

**UPA Board of Directors Meeting June 12-13, 2009
Boulder, CO**

Board members present:

Mike Payne, At-Large Representative
Seth Grossinger, Central Representative, Treasurer
Henry Thorne, At-Large Representative
William Bartram, Northwest Representative
Doug McLaughlin, Southwest Representative (partial attendee via telephone)
Peri Kurshan, Northeast Representative, President
Gwen Ambler, At-Large Representative
Josh Seamon, At-Large Representative, Secretary
Dave Lionetti, Mid Atlantic Representative, Vice President
John Terry, South Representative
Robin Davies, At-Large Representative
Kyle Weisbrod, At-Large Representative

Also present:

Melanie Byrd UPA Director of Membership and Sport Development
Will Deaver UPA Director of Championships
Matthew Bourland UPA Championship Series Manager
Byron Hicks UPA Championship Series Manager
Meredith Tosta UPA Director of Youth Development
Anna Schott UPA Manager of Membership and Sport Development
Val Nigro UPA Administrative Assistant

8:05am: President Peri Kurshan called the meeting to order and gave an overview of the meeting schedule.

Seth and Will provided an overview of the financials. Certain membership categories deemed to be down a small degree, but that may be due to the new membership levels that have been recently introduced. Also, some large sanctioned events did not happen this year.

College eligibility - Will

Lots of time has been spent during a very busy time of the year on roster deadline appeals. Extensions were granted for many reasons. Only a few requests were not granted. 79 of 686 registered teams had an extension. There was an overall very quick turn around on extension requests. There is a public spreadsheet on roster status. 30 teams missed the deadline. On top of everything there were several eligibility appeals.

Are we more or less onerous than other sports? How does our system compare to the NCAA's?

Rostering in varsity sports is not done by the players. What would it take to lessen the number (~30 this year) of teams that missed the deadline.

Even if an appeal is done on process, it still takes up HQ time. There is a slippery slope of making concessions to teams who do not make deadlines.

The number of teams that have missed the series deadline has decreased over the years with a single deadline, many notifications approach.

Creating two deadlines puts a burden on teams that are currently doing things right and teams will still be able to miss the "final" deadline. 50% to 60% of team materials came into HQ in the last two days. There already is a big penalty in place and teams still miss the deadline.

Straw poll on if we are in favor of moving towards a two deadline system: Result:

One deadline: 9 - 1

Two deadline: 1

Violations and sanctions - Will

A few years ago an attempt was made to create a violations and sanctions matrix. It turned out to be massively complex. Three attempts were made. It was realized that we need to have clearer, more strict ramifications. Raflo came up with a template.

We need a systematic log of past precedent in order to fill in the template. There is no way Board can approval the whole matrix. The Board could approve categories instead. Is the existing precedent good or bad?

There was an inconsistency in how we were treating teams that miss deadlines and can't add players, with people who can be added later due to making nationals. Past leniency was due to a less transparent system.

We are at our best when we provide a structure and process that are consistent. It's a sign of a healthy organization that decisions are examined and modified.

Feedback on unrostered players

If someone is left off of a roster between regionals and nationals the player is suspended. If someone is on the field during sections that is not on the team's roster, the team is disqualified. The justification is that we have time in the first scenario, but it feels like we're giving preference to better teams.

What is the minimal deterrence necessary at each level (sectionals, regionals, nationals) vs. being 100% consistent at each level. If a team would have been disqualified at sectionals, shouldn't they be disqualified at nationals?

What do we do about teams that miss the deadline before sectionals, but want to fix the error/omission before the tournament happens? If we do not have harsh sanctions there will be a benefit to not telling the UPA about unrostered players.

If we are going to be harsher, we need to make sure we have many additional supports. We need to make sure we have a hammer for the future. Clear lines would be put in different places.

Straw poll on roster deadlines:

- 1) One line but it's more lenient (Sectionals treated like Regionals/Nationals) - 5
 - 2) One line but harder (Auto DQ every time) - 5
 - 3) One line with the status quo enforcement - 1
- One abstain

We need more feedback from our members and other sports. The National Directors will come up with some recommendations. Our membership may be split the same way.

College eligibility - Will

Update on service exemption, eligibility start date, 5 years to play 4, exemption for non-degree students under special circumstances.

What is the definition of participation? Play a point? At the tournament with the team? Just on the roster? Past conclusion was participation was a person's name being on a roster. This method is enforceable down the road. Problems still exist: a player added without their knowledge, just in case, foul play, mistaken identity. A player is still on a roster if they don't pay and/or sign a waiver.

The competition committee thinks that we're at the right place. The negative is that people are put in a state of flux when they probably would have been told no right off.

The proven simplicity of the system seems to outweigh the negatives of the system.

About half of rostering is done online, and half done by paper. College/Youth tends to be more organized and online.

Players are taken off rosters within a reasonable amount of time (month or two).

Straw poll on the definition of participation:

Stay the same: 10
Be changed: 2

Leave the issue of eligibility up to the competition committee.

College restructuring update - Will

We are not close to being able to vote. Lots of information still needs to be collected. The next step is to survey the general membership. The issue needs to be pushed forward as hard as possible. The ED transition has slowed things down.

Should we hire someone to run the process? The person would need to not have a specific agenda and be familiar with the issue, but not necessarily be an expert. Will have to be very, very careful about many factors such as rostering deadlines and tourney announcements. The devil is in the details.

The feedback from coaches is that they are not convinced we need to do a whole lot different than what we are doing right now. The caveat is that these are only the coaches from Nationals.

What we are and what we own is eligibility.

Should we considering moving ahead on changes at a sub 100% level if it means we can get things rolled out faster? What are we willing to compromise on?

Straw poll on do we have the process focus on the final product, or this coming season:

- 1) Final product - 2
- 2) Split focus - 10

College changes recap - Will

Observer experimenting, nationals expansion, bid allocation revision, D3.

At nationals there weren't any complaints about formatting or scheduling. The tournament is now 4 days long. People liked the ability to showcase games.

Two games a day upped the quality of play. People liked being able to see games in their division.

D3 (Matthew): Teams like having the UPA around. Teams have different challenges. Probably don't need to make the event too substantial for there to be a great improvement. They wish the tournament was earlier. They had four women's teams.

Observer policy

Is it clear? Will we experiment with refs? What are our limits on what we'll experiment on/with?

There is debate on what calls are objective vs. subjective.

Can we experiment with rules that are against our policy regarding officials? We can experiment on things without making them policy. This helps us examine our policy. It's also a plus that we have control and direct access to the information gathered from the experiment.

People are not concerned about the immediate impact. They are worried about the long run.

Straw poll: Is the Board okay with experimenting with things that are outside of our policies:

Yes: 12

No: 0

Straw poll: Should this policy be revamped?

Yes: 12

No: 0

Proposal: 2009 1 High School Eligibility

Submitted by Danielle Hoffman

Proposal Wording: This proposal has 3 basic components related to "Eligibility to Play" which can be voted on separately or jointly.

- 1) A player is eligible to play for a team if they are zoned for the high school where the team resides, but the player attends a magnet school within the school district for academic purposes and there is no home based team at their magnet school.*
- 2) A player is eligible to play for a team that is within their school district and there is no home based team at their school. Limit 2 players per team that fit this description.*
- 3) A player is eligible to play for a neighboring school district that has been on the team for a period of one school year or more, there is no home team at their school or within their school district, and they can provide written acknowledgement from their school's athletic director that they are unable to support an Ultimate Team at their home school. Limit 2 players per team that fit this description.*

Discussion

The policy would be hard to run on a national level. Too much is left to individual schools/districts/states. Easterns and Westerns are the only tournaments this policy would impact. These players can play in all other UPA youth events.

Straw poll on the entire proposal:

For: 0

Against: 11

Abstain: 1

Straw Poll: In favor of a policy based on local policies? (If a school policy allows for outside players we allow them to play at Easterns and Westerns.)

For: 5

Against: 6

Abstain: 1

Motion to approve: Seamon, seconded Lionetti. Declined. 0-12-0.

Proposal 2009 2 Rule Change to High School Eligibility

Submitted by Louis Abramowski

Proposal wording: It is proposed that to provide a practical opportunity to the overwhelming majority of high school students in the United States, a player from a school with no team may be granted an exception to compete with a team from a high school in the same school district at a high school championship event (such as Easterns or Westerns) only after having participated with the team at a UPA sanctioned event during the previous calendar year. Participation can be limited to appearance on a roster, without actual playing time in the event. No team shall have more than 2 roster members falling under this policy. No student member participating in this rule shall be on another ultimate team.

Discussion

The two person limit is problematic. What happens when there are three potential players? Playing Ultimate in HS is all about choices.

Motion to approve: Thorne, second Bartram. Declined 0-12-0.

Proposal 2009 3 Jr. National Team Player Selection Criteria

Submitted by Meredith Tosta

Proposal wording: Players eligible to represent the Ultimate Players Association and the United States on Junior National teams must meet the following criteria:

A) Be US citizens or have lived in the US for over 2 years;

- B) Be current UPA members;
- C) Must be 19 or under, i.e. will not turn 20 in 2010 (no lower age limit);
- D) Have parent/guardian permission;
- E) Will respect the tough decisions of the selection committee; and
- F) Will be able to attend the training camp and the trip to World Championship event.

In addition to the criteria listed above, players must also have demonstrated the highest level of sportsmanship, and will be evaluated based on their skills, athleticism, leadership, team orientation and performance. Should players possess similar abilities in the above categories, preference should be given to geographic diversity and community outreach.

Discussion

Do we want lots of HS players? Do we want geographic representation? Don't we want to guarantee both? There are massive numbers of players trying out. Coaches should be able to adapt.

The 1/3 rule was originally put into place due to the behavior of college aged participants. Behavior is not an issue anymore.

Coaches will like the freedom to build their team. There is a precedent for the UPA applying different eligibility rules than WFDF (Age of Masters players). Youth Ultimate means different things to different people.

If a coach is willing to take the position, they should be willing to take the parameters of the position.

To some, college play does not equal youth play.

If there are geographic quotas for the team composition, no one will ever know for certain if they made the team because of one.

Straw poll: Should there be any restrictions based on age (or college participating) or should the proposal stand as written?

Yes: 6

No: 6

Straw poll: Should there be any kind of geographic restriction or should the proposal stand as written?

Yes: 6

No: 6

Tabled until Saturday.

5:30pm: Meeting is adjourned for the day

Saturday, June 13th, 2009

8:05am: Meeting opened

Strategic planning - Will

Championships: 14 women's masters teams are currently registered. One from each region is needed for the event to be called a "championship".

Youth: Educational video is in the final stages of production, new YCC bid structure will soon go into effect, there are 22 state championships and a couple more on the way, a youth best practices manual is being worked on, the coaching clinics have been divided into two parts, a super highlight video of girls youth Ultimate is being worked on.

Sport development: Nothing but positive feedback from NIRSA and the club sports advisory council. We need to work on our support of intramural leagues. We are currently reaching them by creating other structures and putting information out there.

Women's leadership: Coaching rebate program is still underway.

Standing rules committee: Wants the rules quiz just to be online.

League: More league coverage has been slowed by not having a communications director. League conference went well again. Slightly more people this year. A league affiliation model is more of a relationship with the league and not the players. We need to prioritize pushing an affiliation model forward. More data needs to be collected.

Observers: Ran clinics and experimental events in the spring. 6 clinics run this spring. An experimentation and feedback mechanism is being developed along with a webpage with all of the info on the experiments. The open college division was very close to voting in active travel calls at nationals.

Membership: Four new types: 450 coach-players, 109 coaches, 41 friends and family, and 5 friends-family/coach. A membership tent was a big draw at events. Also took some pressure off of the HQ tent. Will be nice to continue putting up the tent as long as it can be budgeted. No public access to an alumni database

CUPA ED Meeting: They want to use some of our coaching/observing materials/programs. We will be licensing our observer program to them. There will be training clinic in Canada before their nationals. They have government funding if they develop their own coaching certification.

First Sports (Web Development): Weekly meetings through WebX. There has been a lot of progress made on the modules. It's a challenge since it's a moving target. The CRM (Database management) we released to the UPA a couple months ago. There are several different portals: accounts, competition, event management. Follow up with First Sports is the hardest part of the project. Could this project be another area where we hire someone to push the project forward?

Proposal 2009 3 Jr. National Team Player Selection Criteria

Submitted by Meredith Tosta

Discussion continued from Friday:

What is the purpose of the team? Best? What is Youth? What is the role of the team?

Does each goal have to be mutually exclusive?

Is the team a showcase team? What is being showcased? Are we rewarding the top 20 players? It's not about growth?

If we don't have age and geographic restrictions, we still have a layer of protection: the coach.

The team will be diverse as long as we are successful at everything else we do.

We have a huge structure. By placing restrictions you are saying you don't trust the structure.

If there is a low risk of extremes (all college players, all from two regions) why not guarantee that it won't happen?

Straw poll: Should we keep the current restriction (1/3 rule) on post-HS players?

For: 3

Against: 8

Abstain: 1

Straw poll: Should we add some kind of geographic restriction?

For: 3

Against: 9

Vote to amend the last sentence of the proposal to read: "*Consideration should be given to geographic diversity and community outreach.*" Weisbrod, second Bartram.

For: 11

Against: 1

Proposal is amended as proposed.

Vote to amend the team name to “The US U20 National team”. Terry, second Weisbrod.

For: 6

Against: 5

Abstain: 1

Proposal is amended as proposed.

Vote to add a team conduct requirement E. Ambler, second Eckhoff.

For: 12

Against: 0

Proposal is amended as proposed.

Amended Proposal Wording: *Players eligible to represent the Ultimate Players Association and the United States on the U-20 National teams must meet the following criteria:*

- A) Be US citizens or have lived in the US for over 2 years;*
- B) Be current UPA members;*
- C) Must be 19 or under, i.e. will not turn 20 in 2010 (no lower age limit);*
- D) Have parent/guardian permission;*
- E) Will agree to abide by the team Code of Conduct;*
- F) Will respect the tough decisions of the selection committee; and*
- G) Will be able to attend the training camp and the trip to World Championship event.*

In addition to the criteria listed above, players must also have demonstrated the highest level of sportsmanship, and will be evaluated based on their skills, athleticism, leadership, team orientation and performance. Consideration should be given to geographic diversity and community outreach.

Motion to approve proposal 2009_3 as amended. Payne, second Bartram.

Approved 9-3-0.

Proposal 2009_4 Board Seat Selection Policy

Submitted by Mike Payne, Josh Seamon, and John Terry

Proposal wording: The UPA will change its Board seat selection approach to reflect the following seat types and frequency of election/appointment:

Seat Type	# of Seats	Frequency of election/appointment
Regional elected	6 (1 for each region)	2 elected each year, each region newly elected every 3 years
At-Large elected	3	1 elected each year

Board appointed	3	1 elected each year
-----------------	---	---------------------

To achieve this mix of seat types, the following seat selection process shall be followed 2009-2010:

Seat type	2009 process (to fill 2010 seats)		2010 process (to fill 2011 seats)		2011 process (to fill 2012 seats)	
	Year 1 of cycle		Year 2 of cycle		Year 3 of cycle	
	Seats filled	Total seats	Seats filled	Total seats	Seats filled	Total seats
Regional elected	2	6	2	6	2	6
At-Large elected	1	5	1	4	1	3
Board appointed	1	1	1	2	1	3

In each year, to fill the appointed seat, a Director will be appointed by the current Board (including outgoing Directors) through a selection process to be approved by the Board, but to include a majority vote of current Directors (including outgoing Directors) within the 6 months prior to the start of the newly-appointed Board member's term.

To facilitate the revised seat selection process, Article III, part 2 of the UPA's bylaws shall be revised to read as follows:

2. Election and Term of Directors. The Directors shall be elected annually either by written ballot available to all members of the Corporation or by online voting in a manner approved by the Board or by a combination thereof. Alternatively, a portion of the Directors may be appointed by the current Directors via a selection process approved by the Board. However, at no time may more than 25% of Directors be seated through the regularly-scheduled Board appointment process. There shall be no less than one (1) director from each region of the United States, as such regions are designated from time to time by the Board. Directors shall serve for a term of three (3) years; approximately one-third of the directors shall be elected or appointed each year. No director may serve more than two (2) consecutive three-year terms. A person who has served as a director for two (2) consecutive three-year terms shall become eligible to serve on the Board again after one (1) year has expired since the end of such director's last term. Each director shall hold office until the next annual meeting of Board and until his or her successor shall have been elected and qualified. Candidates must be at least 18 years of age. The following further policies apply specifically to Directors seated through the election process:

- Candidates for director positions shall be solicited and approved by a standing Nominating Committee, or by petition signed by no less than seventy-five (75) members in good standing. All such petitions shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Corporation no less than thirty (30) days prior to either the date the ballot is scheduled to be available or when the online voting is scheduled to begin (whichever is earlier).
- The date the ballot is to be available and/or the date online voting is scheduled to begin shall be posted on the Corporation's website and, if practicable, printed in advance in the Newsletter.

Discussion

We now have set fields where we need expertise (IT, Law, Marketing, Managers). With the current structure we could easily have no representation in a crucial field. It is very common for Board to appoint seats. We need to make sure the public understands that this is for the betterment of the Board. Limiting the term of the appointed Board members is not preferable since it makes that position not equal to the others. Appointing 3 of 12 will not dilute the representative nature of the Board. Should the size of the Board be increased?

Straw poll: Are we in favor of appointing Board members?

For: 12

Against: 0

Straw Poll: Are we in favor of:

a) 12 member Board: 4

b) Increasing the size of the Board: 3

c) Abstain: 5

We need to make sure we don't lose our connection to the community. Are there any significant cons to going to a Board of 15 members? We would have three more people "doing stuff". Board still would elect all ExeComm positions. We will lose at-large candidates. It will be hard at first but we need to detach.

Straw poll: How large should the Board be?

12: 7

15: 3

Abstain: 3

Straw poll: Should the proposal be passed as written?

For: 8

Opposed: 2

Abstain: 1

A smaller board means there is a smaller chance of having duds, but a higher change of eliminating a good one. A larger board means a higher change of duds, but less of a chance of eliminating a good one.

Everyone in the room being the same (3 year terms) is a good way to go.

We will get more of what we want with the three appointed people. We have to trust that there are people out there who will run and be okay with not winning.

Straw poll: How large should the Board be?

Larger than 12: 5

Stay at 12: 6

Abstain: 1

Motion to approve proposal 2009_4 as written: Thorne, second Terry. Approved 9-2-1.

Proposal 2009_5 Board Meeting Action Summary

Submitted by John Terry

Proposal wording: At the conclusion each of the two board meetings, the President and Secretary will prepare a statement describing significant actions and topics of discussion which occurred at the meeting. The statement will be posted no later than two days following the conclusion of the meeting.

Discussion

It would be very useful to get something out before the minutes so that the public can be made aware of what happened at the meeting and topics can be discussed. It takes a while for minutes to be posted.

We need to be careful about posting summary items without sufficient justification or the membership may draw the wrong conclusions about why something was or was not passed.

Board members can give evidence of disagreement on the Board, but not undermine Board actions. Maybe we should post "minority opinions" in the future.

Straw poll: Should we pass some version of this proposal?

For: 8

Against: 3

Abstain: 1

A hard deadline ensures it gets done. Sets a strong cultural tone. We can fold this policy into any larger communications policies that emerge.

Motion to amend proposal 2009_5 as follows:

“At the conclusion of every board meetings, at the desecration of the President, the President and Secretary will prepare a statement describing significant actions and topics of discussion which occurred at the meeting. The statement will be posted no later than 10 days following the conclusion of the meeting.”

Seamon, second Eckhoff. Approved 9-2-1.

Hall of Fame Refinement Committee 2009 Recommendations

There is a problem with high peer ratings on individuals with spirit issues when it gets to Hall voters. The idea is to have the peer pool provide a 3 point spirit rating and hold a public call for comments. Spirit is not an out and out eliminator on its own.

Straw poll: Should we pass the proposal as it stands?

For: 10

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion to approve Hall of Fame Refinement Committee 2009 Recommendations as written: Thorne, second Seamon. Approved 11-0-0.

Grievance policy - Mandy

We have a very open door appeals process. Most organizations don't let appeals get to the Board. The issue is less about time spent by the Board and more about time spent by the staff. The process could be streamlined by scoping the decisions out to set up groups. Should the ED check be taken out? The process should be either the Board all the time, or the committee. We should add another layer. The Board should stay in the loop.

Straw poll: Should appeals go to the full Board or Committee?

Full Board: 8

Committee: 2

Abstain: 1

Which appeals will the Board hear? Not hear? We need to avoid a cycle of complaints from unhappy people. People should know that they can go to the full Board.

Are there any types of appeals that shouldn't be brought to the full Board? Until we are flooded, no.

Straw poll: Should everything be appealable or should some kind of line be drawn?

A) Everything, at least for now: 6

B) A line should be drawn: 5

Motion to approve the January 2009 Board meeting minutes: Bartram, second Terry. Approved 9-0-0.

2:07pm: Meeting is adjourned