Present:

Adam Goff	National Open Director
Colby Gilman	At-Large Rep, Board of Directors
David Barkan	Strategic Planning Consultant
David Lionetti	Mid-Atlantic Rep, Board of Directors
David Raflo	National Masters Director
DeAnna Ball	National Women's Director (arrived pm 1/13/07)
Elizabeth Murray	At-Large Rep, Board of Directors
George Cooke	National Mixed Director (arrived 1/14/07)
Henry Thorne	At-Large Rep, Board of Directors
Jeff Dunbar	Southwest Rep, Board of Directors
Jeff Kula	National College Director (arrived pm 1/13/07)
Kate Bergeron	Member, Strategic Planning Committee
Kelly Knieb	UPA Administrative Assistant
Kristen Dailey	Northwest Rep, Board of Directors
Kyle Weisbrod	At-Large Rep, Board of Directors
Matthew Borland	UPA Championship Series Manager
Melanie Byrd	UPA Director of Membership & Outreach
Meredith Tosta	UPA Youth Director
Mike Payne	At-Large Rep, President, Board of Directors
Paige Anderson Bowen	At-Large Rep, Secretary, Board of Directors
Peri Kurshan	Northeast Rep, Board of Directors
Ricky Eikstadt	Central Rep, Interim Treasurer, Board of Directors
Ryan John	UPA Director of Communications & Media
Sandie Hammerly	UPA Executive Director
Todd Demetriades	South Rep, Vice-President, Board of Directors
Troy Frever	Member, Strategic Planning Committee
Will Deaver	UPA Director of Championships

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 2007: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Mike Payne calls Annual Meeting of the UPA Board of Directors to order 8:16 a.m.
Introductions, agenda overview, and ground rules follow.

STRATEGIC PLANNING
Review of 2006 Strategic Planning Process Activities – Dave Barkan
Dave reviews the process design and the overall activities of the Strategic Planning Committee in 2006.

Presentation of Data and Preliminary Findings – Dave Barkan
(See attached PowerPoint presentation, as submitted by Dave Barkan).

Q&A re: Assessment Findings – Dave Barkan
(Opportunity for everyone to ask Dave details on assessments and make comments on findings.)

Q: What are you going to do to incorporate the aspect of coaching into the results?
A: The data is present, it's just that it isn't included in this presentation of the assessment due to lack of time leading up to the BOD meeting. Dave feels like it falls under "people just don't know what the UPA offers."

Q: Provide more information on the apparent conflict between liking the UPA services and the strain on the relationship with the UPA.
A: People keep showing up to tournaments because they want to be there and like what the UPA offers, but as far as a relationship with the organization and seeing oneself as a member Dave doesn't feel like most players see the UPA

as their organization. They see the UPA as the staff and Board, not as the actual member. They see it as an obligation to pay in order to play. This is intuition on Dave's part.

Q: Data appears to be symptomatic, rather than causal. Why have we gotten to the point we are right now that members and non-members feel this way?
A: This theoretical approach is necessary during the small group discussions. Answer: why is that and what do we need to do in order to really understand what this means?

Comment: It's important to quantify how much the UPA "sucks." We cannot be distracted by a well-structured argument in light of the large amount of quantitative data that is available.

Q: Feeling that Finding #7 is deceptive along the lines of another thing that respondents said is that PR is not really all that important to them. Quantitatively, people did not rank PR as that big of an issue.
A: Ranking is important because regardless of how low on someone's ranking system, the item is still really important. Dave doesn't feel a lot of people know what the UPA has done in order to change the perception of Ultimate.

Q: Most interesting finding is Finding #12. It is clear that they are distinct differences among the populations that we serve.
A: Filtering the data in this similar vein will occur in the future, which will give us a deeper understanding of the data.

Q: Concern about linking "the issue of playing with referees" and "becoming a more mainstream sport." Exploring them separately and exploring data about each point individually is necessary. "Mainstream" could mean any number of things to different people.
A: This is something to identify in small group discussions. Dave linked them in the finding because it was often linked in responses, but recognizes that they need to be explored separately.

Q: We need to draw implications at every level, but we also need to be aware of "analysis paralysis." We need to narrow our activities for the future and not consider all the options, otherwise we will never move forward.
A: Yes, this is the "last call" on what we want to focus on then we will investigate and develop future action plans.

Q: The interesting thing about doing analysis is that just the act of conducting a survey has a beneficial effect and impact on those surveyed. The act of engaging people leads to engagement. Suggestion to routinely survey membership in years to come.
A: We got a lot of feedback "thank you for asking." We had thousands of people respond – in three days we had 2,000 former members respond with 1,700 people writing-in responses.

Comment: This puts us "on the hook." This creates our obligation to respond. We cannot assess/survey without taking action. We must create a plan and implement. We have $500,000 in reserves and we must be willing to "take the leap."

Q: In your experience with national, membership organizations, is it the norm to have membership feel disconnected from the organization?
A: I think it is normal, but given Ultimate and the culture of Ultimate, in this case, it feels dissonant to me.

Comment: Interest in seeing views about UPA volunteers versus UPA admin and BOD. Do people see the volunteers (and do they see themselves) as the UPA?

Comment: Relating UPA membership to professionals (e.g. electricians) required to have membership in unions.

Comment: People may feel disconnected from what the UPA does, but still see the value of a UPA membership.

Comment: Real danger of being the gatekeeper to this really cool thing they want. If there is something better that comes along, they could easily bail on us.

Break 10:00-10:10 a.m.

World Café Discussions – Dave Barkan
Remainder of morning and the entire afternoon session spent in small groups to discuss findings by categories, as determined by Dave. Groups rotated from topic to topic so that everyone had a chance to discuss each set of findings.
> Findings #1: UPA Services and Offerings
> Findings #2: UPA as a Business
> Findings #3: External Relations/Presence
> Findings #4: Growth/Change

Summary of Learnings/Next Steps – Dave Barkan, Mike Payne

Meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 14, 2007: STRATEGIC PLANNING, GENERAL BOD MEETING

Meeting called to order 8:11 a.m.
Overview of today's agenda and feedback from yesterday's session follows.

STRATEGIC PLANNING – Dave Barkan
Topics in the Strategic Planning session include: planning summits and other modes of strategic visioning, best methods of convening UPA stakeholders, developing a preliminary schedule of events, next steps.

Lunch 12:25-1:30 p.m.

MEMBERS MEETING

Mike Payne calls to order the Annual Membership Meeting of the UPA at 1:35 p.m.

HEADQUARTERS REPORTS

Championships Report – Will Deaver
(See attached Championship Series Report submitted by Will Deaver, Director of Championship Series)

Highlights of 2006
Participation: Participation is up in all divisions, which is consistent with previous years except noticeable difference in participation in club divisions. Past 3 years has had very flat increase in club-level participation, whereas this year showed increases across all divisions. For the first year since Mixed was included in the Fall Series, there was an increase in both mixed and women's numbers.

Will does not feel there is volunteer burnout across the series, but potentially is present at various levels (sectionals, regionals) of various divisions (e.g. those sections with 20+ teams participating).

Registration: Online rostering was used for both series this year (college, club). College registration was a challenge because even when people sign-up online, we need supporting documentation from schools to verify eligibility. Temps were still required, although the shear amount of data entry was drastically reduced. Club division had mandatory online-rostering which went pretty smooth (other than hiccups in the system itself). Application of online rostering is turning out as we envisioned.

Several features of the college system are automated. One of the items automated is the date of first participation corresponding to eligibility. This year a college player from Florida, whose eligibility was in question, sued the UPA to address these eligibility issues. The lesson learned is that eligibility cannot be confirmed thru online means, and the best action is to resolve the problem by talking directly to the UPA. The message to deliver to membership is that the start of your membership does not correspond to the start of your eligibility "clock." The UPA does not care about players on college teams playing prior to the Series; the UPA does care about eligibility during the Series.

Kristen requests that Todd present a "lessons learned" gained from the lawsuit to the BOD, which Todd agrees to do on Monday, January 15.

Admin continued to enforce strict deadlines, which encourages better information at an earlier date so that HQ can implement better events. College teams who want to play in the Club Series can request a deadline extension. In 2005, 30 teams requested an extension; in 2006, 180 teams requested an extension. Criteria to request an extension is contingent upon the timing of start of school in relationship to timing of Sectionals.

An unexpected negative/positive of online rostering was duplicate entries for teams. The negative outcome was that Admin was required to spend time culling rosters; the positive was that many of these teams would never have submitted a paper roster. The ease of online rostering means that in the future these teams may actually register, which encourages future growth.

Competition: Standard year. The UPA continues to provide consistency to its membership with standard rules and formats. Any issues that arise with rules and formats, Admin responds with consistency and in-line with written rules.

Event Quality: As you would expect, everyone likes Nationals. As you move down to Regionals and Sectionals, resources are fewer so the quality suffers slightly. Down the road, the UPA will work to increase the quality of those events to match that of Nationals.

The four requirements of hosting a sectional event are: fields and cones, medical plan, water, restrooms. Currently, not all of the sectional events meet the basic requirements, which is an opportunity for improvement. Will says there is no consideration of paying Sectional Coordinators more to improve the quality because he doesn't see a clear argument for pay tied to quality. Training materials for SCs include suggestions on how to divide labor between those responsible for event hosting and those for competition related issues. Kate questions whether or not there is a need to cap the number of teams at a sectional event to assure its quality.

Will feels that early communication between coordinators and the UPA ultimately improves the quality of the event. HQ publishes suggested dates for sectional/regional tournaments 9-12 months in advance.

According to the purpose of the Championship Series developed by the BOD several years ago, Sectionals are primarily focused on participation which is why there is no cap on the number of teams allowed to play at Sectionals. Until that purpose changes, there will be no limit. An alternative suggestion from Kate is to divide those sections that draw an excess number of teams into two sections.

There is a contingency plan to be put in action if an event is threatened to be cancelled. It is a fluid process that outlines actions to be taken at each point in the situation.

Personnel: None of this can happen without the volunteers (local, national). Biggest change in 2006 was the hiring of the Championship Series Manager, which will really improve the quality of services provided.

Youth: Signed a 2-year contract with the National Sports Center and the host of the YCC in Minneapolis, MN.

College: The 2007 College Championships will return to Columbus, OH.

Upcoming for 2007
- Current Events/Services: Maintain and improve the quality of events. Will will focus on national events, whereas Matthew will focus on regional/sectional events. Matthew will also be in charge of Eligibility Committee.
- Strategic Planning: Matthew will take on a lot of the series management activities that Will previously did, which will free up Will's time to participate much more in the Strategic Planning process.
- Documentation: With the addition of Matthew, Will will be able to document what we do and how we do it for long-term organizational benefits.

Mike moves to adjourn members meeting. Todd seconds motion.

Members meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

Championship Series Issues: Board Discussion – Will Deaver
Purpose: to seek feedback from the BOD on key Champ Series issues in 2007 and to educate BOD as advocates for the UPA on these issues to facilitate accurate communication between BOD and constituents.

Issue #1: *Masters player/team eligibility for Open/Mixed/Women's sectionals*
Discussion of the pros and cons surrounding Masters players/teams continuing to participate in Sectionals.

Pros
- Extra event for players/members who would otherwise get only two-level series.
- Sometimes helps quality of sectional events to have Masters players/teams included.
- Increased number of teams at sectionals in order to meet requirement for certain formats (e.g. 10 team format).
- Increased level of competition.

Cons
- Masters teams at Open sectionals creates competition issues (formats, seeding, bid allocation).
- Necessarily complex rules confusing for players/organizers.
- Penalties necessary to ensure compliance with special rules.
- Possibly propping up development of sections for Masters.
- Masters teams influence the play-out situation for Regional qualification.

Kyle asks what alternative would be available if Masters teams were not allowed at sectionals – would there be a separate Masters Sectionals? Will responds that is a good idea to look into as far as feasibility. Jeff suggests considering making larger Sectional divisions within the region just for the Masters division.

Peri stresses the weight of the message if we were to eliminate the option of Masters teams/players participating at Sectionals, especially in light of our Strategic Planning activity this weekend which focused on increasing the options for members to play. If we were to eliminate this option, we would have to provide an alternative.

No changes will be made in 2007. If anything were to change, this issue would be brought back to the BOD for decision. Straw poll held to determine where people stand on this issue.
- 15   Yes, current structure needs to change
- 1   No, current structure okay
- 9   Undecided

Issue #2: *11th Edition rules implementation*
11th edition rules passed with 80+% approval from 1500+ members voting. We received a lot of feedback from those who voted, however nothing structurally will change with the 11th edition rules. They will be in place for the 2007 Series and incorporated into observer training. Rulebooks will be sent in membership packets.

Issue #3: *Roster deadlines*
There is a push to eliminate late-deadline registration fee. All teams must be registered by the deadline; player will be able to add after deadline, but not teams. 90% of club teams met early deadline in 2007. A similar system in college is still being discussed since the college division is one season behind on deadline changes implemented over the last few years. 75% of college teams met early deadline in 2007.

Elizabeth recognizes that HQ followed the direction of the BOD from 2006 of allowing a buffer with the early and late deadline.

Issue #4: *Fines*
Associating paying a fine for late registration is pretty standard. As we increase the number of rules we have more people breaking the rules. Currently, the policy is to penalize administrative errors with competition penalities. As

an alternative, Will is considering instituting fines. Question posed to BOD, National Directors, Admin: does this fly in the face of the culture of the UPA?

Todd feels that fines would result in much less oversight time on the part of the BOD since fines would generate fewer complaints than competition penalties. Ricky agrees that fines are appropriate. Adam urges accurate, public documentation of fines associated with violations; less room for complaining is correlated to knowing the fine prior to the violation. Peri thinks that fines are better than kicking people out of the competition.

HQ would work out the details of fines for various levels of non-compliance with administrative rules. The UPA's goal is not to raise money or punish people, but to showcase and improve the sport. Melanie questions whether fines would solve the problem of people purposely breaking administrative rules.

Issue #5: *Divisional showcases/highlights/preference*
Some things we do to very consciously treat divisions equally (e.g. rotation of finals at Nationals so no one division gets the best spot every year), whereas in other settings we showcase one division over another to achieve a particular purpose or randomly highlight one division in promotional materials. Should we have a general policy on divisional showcasing? Does it matter at different levels/events? Should this issue be left up to Admin?

Many feel this is a very important issue that cannot be simply treated as "random." Will stresses that this is an internal emphasis, since we cannot change what external partners do. The conversation is heated considering many personal opinions on this topic. General consensus is that Will should continue doing as he is, but BOD will look into policy specifics to provide tangible direction to Championship Series personnel. Kyle emphasizes that this is a topic that should be included in the strategic planning process to assure that we go in the direction favored by the membership.

General straw poll (BOD, Admin, National Directors)

   14 Exploring issue of divisional showcasing as part of the SP process, only

   9   Recruiting members of the BOD to write a draft policy to be reviewed at the July meeting

Board-only straw poll

   7   Exploring issue of divisional showcasing as part of the SP process, only

   5   Recruiting members of the BOD to write a draft policy to be reviewed at the July meeting

Kristen recommends setting a policy that describes our values on this topic. Such a policy would ideally reflect our values to the extent that it would not be drastically changed within the strategic planning process. Elizabeth points out that there is a difference between internal and external worlds. Todd requests that those who are interested draft the policy and put it before ExComm by the February, 2007 meeting.

Break 3:26-3:53 p.m.

[Director of Championship Series and National Directors leave general meeting.]

Membership & Outreach Report – Melanie Byrd
(See attached Membership & Outreach Report submitted by Melanie Byrd, Director of Membership & Outreach)
Overall benefit to Membership & Outreach was the hiring of Kelly Knieb as a full-time Administrative Assistant.

Membership
12% increase in membership (8,000 new members). Lifetime membership dues increased in 2005, so Melanie increased the lifetime membership benefits (custom discs, credit card-like membership cards). Women's membership increased in all divisions. Melanie created a new brochure that was distributed to all members in 2006 and will be included in all new membership packets.

New members are taking advantage of the single-event membership option, which can be viewed as a stepping stone into the UPA as a full-fledged member.

In 2007, 11th edition rulebooks will be mailed to all members. A deal will also be offered to leagues to order rulebooks in bulk.

Melanie has started tracking new members by male/female.

Women's Outreach
Number of women's players increased by 13%, compared to men which increased 11%. $5000 donation received for women's outreach; a women's group was formed to decide how to use these funds. One use of funds will be to fully subsidize women who coach and for men who coach women to attend the Level I Coaching Clinics.

Innovation Grants
Innovation grants now allowed for overseas programs, as long as the grantee is a U.S. citizen.

Mike asks – How much return do we get on the innovation grants?
A: Melanie has not asked for increased budgeting in this area because she does not feel like it is deserving, yet. We receive 15-20 applications/year for a total of $1,500. Policy is to not fund leagues or tournaments with the intent to emphasize "innovation." Melanie feels 40% of applications are for those things we do not fund, so she thinks there is potential for more variety.
Comment: Interesting idea to link our innovation grants with our strategic plan in the future.

BOD members feel there is potential for an increased number of more innovative grants connected to a larger budget allocation. Todd suggests that we withdraw the budgetary limit on the amount for which they can apply. Paige questions our monitoring and evaluation of programs and the need to bolster that monitoring as the amount of money granted increases. Kristen suggests that we renovate the innovation grant program based on the strategic plan.

General discussion of increasing internal limits to encourage innovation and quality applications.

Event Sanctioning
Continual growth each year in event sanctioning. 9% increase in number of sanctioned events, 4% increase in revenues, 13% increase in sanctioned event participation. (See Appendix C of Report for additional information). Melanie maintains (rather than changes) this program. Improvements necessary for the program (e.g. online sanctioning) will most likely not occur until after 2007.

General Outreach
The League and Ultimate Organizers Conference will be held Feb 10-11, 2007. Registration is to capacity. Melanie is requesting an additional $5000 for this line item.

Melanie continues to work with writers to complete the Ultimate Organizers Resource Manual. Several sections are posted online and have been published in recent issues of Ultimate News.

Potential ideas for 2007:
- Creating a packet for new organizers of leagues (YMCAs, Parks & Rec, schools)
- Exploring the option of creating a volunteer position in each state that would be available as an outreach resource for individuals

Media & Communications Report – Ryan John
(See attached Media & Communications Report submitted by Ryan John, Director of Media & Communications)

Ultimate News: The magazine has had a facelift this year with multiple new columns, full-color, larger and more pictures. All other standard content is still included.

Website: The media section now includes all UPA 2006 press releases. The upcoming events page updated, including event guides (a.k.a. "player guides" for the media). There are now neater and more organized, separate websites for national championships. Hall of Champions had not been updated for 2 years – it is now re-formatted

and updated (to be completed soon). A Hall of Fame section is now present with pictures, biographies, etc for HoF inductees.

Events: Ryan attended all events this year, but most likely will not do so again in 2007. Ryan made media kits for each event in 2006 – press releases, maps, event guide, tournament schedules, fact sheets, etc – distributed to potential media partners. We had newspaper coverage for every event and local station television coverage at College Championships, Club Championships, and YCC. Ryan used video clips in his communication to encourage media participation because he'd noticed that media was more motivated by visual rather than verbal descriptions of the sport.

Kristen asks: Can we have an online press room that showcases our media coverage?
A: Good idea because it would generate additional interest.

Elizabeth asks: Can we subscribe to a clipping service?
A: Lexis-Nexis, the cost-effective option, does not always capture all coverage. However, if the BOD decides to dedicate resources to subscribing to a clipping service, we could certainly do that.

Photographers: New strategy for working with photographers. We are now paying photographers per image, which will be a similar cost to paying singular official event photographers. The result is a good mix from O/W/X/M. Passes were used at College Nationals to regulate who was allowed on-field for photography and videoing.

Discussion re: conflict arising between UPA and a prominent Ultimate photographer over the terms of the contract for photographers at 2006 Club Championships, and specifically The Right of First Refusal (currently, 60 day leeway). Sandie will act on this conversation and follow-up with the parties concerned. The Northwest Rep (Kristen) and the Board President (Mike) will communicate with said photographer to the extent necessary.

Executive Director's Report (including Youth Development) – Sandie Hammerly
(See attached Youth Development Report.)

Youth report is that Meredith Tosta is the new Director of Youth Development. Refer to the monthly ExComm HQ Reports for additional information.

Break 5:24-5:43pm

BUDGET REVIEW – Ricky Eikstadt, Sandie Hammerly
(Section-by-Section discussion of Budget)

4300 Sponsorship/Licensing: We do not have a signed contract with Discraft for 2007-2008, but Sandie doesn't anticipate there being a change from 2006-2007.

4500 Contributions: Does include selling rulebooks for outreach.

4800 Interest Income: The minute we dip into reserves the $20k in interest will decrease. Sandie will look into a fluid account with ING for future investment.

TOTAL INCOME: $790,000 of our $1.1M income is from membership, which means we are heavily dependent on membership.

Elizabeth moves to discuss changing the fee for Level II Coaching Clinics.
Todd seconds motion.

Discussion: Current fee is $250 and Elizabeth prefers a fee in the $75-100 range. A portion of the donation received for women's will be dedicated toward subsidizing Level I Coaching Clinics. Kyle recommends a $150 fee, which would be double the 1-day fee ($75) for Level I Coaching Clinics.

Elizabeth moves that we close discussion.

Todd seconds motion.

Elizabeth moves that the price for Level II Coaching Clinics be $150.
Todd seconds.

Motion passes unanimously 12-0-0   5:55p.m.

6120.01 Sanctioning Insurance: The cost of sanctioning insurance has decreased because of increased membership.

6205.20 Line item changed to "Instructor Training" rather than "Level II Instructor Training" since the funds can be used to train instructors for either level of coaching. Eventually coach development should be its own line item – it sits here because originally it was associated with youth development.

6216.02 Outreach Travel – PE: In the past this line item was sponsored by Wham-O. We do not have involvement from Wham-O in 2007, so Admin is requesting $16,800 to fund this travel.

6350 National Teams Expense: Only expense in 2007 is to send selected coaches to YCC.

6525 CSTV: $40k is the offer we got from CSTV to produce two 1-hour shows for broadcast on their network compared to 2006 where we paid $15k for 4 shows, which means that we would now be funding the production costs. In the past CSTV funded the production costs. If we pay CSTV the $40k in production costs, they will have full control of production and all rights, but we will not pay anything for getting it on air. The contract is strictly for production; they will air it for nothing. CSTV is no longer a struggling, start-up company looking for content since they were recently bought by CBS. There is no longer a win-win relationship between the UPA and CSTV.

Sandie shared CSTV's specs for production with outside producers to determine cost. The producer of "Above and Beyond" submitted a bid to produce the shows for $62k. Rob of Ultivillage submitted a bid for $25-30k. He is interested in having a relationship with the UPA to broadcast college and club series on the internet.

Question that Sandie poses to the Board: Do we want to stay with producing two 1-hour shows with CSTV? Is $40k what you want to spend on this because Sandie does not feel we can maintain the quality and produce it for less? Do you want college to stay on TV and how much do you want to spend?

Sandie requests to take the $40k and produce the show ourselves, then we would maintain control of production and rights. Kyle says that TV is not the only media avenue and that we could use the money to broadcast via the internet. Peri thinks that $40k is a lot of money for something that we are not sure of the return (we do not have ratings from CSTV past broadcasts). Discussion re: the option of investing this $40k into strategic planning to determine where our membership wants to see Ultimate in the media. Sandie does not feel that we will burn any bridges if we walk away from CSTV for 1 year. Todd thinks that we should always endeavor to have a TV presence, but we have not received constant formats delivered by CSTV therefore he recommends that we go our own way and produce in-house.

Rob of Ultivillage wants the rights to video and broadcast on the internet. For all products delivered to the UPA, Rob has never charged any money. This could be an opportunity to establish a relationship with Rob.

Kristen brings the assessment from SP back into the conversation pointing out statistics and comments from the surveys re: media coverage. We need to communicate with our membership clearly to assure that we do not lose them in this process.

Paige urges a partnership with Rob and Ultivillage because of the potential for future relationships. Kyle leans toward partnering with Rob, which allows us to have high-quality production and rights to future use. Peri wants the UPA to invest in associating the UPA brand with Ultivillage and prioritizing that relationship. Dave supports Paige/Peri opinions on UPA/Ultivillage partnership, especially considering Rob's ability to broadcast footage in more timely manner (weeks versus months). Colby/Meredith reminds everyone of the different target audiences between Ultivillage (ultimate-specific) and CSTV (15 million general subscribers) and that we need to be cautious jumping on the hot item now.

Elizabeth requests that any photography policy (discussed earlier) align with a videography policy.

Elizabeth moves to close discussion.
Jeff seconds.

Description of line item 6525 changed to "CSTV/Championship Production."

6600 PR/Communications: Kyle suggests a competition for Best Ultimate Video and add a line-item associated with it in order to support all those producing videos and the future "Robs" of Ultimate.

Todd moves that we add $1000 to the discretionary line item 6635 to sponsor an Ultimate video contest.
Dave seconds.

Motion passes 11-0-1   6:47 p.m.

6730 League Leadership Forum: Melanie explains that $5k was moved from another line item into line item 6730.

6800 Headquarters: Difference between actual and proposed for 2006 is reflective of hiring open positions later in 2006 than anticipated and not retaining the hired IT employee.

[Closed discussion of the Board and ED to discuss line item 6805 Salaries and Bonuses.]

6885 Staff Training: In 2006, $1000/staff was allocated for staff training; Sandie attended a facilitative leadership class, Melanie attended 3 courses – HTML, photography – which directly contribute to her ability to serve the membership.

6820.01 IS Programming: $45k for maintenance of our current website.

6825 Other Insurance: We left St. Paul Companies and found a new insurance plan with Philadelphia Insurance.

6900 Board of Directors: Elizabeth feels very strongly that the BOD have a different policy as far as paying for travel for BOD members and that BOD members should not have to wait more than 30 minutes at the airport waiting for a ride. The BOD works hard all year long and should be rewarded in small ways such as this. Sandie feels that Will should be involved in this discussion since he has opinions about travel policies for volunteers. This discussion does not need to be tied to the budget – a policy can be submitted at a later time.

6936 SPC: Sandie suggests that the BOD take the costs listed during SP process as a good-faith estimate and increase the line item accordingly.

Todd moves that we increase the line item 6936 to $63,500.
Ricky seconds.

Motion passes unanimously 12-0-0   7:15 p.m.

Todd moves that we accept the budget as amended.
Colby seconds.

Motion passes unanimously   7:17 p.m.

   Meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 2007: GENERAL BOD MEETING

Mike Payne moves to call meeting to order 8:10 a.m.
Elizabeth seconds.

[Closed discussion of the Board]
EXECUTIVE SESSION – Board

Consent Agenda
Mike Payne moves that we adopt the minutes of the July, 2006 BOD meeting.
Elizabeth seconds.

Motion passes unanimously 12-0-0   8:18 a.m.

Executive Director Performance Review
Todd moves to adopt ED compensation decisions.
Kristen seconds.

Motion passes unanimously 12-0-0   9:28 a.m.

2007 Standing Committees
Executive: TBD
Nominating: Elizabeth (Chair), Mike, Kyle
Finance: TBD
Conduct: Ricky (Chair), Colby, Jeff
Board Development: Elizabeth (Chair), Mike, Kyle

2007 Ad Hoc Committees
Strategic Planning: Henry (Chair), Peri, Kyle
USTInC (US Teams in International Competition): Paige (Chair), Todd

2007 Non-Board Committees
Observers: Peri (BOD Liaison)
Rules Usability: Peri (BOD Liaison)
Standing Rules: Peri (Chair, BOD Liaison)
Disc Standards: Dave (BOD Liaison)
Hall of Fame: Henry (BOD Liaison)

Todd moves to close discussion.
Elizabeth seconds.

Todd moves to adopt list of committee assignments, chairs, and other BOD members.
Henry seconds.

Motion passes unanimously 12-0-0   9:43 a.m.

Next steps for Committee Chairs (as outline by President):
- By end of February, work with VP to agree on action plan for 2007 and additional members, if needed (to be initiated by VP by 1/26/07)
- Monthly, send report on progress to VP for review by ExComm (and forward to full BOD)
- ~2x/year, join ExComm for 10 minutes to report on/discuss committee activity (at request of VP)

2007 Officers
Paige elected as Secretary 12-0-0   9:55 a.m.
Kristen elected as Treasurer 9-3-0   10:06 a.m.
Mike elected as President 12-0-0   10:18 a.m.
Ricky elected as Vice President 8-4-0   10:32 a.m.

Todd selected as the At-Large appointment to the 2007 BOD Executive Committee.

2007 Standing Committees
Executive: Mike, Ricky, Kristen, Paige, Todd
Finance: Kristen (Chair)

Break 10:50-11:06 a.m.

[Meeting opened to Administration and National Directors]
PROPOSAL REVIEW/VOTING

Ricky moves to open discussion on proposals.
Todd seconds.

Proposal 2007.04 – Temporary College Rules Set Modification, Submitted by Will Deaver, UPA Director of Championships; Matthew Bourland, Championship Series Manager; Jeff Kula, College National Director

Proposal: *In 2007, the UPA Board supports the administration's use of the following subset of competition rules, not contained in the 11th, that have been used in the College Series since 1999. These rules include: mandatory use of Observer's to track time limits, offsides, and deal with conduct issues at Regional semis, finals, games-to-go and all games at the College Championships; use of the Team Misconduct Foul System to manage team/player conduct during competition.*

Financial Implications: None

Discussion: This is the same proposal we discuss every year, it's just smaller. It is the proposal that allows the College Division to play by their own rules set. Mandatory use of observers at College Nationals, the team misconduct foul system instead of card system.

Ricky moves to close discussion.
Colby seconds.

Straw poll: In favor of proposal 10-0-0.

Todd moves that we adopt proposal 2007.04.
Dave seconds.

PROPOSAL 2007.04 PASSES   Vote: 10-0-0   Time: 11:08 a.m.

Proposal 2007.03 – Current/Former UPA Employee BOD Election Policy, submitted by Todd Demetriades, Vice-President, UPA Board of Directors

Ricky moves to open discussion on Proposal 2007.03.
Todd seconds.

Proposal:
- *Current employees shall not be allowed to be a director on the UPA Board of Directors during their employment with the UPA.*
- *Former employees shall not be allowed to be a director on the UPA Board of Directos for 3 years following the final day of their employment with the UPA. In the event a former employee does become a director and any of the then current staff who was employed by the UPA during the former employee's employment is still employed by the UPA, the former employee/director will be subject to the same restrictions that would be placed on Kyle Weisbrod should he win election and which are set forth below.*
- *Executive Directors shall not be allowed to be a director on the UPA Board of Directors for 10 years following the final day of their employment with the UPA.*

- *In the event a former employee is elected to the UPA Board of Directors, following his or her employment, he or she will not be permitted to:*
  1. *Attend any portion of any UPA Board of Directors meeting in which the Executive Director's performance is reviewed or evaluated for a period of three years following his or her employment (this does not apply to Executive Directors);*
  2. *Attend any portion of any UPA Board of Directors meeting in which the Executive Director's performance is reviewed or evaluation (this only applies to a former Executive Director (sic);*
  3. *Vote on any matter regarding supervision, salary, benefits, or the like of the Executive Director;*
  4. *Attend any portion of any UPA Board of Directors meeting in which UPA employees' performances are reviewed or evaluated for a period of three years following his or her employment;*
  5. *Vote on any matter regarding supervision, salary, benefits or the like of UPA employees for a period of three years following his or her employment.*

Financial Implications: *None*

Discussion: Todd leads discussion explaining the details of submitted proposal and entertains any questions regarding Proposal 2007.03.

Ricky moves to amend Proposal 2007.03
Colby seconds.

Amend Proposal 2007.03 as follows,
- Section IV.3: Vote on any matter regarding supervision, salary, benefits or the like of any ED/s under which that employee served.
- Close parentheses on Section IV.2

Motion to amend Proposal 2007.03 passes unanimously 9-0-0.

Paige moves to adopt Proposal 2007.03 as amended.
Colby seconds.

PROPOSAL 2007.03 PASSES Vote: **10-0-2** Time: **11:20 a.m.**

Point of clarification: As Executive Director, Sandie contributes feedback on the Officer election process. Henry will be submitting a proposal to solidify the policy surrounding administrative involvement in the election process.

Lunch 11:22-11:45 a.m. (Complete meeting assessments, commitment letters, COI forms)

Ricky reconvenes meeting at 12:13pm, presiding as senior officer

Proposal 2007.01 – Spirit Ranking System, Submitted by Eric Zaslow

Proposal: *That the UPA:*
1. *Create new guidelines for spirit score rankings and submit for board approval by April 1, 2007. If approval is not granted, revise and submit within a month. And so on, until approval is obtained.*
2. *Require Admin to ensure ranking guidelines are communicated to captains of teams whose spirit scores are to be collected.*
3. *Include guidelines along with other "conduct" literature used for training UPA event personnel.*
4. *Distribute "Ten Things You Need to Know About SOTG" along with waiver forms -- if legal, then on the back of the paper; also if legal, then as page two of the electronic document containing the waiver.*
5. *Administer the collection and processing of spirit rankings as follows:*
   a) *Collect spirit rankings at every game at UPA championships for college and club, and for HS Easterns/Westerns and YCC.*
   b) *Establish a Team Spirit Award for each division at the events of part 5.a, given to the team that receives the highest overall average spirit ranking.*

> c) **Collect spirit rankings at the finals of regionals for college and club divisions**
> d) **Expand the collection and processing of spirit rankings beyond 5.a, 5.b, 5.c as resources allow**
>
> *[Note: Items 5.a and 5.b describe the current practice of the UPA.]*
>
> 6. **Implement items 2-5 by September 1, 2007, or within a month of approval of new guidelines, whichever comes LATER.**

Financial Implications: ***Minimal or none.***

David moves to open discussion.
Henry seconds.

[Paige leaves meeting. Colby assumes responsibilities as stand-in Secretary.]

Discussion: Jeff suggests that the proposal certainly couldn't hurt given the ambiguity of SOTG and our value of it. Ricky asks if there is actually a cost associated with the proposal given the extra time it would demand of staff at nationals and other events. Adam says that though this would require extra work it has no direct financial impact, and that proposal seeks to address this by specifying finals games as most important. Will says that Zaz approached him on the issue and that the most direct cost would come from putting "10 things you need to know about SOTG" on the waiver notice because of cost of going from one page to two. Melanie suggests that this could add some cost to mailings but that online waivers would help this. Will suggests that since people can already get their waivers online, cost may not be an issue. Jeff gives background about "10 things."

Kyle thinks that anything that promotes SOTG is a good thing, but wonders if we don't already get this at nationals and doesn't like the guidelines suggested by Zaz. Adam clarifies that Zaz recognizes that work needs to be done and that the proposal lays out a proposal by which the BOD would do this.

David adds that it seems like guidelines seem to address games rather than teams, and if this is so the scorekeeper ought to do this. He suggests that "10 things" be included in captain's packets.

Henry says that clarity is good with guidelines, Zaz needs to be on committee deciding guidelines. Notes that UPA has changed its position on SOTG slightly –to upholding rather than safeguarding—and that guidelines need to be something that people will want to adopt themselves as opposed to coming from "on high". Suggests that #4 should be eliminated but that he'd vote for it either way. Will clarifies that there are some legal concerns with putting "10 things" on the waiver because of the way it would "squish" that document.

Kristen asks if the intention of including "10 things" is to get people to sign onto it like they do the waiver or if it is just a delivery mechanism. Adam says that it is delivery only. Mel says that she's not comfortable tacking things on to the waiver because of the work that's been put into it. Kristen follows up by asking if Mel minds sending "10 things" out to all members. Mel says she's fine with that but that it needs to be in an independent document.

Will says that Zaz's intention with the "10 things" section was just to get it out there, but that he would push it even if it cost a great deal because of its importance to us as an organization.

Meredith says that she's excited about the idea of setting guidelines for spirit scores to deal with "spirit score inflation" that she feels is pervasive.

Dave Raflo suggests that a better vehicle for distributing "10 things" would be in the new rulebooks since they're going out to all members anyway.

Jeff says that Zaz's proposal is intended to push to promote SOTG rather than uphold it, and he doesn't see why we shouldn't do that since it's one of our core values. Kyle responds that adopting the proposal is tantamount to defining SOTG for our members and that we shouldn't do that. Henry responds that SOTG does better if it comes from the bottom up and that we as the Board shouldn't be the gatekeepers of SOTG. Adam says that this makes sense as a concern but suggests that there is a separation between providing a limited framework for giving spirit scores at games and forcing a definition of SOTG down people's throats. Will adds that he talked to Zaz and has

similar concerns to Kyle, but that SOTG is already defined in the rules and that what already exists is an affirmation of that. He doesn't think that this precludes passing the policy because what exists now is ad hoc, and that a statement from the Board would be helpful. He suggests that the Board approve the measure but that the Board should be careful about what it does say. Adam adds that Zaz thinks changing the proposal is fine but that the point is to mandate that taking spirit scores happens. Todd clarifies that SOTG isn't well-defined in the rules. Will disagrees. Kyle responds that it's good that there's room for individual players to interpret SOTG and that we shouldn't take this away from them. Adam suggests that we could pass a proposal that mandates what happens now with spirit scores but notes that there's some confusion about how scores are defined.

Will says that one modification would be a broad statement that Admin should decide how to expose membership to "10 things." Mel responds that she isn't comfortable with having staff be forced to do this in a certain way.

Straw poll is 7-3 in favor of modifying section 4.

Jeff moves to amend the proposal "to distribute or expose the membership to Ten Things You Should Know about Spirit of the Game."
Todd seconds.

Todd moves that we vote on the amendment.
Jeff seconds.

Motion to vote on amendment passes 8-2.

Colby moves to vote on the proposal as amended.
Todd seconds.

PROPOSAL 2007.01 PASSES   Vote: 10-1-0   Time: 12:48pm

[Mike takes over control of meeting. He scratches Champs Series Disc approval process from the agenda in interest of time and because IS is strategically more important.]

REVIEW IS ASSESSMENT; DISCUSS NEXT STEPS – Sandie Hammerly
Dale Lauschman (SP), the IS consultant who wrote the report on our IS processes, reports back to BOD.

Mike says that staff has directed us to answer the question whether we should totally redo our existing IS systems or if we should repair and improve what we have. He suggests that the reason we haven't addressed this in the past is a lack of info, but that we have a good base of information now and that we should make a decision based on the analysis we do have. He says that at the very least we leave the room with a clear understanding of what we still need to know and clear expectations of what Sandie needs to find out. Asks for feedback on that approach (silent approval).

Dale asks what expectations of the report were and why people think he didn't meet them. Mike clarifies that this had to do with the use of the word "vendor" and that the perception that the report was poorly written is something of a misunderstanding. Dale replies that he did his best to "de-geek" the report.

Dale says that he reviewed current IS systems over the course of a few months, interviewed users, and reviewed code. He concluded that the system is fragmented and found fundamental flaws in the system: 1) there are two databases that are out of sync, and up to 4 others that are involved that can also get out of sync; this causes problems with duplicate records, and 2) general coding is bad—many different programming languages, coding incoherent and ad hoc.

What he sees is that current system is maintainable but only by current vendor and that any alterations they make have unintended consequences since the system wasn't logically designed.

Henry asks Dale to evaluate the three options (do nothing, use current system, rebuild). Dale suggests that 3 major things have to be done to use the current system. First is to document the code, so that Coding Clan isn't the only

group that can do stuff with it. Second would be to unify the databases, a major undertaking. Third would be to eliminate some of the access staff currently has. His guess on how much work it would take to get the system up to speed is 1000-1500 hours.

Elizabeth gives history about the different tools that exist and why they don't match.

Henry and Jeff ask Dale to clarify the alternative.

Dale says that rebuilding the system would take as long or longer (up to a year) and cost $100-200K but would have much greater functionality and have better-planned systems.

Todd asks about off-the-shelf technology. Dale responds that it would be best to use off-the-shelf tech as much as possible.

Dave responds that the hard part of the process is the spec, and that designing the system will be the hardest part. Coding is easy, but the hard part is how to access and use the data. What we have currently is a good spec. $100K seems like a lot of money, but investing in a system that is scalable and is flexible as far as our vendors go is a good idea. Our current system won't allow us to move forward or do something new. What we get for $100K is a lot. We're at the step now where we have to solidify the ad hoc system we already have.

Kristen asks Dale, Dave, and staff to clarify what the impact on staff would be during the interim. Dale responds that it would be foolish to just switch over, but that in the meantime we would freeze the current system with must-fix bugs dealt with, then design spec for new system, then review process, then begin coding. At the end of the coding, you would run portions of the system in parallel to test it. This would keep happening as different tools are brought online.

Henry asks David to clarify how he's so knowledgeable.

Q: Would we retain the rights to the system or could we retain some rights to distribute to our constituency? (Todd)

Q: Will asks about "freezing." Is that because we don't want to invest more time and money in the system or is it because it makes designing the new system easier?
A: Both

Q: Will developing the current system at the same time confuse the process? (Will)
A: Yes.

Q: Do we understand the requirements for our new system well enough to make a decision? (Adam)
A: Dale responds that he didn't think so much about the specific direction we should go, but that at some point we will need to add functionality.

Q: Mike adds that we've tried to hire a permanent IT position already to maintain our system and asks what our needs for maintaining it will be.
A: We definitely will need some maintenance, but that we could probably go either way (internal/contract) as far as hiring someone to maintain it.

Elizabeth says she supports the idea of starting from scratch.

Henry asks Sandie her opinion. Sandie responds that she supports Dale's report and suggests we freeze what we have and develop an entirely new system.

Dave volunteers to help staff work through work requirements.

Elizabeth wonders how building the new system will interfere with Strategic Planning. Todd responds that this is an important part of Strategic Planning.

Q: How much impact this will have on the staff? (Henry)
A: Building a new system will definitely be more burdensome to the staff than repairing the old one, and that designing the spec by itself would require a big investment from staff--several hours a week of meetings for a few months.

Will suggests that it sounds like building a new system wouldn't be that burdensome, but imagines that twice as many new ideas might come out of strategic planning so we might wait to see what that process gives us. Acknowledges that we have to wait some (new system can't be up tomorrow), and asks how long we can really wait.

Q: Should we wait, given that we don't know what strategic planning will come up with, and if we do wait, are we at risk given that our old system is already pretty patchy? (Will)
A: Whatever happens, you should maintain your current relationships with vendors to keep things stable.

Q: How much burden will new ideas might put on the design process?
A: If the system is designed well it should be extensible, but that you could limit your ability to do new things within the current system. Every individual module/feature has a software component and a data component. As long as you spec out what your future needs *might* be, you can add them on better. Sticking with the current system, there's no way you could do this. There's never a good time, so maybe it's the best time now to brainstorm our ideas so that as many options as possible are left open in the design.

Ricky reminds everyone that we need to keep budget-related stuff in house. Asks the staff—how long do you think you can live with the current system? Mel responds that 2-3 years would be too long. As regards staff time, says that system requires as much maintenance now as planning would later. Says that we have a good basis to start from and that we probably have enough info now to start. Kristen concurs.

Todd comments that process is time consuming but not as much as we think. Henry feels like he's on board now that he's heard input. Peri adds that since data collection part of Strategic Planning doesn't extend that far out, and since process might take a long time to start, now's a good time. Elizabeth suggests that we think of each feature differently from each other—more complex than we're implying. Kyle says that system was unsustainable six months ago and that one of his major reasons for leaving was this problem. Todd says that this is extremely important and we need to move now.

Mike asks Dale to step out so BOD/Admin can talk internally about budget and next steps.

Straw poll in favor of making significant investment in new system now. 20-0 in favor.

Will says that he's still concerned with things that may pop up. Elizabeth says that it's great that we're finally ready to do this after many years of wanting to do so.

Mike asks Dave what motion should look like, suggests motion should approve staff to move forward and find a vendor and get a spec done. Dave responds that budget item should be this year, and suggests a budget of $150K this year, maybe $50K next year. Mike asks if we can do something with currently appropriated money. Sandie asks Dave if we could approve additional money to hire someone to write the spec and then come back again to ask for money to put it together.

Jeff asks if there's anyone who's not willing to pay what it takes to do this.

Dave says that this will require RFP, Sandie asks Dave to help, Dave volunteers to do this, says that RFP would be to seek a firm to do everything from beginning to end. Adam says he can help too, but says also that it wouldn't be abnormal to hire help to write and put out RFP.

Todd wants people to know that there's no flat fee and that we won't know exactly what this would cost.

Will asks if people want to talk about currently maintaining relationships with Coding Clan for a year or so while we get new system in the works. Mike asks how sustainable relationship is. Will answers that he's not sure how Kit

would respond, but that she's probably willing to continue working under current contract. He suggests that we come up with something slightly more complete since Kit might be upset about scrapping the current system.

Dave suggests sending an RFP to Coding Clan to make her feel like we're not doing this behind her back. Mike says that Kit and Coding Clan would be happy to hear about this and that we're using their basic spec. Peri says she talked to Kit and asked about this, Kit said that we ought to fix what we have but that a new system could be an option.

Todd, Kristen, and Mike suggest putting a number out there so we don't need to revisit it. Dave clarifies $150K as being a decent number (1000 hours x $150 an hour).

Todd volunteers to write a motion.

3-minute recess for Todd to draft motion. 1:57-2:00 p.m.

Mike reconvenes the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Todd and Dave jointly move that "The UPA administration proceed with engaging the services of a software design firm for the design and delivery of a custom-built, integrated software package to replace the current software infrastructure used by the UPA. For this endeavor, the board approves spending up to $150,000 in 2007 out of the UPA's reserve funds. The hiring of the firm is contingent upon Board approval."

Ricky seconds.

Motion passes 11-0-0.

Mike asks that Dave act as a liaison for this endeavor and that he check in frequently with Ricky on these efforts.

Mike says that Ricky will get in contact with committee chairs w/in two weeks to make charters and start that process. Committee chairs will get in contact with members soon. Everyone should already know what they need to do as far as strategic planning goes, and that Henry and SPC will synthesize our work and send it out as a document.

Peri brings up "fly-on-the-wall" concept during ExComm calls. Mike asks if there are any objections. None are raised. Todd clarifies that scheduling is driven by ExComm and not "flies-on-wall."

WRAP-UP – 2007 BOD President Mike Payne

Mike brings up dates of July meeting. Tourney idea won't work; last weekend in July, in Boulder might be most appropriate time. Kyle says that Colorado Cup is that weekend. Mike amends to "one of the last two weekends in July". No objections. Mike says that we'll work on the dates.

General all Board feedback/impressions on Annual Meeting.

Mike caps by saying that we should go out and "proselytize" the SP process. It's time to give the big pitch to our members.

Mike moves to adjourn the meeting.
Colby seconds.

Being no further business the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors is adjourned by Mike Payne (President) at 2:xx p.m.