject to Board approval. Bob said that the A, B, C, D are good statements but not related to "Code of Conduct".*
g. ***ACTION**: We need to get answers to the overarching questions in order to move forward with this.*
h. Focus for 2021 (Kris) – *moved to next meeting*

4. Impacts of Registration Requirement for Dual and Tri Meets (Howard) – *USRowing seems to want to have duals and tris as "registered regattas" which would require corps to staff such regattas with a minimum of 5 referees because that is what the Rules state. Jules said the request is from the insurance company. If multiple teams are getting together for an activity it is important to know who is getting together and how often, etc. The goal was not to make the club/organization do/run anything any differently. The institutions would go into the database and register it for free. Terry asked if this would affect athlete membership. Jules said no, if the org was already a member the athletes were already members. Questions: how do the refs know which organizations are members? Chief would receive a verification from USRowing that all orgs are members and the event will be covered. Clubs would need to be told about this, otherwise, when the referee is asked to work the regatta, that ref is now the one who has to communicate the new listing/registration requirement. Jules said USRowing is preparing communication to the clubs and can also send communication to the referees.*
5. *New waiver coming out from USRowing saying if someone participates in rowing they cannot make a claim that they caught Covid.*

Guests Annette Forster and Doug Jones left the meeting.

6. *MOTION from Kris to go into Executive Session. Terry seconded. At 9:46p went into Executive Session.*
    a. *Kris made a MOTION to ascend out of Executive Session. Bob seconded. All in favor. Committee ascended out of Executive Session at 10:09p*
7. Update of RefCorps (Dee) – *moved to next meeting*
    a. Current Activity
    b. Moving Forward
8. Review Committee Action items from Previous Meetings – *moved to next meeting*
9. Other Issues or Items for Discussion -
   Emeritus pins have been found and are being sent out to at least 2020 and 2019 Emeritus referees. ***ACTION****: Need to go back farther to check that all Emeritus referees have received a pin.* ***ACTION****: Create/Find list of historic Emeritus members.*
10. Next Meeting – February 10 @ 7:30 PM Eastern
11. Adjourn – *John made the motion to adjourn. Kris seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:16p*

###