

Minutes

Special Meeting of the USA Fencing Board of Directors

July 4, 2012 in Anaheim, CA

Index of Appendices

<u>Description</u>	<u>Appendices/ Attachments</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Director's Report	A	10
Athlete Council 2012-2016	B	11
National Team Oversight Committee Report	C	12
Proposed NTOC Modifications	D	13
Safe Sport Task Force Report	E	15
Non-Fencer Code of Conduct	F	16
US Fencing Policy on Massage	G	18
USA Fencing Criminal Background Check Disqualification Criteria	H	20
Safe Sport Task Force Recommendations	I	21
Tournament Committee Report – June	J	23
USA Fencing Policy for Responding to Allegations of Certain Misconduct	K	24
Pre-Screening Questionnaire	L	26
Tournament Committee Proposed Changes to the Athlete's Handbook	M	27
Hall of Fame Committee Report	N	29
Veterans Committee Report	O	30
Scholastic/Collegiate Task Force Report	P	31
USFA Sports Medicine Report	Q	32
Sports Science & Technology Report	R	35
Tournament Committee Report – July	S	37
Youth Development Committee Report	T	38
Divisions Best Practices Task Force Report	U	41
DBPTF – Principals for Sanctioning	V	42
DBPTF – Conflict Resolution Process	W	47
DBPTF – Recommendations for Running Qualifiers	X	49
DBPTF – Suggested Bylaws	Y	50
DBPTF – Recommendations on Posting Information on USA Fencing Website	Z	58
Budget Committee Report	AA	59
Executive Director Search Task Force Report	AB	59
Compensation Committee Report	AC	59
Audit Committee Report	AD	60
Election Committee Report	AE	61
Fencing Officials Commission Report	AF	62

*Reports are provided by committee chairs regarding their committee's activities; receipt of the submitted reports does not indicate adoption of items within each report.

Present: David Arias, Bradley Baker, Aaron Clements, Bill Becker, David Blake, Wes Glon, David Herr, Terry Kwan, Mario Rodriguez, Sunil Sabharwal, Jeff Salmon, Laurie Schiller, Soren Thompson, Kalle Weeks, Alex Wood.

Guests: Donald Alperstein, Randy Barnette, Jerry Benson, Colin Chock, Kirsten Crouse, Greg Dilworth, Allen Evans, Ani Fox, John Heil, Cody Mattern, David Sierra, Joe Streb, Melissa Zentgraf.

I. General Information and Organizational Items

General announcements

Remarks – Kalle Weeks, President

Congratulations were offered to Cody Mattern and Soren Thompson, members of the #1-ranked World Champion Men's Epee Team. It was also noted that the Annual Membership meeting earlier in the morning did not draw the required quorum, so no business was conducted.

Ms. Weeks provided a recap of announcements from the Membership Meeting:

In 2010-11, USA Fencing had 18,847 national tournament participants.

In 2011-12, that number grew to 19,471 tournament participants.

2011 Summer Nationals included 6,221 individual and 340 team entries.

2012 Summer Nationals had 6,947 individual and 427 team entries.

Online results reporting software typically receives 120-150,000 page views at NACs. The anticipation is of 500,000 page views during Summer Nationals. The capability has been very well received by the membership.

A moment of silence was observed to memorialize the passing of members of the USA Fencing community. Ms. Weeks noted accomplishments of Charles Selberg, Michele Mamlouk, and Timothy Loomis.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion (Mr. Baker): To approve the minutes of the May 24, 2012 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors.

Motion (Mr. Baker): To approve the minutes of the June 5, 2012 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors.

Motion (Mr. Baker): To approve the minutes of the June 21, 2012 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors.

Motion (Mr. Baker): To approve the minutes of the June 27, 2012 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors.

No action was taken on these motions as the minutes were not yet ready for review. The expectation is that the minutes will be distributed via email next week and approved via email vote.

III. Executive Director's Report (Greg Dilworth)

An oral report was provided by Mr. Dilworth.

Financials as of 5/31/12 are the most recent currently available.

We currently have 20,676 members. – 935 fewer than last season.

34 noncompetitive (\$5) members for 2012-13 have joined already. The Chicago world cup was a very successful event with a couple of sponsors, led by the Mariel Zagunis Women's Sabre Fund. The sponsorships meant that we could add features that made it special for competitors and spectators. These items included T-shirts and posters for athletes, flowers for medalists, and glassware prizes for the top four. We also received sponsorship from a coalition of Chicago-area businesses with affiliations with Polish community.

Competition recently concluded at the Pan Am Zonal Championships. The US won 11 of 12 gold medals, helping us keep our high standing for seeding. Generally we had an overall positive event in Cancun.

Preparation is under way for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, including travel and logistics and uniforming.

The office is getting ready for new membership year, including education for clubs and club owners around new insurance requirements and professional memberships.

Question: Could you address staffing related to potential delays in processing given increases due to the new membership requirements?

Answer: There are a number of fencing people in COS area. We plan to talk to resident athletes to handle data entry.

Question: What ramifications on insurance coverage could there be from a delay in submission or processing?

Answer: I don't know most accurate answer. I think a difference exists depending on whether a

club doesn't submit the form vs. the office has it but has not yet processed the membership. We will continue to investigate.

IV. Finance and Budget (Sunil Sabharwal)

Financial Reports

An oral report was provided by Mr. Sabharwal.

During our last call, we debated at length what levers were available to reduce net indebtedness. It was a productive discussion. The most recent budget now proposed reflects all we agreed upon. One item that was incorporated where there may be a discussion due to no previous consensus is that of sanctioning fees.

Mr. Dilworth:

(Line 11). My sense after conversation was there was an appetite to put in sanctioning fee. I heard from Board members, however, that this may be precipitous.

We may need to wait until we have a system that captures all local results. We can still hit our overall goal without this \$45,000. We wouldn't have to adjust something else.

Comment: At some point when we have points-based classification system, we could choose to charge a fee. As structured, this encourages not submitting results. It is onerous on small tournaments. Prefer not doing that until holistic approach.

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal): To receive the Budget Report as submitted to the Board.

Second: Mr. Baker

Motion passed. Mr. Becker was opposed.

Discussion of 2012-13 Budget

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal): To approve the 2012-13 Budget, without the sanctioning fee in Line 11

Second: Mr. Herr

Motion passed.

Ms. Weeks made brief comments: Last year's Summer Nationals special meeting included four hours devoted to discussion on the topic of the budget. This year we held lengthy conversations in advance of the motion to adopt the budget and a 15-minute conversation here. This process has resulted in members of the Board having a better understanding of the variables that needed to be considered, as well as what has been included in the budget. Congratulations to the Board were offered on the improved process.

In the future, we will be more proactive about building rolling 4-year budgets. Ms. Weeks indicated she

had held conversations with Mr. Anthony on the topic. USA Fencing will be developing projections and planning to have a clear sense of the long term financial landscape.

Contract Approval

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal): To approve lease for new offices at Sinton Rd. [Contract distributed separately]

Second: Ms. Kwan

Mr. Dilworth: The main reason to move to new office space is that we have outgrown the building we have. For the last several years, we have been renting space across our parking lot for the finance department. That lease is around \$2000 per month. The current offices are not a great office space and are not conducive to a positive working environment. USA Volleyball has bought a new building and has extra space. We, and two other NGBs, have been offered the space at \$0 rent, paying just operating expenses. This is a 5-year lease for operating costs only.

Moving costs are projected to be \$10-12,000.

Our current building is up for sale. The commercial real estate market in Colorado Springs is not good. While we have some on-going costs for our current building, USA Volleyball has agreed (in a handshake deal) that they won't charge operating costs for up to 6 months unless we sell our current building. This deal is reflected in the (just approved) 2012-13 budget.

Question: What are our current operating costs?

Answer: It will be \$2,300/month for USA Volleyball space. That's roughly same as we pay to rent the space where finance is located now. Our current space is ~\$1,000/month. Overall, the move saves us ~\$1,000/month.

Question: Will we be farther from USOC?

Answer: About 5 miles, instead of 1.

Question: What is the state of building as far as move-in readiness?

Answer: It's pretty ready. USA Volleyball is already in it, as is Table Tennis. We have a phone vendor.

Question: What is the time frame for the move?

Answer: They've been waiting for contract approval. We will start next week.

Question: What is the distance from the OTC?

Answer: 10-15 minutes.

Question: Is there any benefit being with Volleyball? Can we share staff or services?

Answer: Volleyball is the biggest event group in Colorado Springs. We're the second biggest. People who come in to meet with either group can meet with both. There's not much synergy with Table Tennis or Archery.

A comment was made regarding the timing of the move. It was noted that eight years ago, our website went down during the Olympic Games. Four years ago we were not ready for post-Olympic communications. We need to make sure that if we're moving around the time of the Games, we can handle media inquiries, promotional opportunities and the like.

Motion passed. Mr. Becker and Mr. Clements abstained.

V. International Update (Sunil Sabharwal)

Mr. Sabharwal provided an oral report.

USA Fencing hosted the FIE Congress in December. Almost 130 countries were in attendance. This marked the first time a non-elective Congress was held in the US. USA Fencing contributed \$25,000 towards an event that cost approximately \$500,000. The FIE, USOC, and City of Philadelphia paid for the rest.

USA Fencing has hosted a number of other international programs over the past few years:

July 2011 in Reno: Pan American Zonal Championships (Event funded by USOC) and FIE Administrator Course (funded by USOC and FIE).

March 2010 FIE Referee exam in Houston. The US was allowed to put forward 13 candidates, not just 2, due to our hosting. 11 passed.

July 2009, coaches clinic in Colorado Springs. Almost 80 coaches from around Zone attended. The program was paid for through an IOC solidarity grant. This generated a lot of goodwill for us, while being funded by someone else.

The video replay system being used now, when purchased, was not FIE-approved. It was the least-costly system that actually worked. We worked with FIE to homologate the system, which made it possible for us to use it for world cups and zonals, saving tens of thousands of dollars compared to renting from Europe or buying a more expensive system.

International outreach over the past four years has been very successful. We are getting ready for more such programs moving forward.

Question: Our goal is to have all twelve events contested at future Olympic Games?

Answer: That's the FIE's objective. It is their highest priority, but very difficult.

Comment: Objective for us: continue on path. We should host more events, continue to gather influence and make friends. We always talk about influence and compare ourselves with Russia and Italy. We don't host as many events as they do. We're not in the same ballpark. We need to host more events. That's how we grow. That should be our objective over next four years.

VI. Legal Update (Donald Alperstein)

Mr. Alperstein provided oral remarks.

This motion should conclude a long-running saga. \$568.96 is the amount paid out by USA Fencing for those who responded to our offer to reimburse those who had paid for entries to the ROC that was not held. That amount is not equal to the total amount that disappeared. It is the amount we paid out to cover entries.

Motion (Mr. Baker): If the organizer of the Queen City ROC (originally scheduled to be held March 19-20, 2011) does not reimburse USA Fencing in the amount of \$568.96 by July 31, 2012, the President shall constitute a panel under the disciplinary rules.

Second: Mr. Clements

Question: What if more people come forward in the future?

Answer: A generous time frame was provided, and has now closed.

Motion passed.

Updates on pre-existing situations:

- Dispute between two athletes being mediated. Not much to report. Mediator has heard from both parties. Parties have not yet gotten together.
- THS issue was not settled in mediation. The court case is now entering the discovery phase. More detail will be made available during our executive session. The litigation is going forward. The court has sent an order to set the case for trial within 35 days. The trial itself is likely to be set for a date in the 18-month time frame. It is expected to be a 3-week jury trial.
- Complaint between parent and club owner. A request had been made for a disciplinary panel. Reported back to Board as private civil matter. Letter sent. Request for both to play nice. Coda: Two fencers involved as prospectively registered to fence for another club in a team event at Nationals. The first club has challenged their right to represent the second club. The situation may be resolvable under our rules. The individuals involved likely will not be happy. The matter has not been escalating of late. The mother and one of sons involved were black carded a few days ago in an unrelated incident. That may have served as wake-up call.

- USA Fencing was sued by a spectator at the NCAA Midwest Regionals. We are currently being defended by our insurance company. Our insurer is not admitting liability, but is assuming the defense. We are actively working with their attorneys. We are entering the discovery phase in that case. We will have to provide information and will move to be dismissed out of the larger case.
- We have received a new disciplinary request related to a tournament in the Mid-Atlantic region. It will be taken up in due course.
- We are still dealing with trans-gender issues. Resolved complaints of veteran women who had questioned propriety of allowing trans-gender females to fence. We have been approached with a new issue. Complaints have been made regarding some transgender females that others feel are not transgender enough. This is a reflection within our association of what is a fairly hot political issue in wider LGBT community. The USOC ombudsman, etc. are involved.

The IOC has recently adopted a new policy, which we have not yet studied closely. We will NOT be requiring that everyone registering as female to identify whether or not they are transgender. There is no legal requirement to do so. We cannot accept anonymous allegations/accusations from people who refuse to provide evidence and state the grounds of a challenge. If an individual comes forward and makes such challenge, are they immune from a claim of defamation on the basis of a privilege? This question is being investigated.

VII. Committee and Task Force Matters

Committee Reports

Athlete Council [Report included as Appendix B]

National Team Oversight Committee (Alex Wood) [Report included as Appendix C]

Motion (Mr. Wood): To approve the adoption of the modifications to the National Team Oversight Committee's roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority as defined in Appendix D.

Second: Mr. Baker

Discussion of background and rationale from Alex Wood.

Question: Who is approving modifications now?

Answer: Staff.

Comment: Does this add layer of bureaucracy? I was on the HPC. The committee had lots of conflicts of interest. Rather than helping, it was an obstacle. We went to a concept of personal responsibility. If a committee is making decisions, and something is wrong, nobody is responsible. As we went this way, the President, ED, and coaches became responsible. We can identify who is responsible. With this proposal, if a decision is made, why do we need the Board? If a bad decision is made, everyone can say “that wasn’t me.” We should learn from our history. We now have success. We should continue what we’re doing.

Comment: We’re struggling with how we make decisions and who decides. This committee is reviewing or reviewing and approving. The responsible party is still the HPD. This proposal gives second a set of eyes. Someone who can ask “Have you thought of this? We tried that 10 years ago and it didn’t work and here’s why.”

Question: What is the difference between the proposed NTOC and past (failed) HPCs?

Answer: It comes down to personnel.

Comment: Everyone should carefully read the appendix. “Review and approve.” This shifts significant responsibility to the committee. We are in the final days of this Board. Half dozen members are moving in or out. We will have a new ED, a new HPD, a new President. High performance is a significant piece or what we do. It is always a sensitive area. Should this Board, in its final session, push this through? The new Board should make the decision on whether or not to move in this direction. We should not have a last-minute change.

Response: This is the result of a collaborative agreement. In a practical sense, whether passed or not, this is how we will be working.

Discussion continued regarding whether the changes remove Board approval rights.

Comment: We currently have the right of review, but it is not usually exercised. We don’t currently have oversight. This would be an improvement.

Discussion ensued regarding how personnel are the key determinant of success of the group.

Comment: How are people chosen? In the past, internal politicking has dominated for selection to such groups.

Question: Can we not replace “review and approve” with “review and recommend to the Board?”

Answer: Ultimately, if a decision by the HPD is presented and the NTOC approves it, is it still something where the Board can intervene in what the HPD does? It's a staff function. It doesn't go to the Board anyway.

Motion (Mr. Becker): To table motion to the Annual Meeting in September.

Second: Mr. Baker

Question: Is there anything in motion that would require changes to Athlete Handbook?

Answer (Mr. Dilworth): The High Performance Plan is due to the USOC by October 1. The Board meeting is September 29-30. If this motion doesn't pass, we'll still work with NTOC. In that case, if HPP plan is sent to the NTOC and the NTOC says rework, Jim could ignore the request to rework the plan and still submit it as written. Without this motion we would have to rely on good will.

Comment: I don't think we should table. We should have further discussion now.

Comment: This is the worst possible time to put this before the Board. Half of the Board are leaving. We have a search going on for ED. We want to bring in a star ED. He or she will find out we're in a financial mess. The biggest part of job will be in the hands of some committee. This doesn't seem to be the right time.

Vote 7-7. Ms. Weeks votes to break the tie and approve the motion to table. The motion to table passed.

Athlete Protection Task Force (Felicia Zimmermann)

The following documents from the Athlete Protection Task Force are included as appendices:

- Report Appendix E
- Non-Fencer Code of Conduct Appendix F
- Policy on Massage Appendix G
- Criminal Background Check Disqualification Criteria Appendix H
- Task Force Recommendations Appendix I

APTF motions appear below under Old Business.

Tournament Committee [Reports included as Appendices J & S]

Hall of Fame Committee [Report included as Appendix N]

Veterans Committee [Report included as Appendix O]

Scholastic/Collegiate Task Force [Report included as Appendix P]

Question: How can we have more success? What needs to change for the task force to be more effective next season that it has been over the past couple of years?

Answer: We need the National Office to provide contact lists of clubs and teams. We can't move forward without those lists.

Follow-up: That's the problem. What is the solution?

Response: We need the National Office to do this. There have been difficulties with the chair and balancing other duties. Maybe we need a personnel change.

Kris Ekeren is to be the staff member responsible. She will be the one to coordinate with Kathy Vail.

Sports Medicine/Sport Science & Technology [Reports included as Appendices Q & R]

Youth Development Committee [Report included as Appendix T]

Motion (Mr. Glon): To modify the Athlete Handbook as follows:

AH 3.2.2: Senior, Junior, Cadet, ROC, SYC tournaments are required to have at least 6 competitors for points to be awarded and cannot be a mixed competition. If there are less than 10 competitors there must be a fence off for third.

The YDC recommends 2 changes in this policy regarding field size and fencing off for third at SYCs. The current rule states that a field of 6 is required for points to be awarded and that in events with less than 10 competitors, there must be a fence off for third place. We recommend both be removed. The rule against mixing events should NOT be changed.

Rationale:

Only SYC events in the Y10 Epee and Y10 Sabre fields were affected by this rule this season. Senior, Junior and Cadet NACs do not have events in any weapon with less than 10 competitors. To our knowledge, there was only one ROC event this season with less than 6 competitors.

I. The requirement of 6 fencers to award points was found to be counterproductive in the Y10 events that generally have small SYC competitive fields.

-Needing 6 competitors for points was seen as a deterrent to registering for these events, as fencers would wait for others to register to fill the field. The committee believes that by lifting this restriction, more fencers will register

once they know they can earn points by placing well.

- Encouraging participation is a key aspect of our youth point system.

- Quantity does not necessarily equal quality in the Y10 age group. There are fewer fencers in this age group (especially in WE, ME, WS and MS) competing at SYCs and these small competitive fields often include the best fencers in the age group.

II. Fencing off for third is not done except for at the Olympic Games and some small divisional qualifiers. Our sport calls for the two fencers who lost in the semi-finals to be tied for third. They should both receive the rewards of that placement. The committee did not see the benefit to the young developing (Y10) fencer completing their day by losing 2 DE's, finishing just outside of points and taking 4th place.

The YDC recognizes that in following the 40% rule, with 8 or 9 competitors, 3 = 40%. Yet, in the interest of what is best for the young competitive fencer, we feel an exception should be made in the rare instance that an event at an SYC is run with a competitive field of 8 or 9 fencers.

Brief background comments were provided by Mr. Salmon:

We currently have strange rules that apply to small SYCs. We are currently making youth fencers fence off for third. We don't do this in other events in our sport. The YDC questions the appropriateness of a 10-year-old having to fence again immediately after losing. There is a minimum of 6 fencers for points to be awarded. This leads to issues with people not signing up unless others sign up. This change makes things easier and promotes the sport.

Second: Mr. Becker

Motion amended: Any requirement of minimum size for SYC and ROC tournaments be removed from the Athlete Handbook and that there not be a requirement for these categories of tournaments to fence-off for third, regardless of size of field.

Motion passed.

Divisions Best Practices Task Force [Reports included as Appendices U-Z]

It was noted that there is a desire for a more complete discussion in light of anticipated strategic planning discussions at September meeting.

Comment: It is easy to get lost in the recounting of small/medium/large/large divisions. We should have a standardized set of principles. This presentation was confusing.

Response (Mr. Benson): We found there are very different sets of needs for different divisions. We put forward samples that divisions could use as guidelines. The only thing we are recommending very strongly is that every division produce procedures that are made public and follow our five principles. The rest are examples to be used as a starting point for those conversations.

Comment: People should feel free to contact Jerry Benson with comments or questions.

Budget Committee [Report included as Appendix AA]

Executive Director Search Task Force [Report included as Appendix AB]

An oral update was provided by Mr. Sabharwal.

Since the report, we have conducted lengthy phone interviews with four short-list candidates. The next step is that strong contenders for the position will be coming to Anaheim for face-to-face interviews. Three interviews have taken place so far. We expect to talk with another 3 or 4 people – perhaps 1 or 2 will move onto the short list. We are making good progress and have good candidates. Exact timing will depend partly on whom we choose and their personal circumstances. Prior to that, we will come to Board with a recommendation of 1 or 2 individuals for a final decision.

Question: Are we still accepting applications?

Answer: Yes.

It was noted that any such new candidates better move quickly.

Compensation Committee [Report included as Appendix AC]

Audit Committee [Report included as Appendix AD]

Election Committee [Report included as Appendix AE]

Question: We had an election. At one point we elected people who won the election. Then we had an additional Board opening. Shouldn't we have appointed the person who received the next highest vote total?

Answer: The Bylaws require that the Board elect the replacement in case of vacancy.

Fencing Officials Commission [Report included as Appendix AF]

Motion (Mr. Baker): To receive committee reports, as submitted to the Board.

Second: Mr. Becker

Ms. Weeks noted that we have more committee reports than in the past. The number also reflects a need for thought towards committee structure. That consideration will take place between now and September.

Motion passed.

VIII. Election of Trustees – United States Fencing Foundation

Background commentary was provided by Ms. Weeks.

There has been a request to leave one position open to allow for a search for a person for that role who will work on enhancing the funding of the Foundation. There has been the desire expressed to grow the foundation fund levels well beyond current levels.

Six names are being put forward now:

Keeth Smart

Stephen Trevor

Steve Sobel

Robert Dow

Donald Anthony

Sam Cheris

Motion (Mr. Blake): To nominate the six people named above.

Second: Mr. Schiller

No further nominees were received.

The six nominees were elected.

IX. Old Business

Motion (Mr. Baker): To adopt the “USA Fencing Policy for Responding to Allegations of Certain Misconduct” included as Appendix K.

Second: Mr. Schiller

Question: Is there a plan to hire for someone as Athlete Protection Officer?

Answer: It's not a full-time position. There are no plans to hire a dedicated individual. The role is considered additional duties for an existing staff member.

Comment: Independence in this position is important.

Response: We have access to USOC resources in case of potential for conflict within our organization.

Comment: I intend to abstain from this and all other similar motions. I don't feel Board appropriately educated. The committee may or may not be. Having addressed these kinds of policies in other contexts, such discussion needs to begin with a comprehensive education program of the Board and there needs to be a lot more knowledge in the organization to make reasonable decisions.

Comment: As a criminal defense attorney, I have experience with such matters. I am concerned about breadth. This calls for an automatic red-light. Members may have substantial rights that have yet to be litigated. Something may be extremely stale and not a disqualification for even highest offices. I know judges that might fail these requirements.

Comment: USOC work indicates that protection of athletes, in some circumstances, needs to trump due process until final resolution. This is consistent in materials coming out of USOC and USA Swimming.

Question: Will there be additional guidance coming from the USOC shortly?

Answer: A variety of materials have been provided to Athlete Protection Task Force. Comment: We are much better off adopting these policies than flailing around for another year without them. Let's not let the search for perfection get in the way of having improvement.

Question: If we get the information and have report that a person has been convicted of a felony, what's next?

Answer: The steps are outlined in the policy.

A discussion of steps available to the Board followed.

Motion (Mr. Wood): To call the question.

Motion to call the question passed.

Motion passed. Mr. Clements and Mr. Becker were opposed. Mr. Salmon, Mr. Glon, Mr. Arias, and Ms. Kwan abstained.

All others voted in favor, except Mr. Blake who was out of the room at the time.

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal on behalf of the APTF): The pre-screening questionnaire in Appendix L is adopted as a standard for the National Office in its interviews of staff and will be made available to clubs as a minimum standard to satisfy the obligations of Member clubs.

Second: Mr. Herr

This motion was tabled during the meeting on May 24, 2012.

It was noted that the Board had discussed this proposal previously.

Comment: We referred this to committee in May. The task force has not altered the document to reflect any changes. It should be voted down at this time. If they would like to bring it back up, it should come up as a new item in completed form.

There was a request that the minutes reflect that the motion was not being defeated on the merits, but rather due to a lack of completeness.

Motion defeated. Ms. Kwan abstained.

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal on behalf of the APTF): To adopt the Non-Fencer Code of Conduct in Appendix F, effective May 1, 2012.

Second: Mr. Herr

This motion was tabled during the meeting on May 24, 2012.

[Secretary's Note: A revised version of the Non-Fencer Code of Conduct has been included as Appendix F]

Motion (Mr. Sabharwal on behalf of the APTF): To adopt the APTF USFA Policy on Messages in Appendix G, effective May 1, 2012.

Second: Mr. Herr

This motion was tabled during the meeting on May 24, 2012.

[Secretary's Note: A revised version of the Policy on Messages has been included as Appendix G]

Motion (Clements): To consolidate the two motions above.

Second: Blake

Motion to consolidate passed.

Discussion was heard regarding the rationale behind the deletion of bullet point 2.

The motions were amended to have effective date of August 1, 2012.

Motion passed. Mr. Herr opposed. Mr. Baker, Mr. Becker, and Ms. Kwan abstained.

X. New Business

A. Bylaws Revisions

The USA Fencing Bylaws specify the following procedure for amendment of the Bylaws by the Board of Directors:

Procedure. Any member of the Board of Directors may move the adoption of amendments to these Bylaws or the adoption of new bylaws. Not later than forty-five days before the date of any meeting of the Board at which an amendment or new bylaw is to be

considered, a general notice of the proposed change shall be published prominently on the USFA's website. Such notice shall set forth the text of the proposed amendment, the time and place of the meeting of the Board of Directors at which the change is to be considered, and provide a means by which general comments of the membership relating to the proposal may be communicated for distribution to the Board of Directors not less than five days before the meeting. Amendments and new bylaws shall be adopted upon the affirmative vote of not fewer than two-thirds of the members of the Board of Directors then in office.

Motion (Mr. Salmon): To publish, in accordance with USFA Bylaws Article XIV, Section 2.a., a notice of proposed amendments to the Bylaws to be voted upon at the September 2012 meeting of the Board of Directors, and to provide a means by which comments of the membership relating to the proposed amendments may be commented upon for distribution to the Board prior to such meeting.

- a. To adjust the by-laws in Article VII Section 2.g. for the qualifications of the Age Group Parent Director to include the Junior and U-23 fencer.

Rationale: With the limitations of "being a parent or guardian of a cadet or youth fencer" the board experienced difficulty finding candidates with enough fencing exposure to be a contributing board member. Almost every candidate needed to have either other USFA experience or a large disparity between siblings to be an effective board member.

Mr. Salmon discussed the original rationale with by-laws contributor Alan Kuver. He described that the goal was to give representation to the 1/3 of the membership (minors) that are not represented. Although this rationale does have merit, increasing the parenting age group does not take away from this representation. The increase will expand the candidate pool so that the candidates will not need to wear other hats to be effective.

- b. Article IX, Section 3(a) of the current USA Fencing Bylaws should be modified as the following:

- a. The Nominating Committee shall nominate ~~two~~ **AT LEAST ONE** qualified candidates **CANDIDATE** for the office of President and ~~two~~ **AT LEAST ONE** qualified candidates **CANDIDATE** for the office of Treasurer, and shall announce its nominees no later than January 15 of the calendar year in which the elections are to be held by publishing the names of the nominees and any report issued by the Committee on the USFA web site.

Rationale: The Nominating Committee feels that it should be given more flexibility in nominating candidates since there are cases when only one candidate is deemed worthy to be nominated by the committee while in other cases there may be three or more candidates worthy to be nominated by the committee.

- c. Article IX, Section 4(a) of the current USA Fencing Bylaws should be modified as the following:

Nominations by the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee shall nominate ~~twice the number of~~ **AT LEAST AS MANY** qualified candidates as there are directors to be selected in each category, and shall announce its nominees no later than January 15 of the calendar year in which the elections are to be held by publishing the names of the nominees and any report issued by the Committee on the USFA web site.

Rationale: The Nominating Committee feels that it should be given more flexibility in nominating candidates since there are cases when only one candidate is deemed worthy to be nominated by the committee for each elected position while in other cases there may be two or more candidates worthy to be nominated by the committee for that elected position.

The Elections Committee requests the following changes in Article IX of the USFA Bylaws, *Elections*, as set forth below.

d. Article 9, Section 11. Plurality

In elections by the membership to fill positions in the USFA, the candidate receiving the greatest number of votes shall be declared the winner, [provided that if no candidate for a given position receives at least 35% of the votes cast, there shall be a runoff election between the two candidates who receive the greatest number of votes.] *provided that if there is a tie in the votes cast for a position, the Board of Directors will select the winning candidate. [Added]*

Rationale:

Due the low rates of membership participation in elections, (the most recent election had 20% of eligible voters participating, which was the largest to date) the plurality provisions have caused significant problems for the Election Committee, particularly in construction of the percentage of votes cast for directors, when there are two votes to be cast by each member for at large candidates. Removal of the plurality provision would leave the member with the greatest number of votes cast declared the winner, with a provision for a tie breaker in the unlikely event of a numerical tie. This will reduce the time necessary for elections, and possibly lead to a lower charge from Vote Net, as the contract had a runoff possibility built in.

e. Section 13. Method of Selecting Directors by the Membership.

The following procedures shall govern this election of Directors: ...

(b) In the selection of At-Large-Directors, each voting member shall be allocated two votes to be distributed among the candidates as the member chooses, but no member may cast more than one vote for any candidate for the position.

Add:

However, a member need not cast a vote for every eligible position.

Rationale:

As a requirement of the contract with Vote Net, the electronic voting provisions were set up

to require a vote for every position. However, there is no bylaw requirement to do so, and this amendment is to clarify the existing procedure, so that the contract with Vote Net, or any future electronic voting vendor, may also be clarified.

f. Section 5. Delivery of Petitions.

No petition shall serve to nominate a candidate for any USFA position unless the original and all parts thereof are submitted to the National Office of the USFA and a copy is received by the chair of the Election Committee before April 1 of the year in which the election is to be conducted. ...
Add:
No electronic petitions are allowed.

Rationale:

During the most recent election, there was a question as to whether or not a petition could be circulated electronically. It was the position of the Election Committee that the Bylaws, by reference to proof of mailing, implied that petitions could only be hard copy, and in addition, it would be more difficult to substantiate membership numbers and valid signatures gathered electronically. The numbers of signatures required for a Petition are sufficiently low enough that it is not overly difficult to find enough members to sign a hard copy of petition, which can certainly be completed in sub-parts. Primarily, Committee concerns regarding voter fraud and verification are the primary rationale for this clarification.

g. Section 8. Proceedings of the Election Committee.

[The Proceedings] *Formal Meetings [Added]* of the Election Committee shall be open, except for deliberations in arbitration and consultations with legal counsel regarding matters within the protection of the attorney/client privilege. Reasonable notice of meetings of the Election Committee shall be given by posting on the official USFA website. Candidates for office or their designated representatives may attend such meetings at their own expense.

Rationale:

The majority of the work of the Election Committee was done via email consultations, and in fact in the most recent election, the Election Committee had no formal meetings, with two ad hoc meetings held amongst the members present at various national events. Thus, the addition is sought to provide clarification that any formal meeting actually held would be open, as necessary, in order to give transparency to the voters and to provide for a record of any open meetings, but the section does not as presently constituted, appear to adequately address the current state of affairs.

h. Section 1. Method of Balloting.

The Board of Directors shall provide a secure and adequate method of electronic voting that assures compliance with the voting qualifications, requirements and procedures set forth in the

Bylaws, that protects the secrecy of each member's vote and that prevents the casting of illegitimate ballots. Such method may, but need not, be the only method for the casting of ballots, unless otherwise provided by these Bylaws. Ballots not cast by electronic means shall be returned to the Election Committee of its designee at the expense and risk of the voter.

Add:

To insure the validity and security of electronic voting, no more than two members may have the same email address.

Rationale:

Currently, family members may share an email address. The National office sends emails to the address shown on the membership application, and if there were group or club registrations, there are no prohibitions on placing the same email on all applications. There are concerns on the Committee about voting fraud, since the election procedures and voting access are provided via email. It is anticipated that if two members already have an identical email address, (for example, a family), then the National Office will be required to contact any new member using the same email address in order to establish a new, different email address.

Second: Mr. Becker

It was noted that there is no uniformity or consistency in how various groups worded proposed changes. It was suggested, for the sake of clarity, that they be harmonized. Specifically, how language to be excised is to be indicated and how language to be added is to be indicated.

The motion was amended to include a clause to require standardized language.

Motion (Mr. Salmon): To publish, in a uniform style as prepared by General Counsel, in accordance with USFA Bylaws Article XIV, Section 2.a., a notice of proposed amendments to the Bylaws to be voted upon at the September 2012 meeting of the Board of Directors, and to provide a means by which comments of the membership relating to the proposed amendments may be commented upon for distribution to the Board prior to such meeting.

Motion passed.

B. Other Motions

Motion (Mr. Blake): When a team event and an individual event in the same gender weapon are scheduled on the same day and the entry deadline is before the day schedule is posted, any withdrawals due to the time conflict will be refunded in full.

Rationale: Currently, entry deadlines are before the day schedule is posted. When the event schedule is posted, if a team or individual has to withdraw because of the times in the day schedule, only 50% of the entry fee is refunded. Although we have been using the entry numbers to make the most effective day schedule, it does not seem to be the best way to deal with members who are up against this conflict.

Second: Mr. Glon

Motion passed.

Motion to reconsider (Mr. Clements)

Second: Becker

Motion to reconsider passed.

Motion amended to add “effective June 29, 2012.”

Question: Why are we making this retroactive?

Answer: It was intended to cover this Summer Nationals when originally proposed.

Comment: If it had come up two weeks ago, I would not have supported it being effective for this Summer Nationals. I support the motion, but not making it retroactive.

Discussion took place regarding the effect of the change and references to the limited amount of money involved.

Motion passed. Mr. Baker opposed. Mr. Wood, Ms. Kwan, and Mr. Arias abstained.

Motion (Mr. Thompson, on behalf of the Tournament Committee): To weight Division II NAC events at 1.5 times the normal point value for the ROC Division II points list, and to adopt the changes to the Athlete Handbook included in Appendix M, effective August 1, 2012.

Second: Ms. Kwan

Motion(Mr. Clements): To refer the motion to Divisions & Sections Committee, ROC Committee, Tournament Committee, Tournament Oversight Committee, Youth Development Committee and Athlete Council for comment.

Second: Mr. Becker.

Parliamentary question: Is discussion on a motion to refer to committee allowed?

Answer: No.

Motion to refer to committee passed. Mr. Baker opposed.

Comment: This is not how this should have been handled. We can have discussions without a motion, much less a motion which is immediately moved to be referred to a half dozen committees cutting off any possibility of discussion when it does appear on the Board agenda.

Motion (Mr. Clements): To modify the background check policy for international personnel as follows:

All USA Fencing paid staff and any member of the cadre of a USA Fencing contingent at an international event must successfully pass a background screen administered by NCSI. This policy will take effect on August 1, 2012. For purposes of this policy: (1) "USA Fencing paid staff" means employees and independent contractors receiving compensation from USA Fencing other than individuals whose only compensation includes payment of travel expenses, per diem, and a nominal honorarium to attend an event principally as an official for said event; and (2) "member of the cadre of a USA Fencing contingent" means any individual accompanying USA Fencing athletes to an event whose function at an event requires providing substantial interaction with and support for USA Fencing athletes and for whom USA Fencing provides total or partial monetary support to attend said event.

The motion text was slightly amended from the version present in the agenda and above. The amended text was not available at the time the minutes were prepared.

Second: Mr. Wood

The APTF noted that they have not opined on whether or not referees should be covered.

The FOC has indicated they are opposed to including referees.

Comment: This is another motion without sufficient background education.

Comment: This is modifying a policy we've already adopted.

Suggestion: Adding sentence saying referees, unless there is significant programmatic interaction with athletes, are not subject to this.

Response: That would be too wishy-washy.

Comment: I haven't traveled often. When I did, on one occasion I had an athlete (19-years-old) as a roommate. The other times I was always around the athletes, at the same hotel, and ate with them.

Excluding referees would create a huge hole in our policy. How would this be implemented in practice? Who would say this referee on this trip has programmatic interaction and that referee on that trip does not. Especially if we need to make such determination at least 30 days in advance of the trip.

Comment: Let's protect athletes from everyone. All athletes need to undergo a background check. All members need to get a background check. This is the logical continuation of where that goes.

Question: Why is the FOC opposed?

Answer: Because we have young people that we don't pay who pay their own money for their work.

We can't add more costs. They can't afford this. We're asking them to spend more money they don't have in order to help us out.

Comment: The American Red Cross provides background checks on 5,000 employees and 60,000 volunteers. The ARC pays for that.

Response: I have no problem with that, but we don't have money for that.

Response: A contrary example is from USA Swimming. USA Swimming has 40,000 background checks. They are paid for at personal expense. Volunteer timers on the swim deck need this. USA Softball does 60,000 per year. Anyone on the field with athletes needs to have a background check.

Question: How much are those people paid?

Answer: Below the national level, these people are all volunteers.

Motion failed. Mr. Rodriguez, Ms. Kwan, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Baker, Mr. Glon, Mr. Salmon, and Mr. Becker abstained. Mr. Clements voted in favor. The final vote tally was 1 in favor, 6 opposed, with 7 abstaining.

XI. Good and Welfare

Ms. Weeks reported a very successful All-Academic essay contest was held once again this year. The contest called for background information and essays. Essays were written in response to a statement

regarding an experience in fencing that has been transformative. Mary Griffith, Jennie Salmon and Kate Sierra were thanked for their extensive assistance in designing the essay prompt and rating the essays. Four winners are to be announced on Friday. 2 will receive \$1,000 scholarships, 2 will receive \$4,000 scholarships. \$10,000 was donated by Absolute Fencing to support the scholarships.

Question: Is there an intention to publish the prize-winning essays?

Answer: There has been discussion of that. It has not yet been formalized.

The Annual Meeting will be September 28-30 in Colorado Springs, CO.

XII. Executive Session to consider personnel, litigation, disciplinary and membership matters

Motion(Mr. Glon): To move to executive session.

Second: Mr. Herr

Motion passed.

The Board passed a resolution to form a disciplinary panel to investigate the behavior of a fencer at a local tournament in the Capitol Division. The panel is instructed to provide a report to the Board, including a recommendation of action(s) to take.

The Board passed a resolution authorizing the expenditure of \$2,500 each to reimburse Kalle Weeks and Donald Anthony for expenses incurred to attend the Olympic Games in London.

The Board passed a resolution that no expenditures during the London Olympic Games and travel to or from London will be reimbursed unless it has been approved by at least two of three of the following: Mr. Dilworth, Ms. Weeks, and Mr. Sabharwal.

XIII. Adjournment

Motion (Mr. Baker): To adjourn the meeting.

Second: Mr. Schiller

Motion passed.

Appendix A
Executive Director's Report

[To be distributed separately]

Appendix B
Athlete Council – 2012-2016

New Athlete Council - in office at the conclusion of the Summer Olympics:

- (1) Ryan Estep - Wheelchair Representative
- (2) Natalie Vie - Women's Epee Representative
- (3) Daria Schneider - Women's Sabre Representative (Alternate, USA Fencing Representative to the USOC AAC)
- (4) Doris Willette - Women's Foil Representative
- (5) Greg Chang - Men's Foil Representative
- (6) Jeff Spear - Men's Sabre Representative
- (7) Cody Mattern - Men's Epee Representative (USA Fencing Representative to the USOC AAC)
- (8) Soren Thompson - Incumbent (Men's Epee fencer) (Chair, Athlete Council)
- (9) Holly Buechel - Incumbent (Women's Epee fencer)
- (10) Iris Zimmermann - Incumbent (Women's Foil fencer)
- (11) Rafael Suarez - Incumbent (Men's Foil fencer)

Athlete representatives to the Board of Directors:

Cody Mattern
Daria Schneider
Soren Thompson

Appendix C

National Team Oversight Committee (NTOC) Report

The NTOC convened an in-person meeting on June 2nd and 3rd in Newark, NJ.

The following issues were discussed during the meeting:

1. Recommend replacing Feb 2010 description of function of NTOC with revised mission, roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority of NTOC. New motion attached to this meeting's report.
2. Adding new members to the NTOC - representatives from YDC (Jennie Salmon) and wheelchair community (Ginny Boydston). New motion attached to this meeting's report.
3. Resolved that the maximum number of cadets allowed to be entered in designated international cadet competitions will be 20 per weapon.
4. Resolved that the squad fees for cadets and juniors be set at \$275 per accepted entry.
5. Performance grant of \$275 with submission of related travel receipts for a top-4 result at designated international cadet competitions and top-8 for designated junior world cup competitions.
6. One US referee at designated junior and cadet international competitions will be named 'Head of Delegation' and will need to perform a number of responsibilities with help from the designated coach.
7. Number of designated international events - three for cadet, four for junior (except sabre +1 for Phoenix).
8. Review, update, and approve responsibilities for Weapon Squad Manager and International Team Manager.
9. Discussion of World University Games – funding proposed similar to last WUG by working with universities to help fund their athletes; work with Emik Kaidanov on program; propose to have most recent NCAA Overall champion to have first right of refusal to send cadre.
10. Discussion and formulation of new Division I, Junior, and Cadet domestic tournament format for NAC tournaments only.
11. Review job description for National Coaches. Recommend that current national coach contracts be extended until November 1, 2012.
12. Review job description for High Performance Director. Recommend that job description be posted to USA Fencing website as soon as possible.
13. Request guidelines on development of a National Training Club/Center from HPD
14. Recommend HPD that international points gap between placements in 33-64 table be only one point for SF of 2.0.
15. Recommend Strength Factor to be raised to a maximum of 2.5 for senior world cups.
16. Recommend for men's epee team selection that there be no limit to the number of 33-64 results that can be considered in Group II team point standings.
17. Recommend the actual strength factor will be applied to places 33-64 only if SF is at least 2.0 and there are at least 160 or more fencers registered fencers.

Jim Page will be discussing some of these issues with the National Coaches at the upcoming Zonal Championships. The next in-person meeting is scheduled to take place in September. The HPD is expected to present a draft of the High Performance Plan for the 2012-2016 Quad to the NTOC at that meeting. This HPP needs to be submitted to the USOC by October 1, 2012.

Appendix D

Proposed NTOC Modifications

The National Team Oversight Committee will be responsible for the following:

- Review and approve High Performance Plan required by the USOC, and to monitor progress in fulfilling those plans as needed;
- Review and approve national coach performance plans on an annual basis, and if major modifications are requested;
- Review and approve international team selection criteria on an annual basis, and if modifications are requested by the National Coaches;
- Review budgets for all weapon squad programs on an annual basis;
- Review budgets that pertain to international events as needed (e.g. World Championships);
- Review and approve performance cadre for teams selected for major multi-weapon international tournaments and World Championships;
- Recommend any changes to domestic tournament formats and point systems, in conjunction with relevant committees and the FOC, if requested by the National Coaches or the HPD, for approval by the HPD.
- Review and approve job descriptions for national coaches and High Performance Director;
- Review any elite performance plans for wheelchair program development;
- Review plans regarding practices and procedures affecting athlete performance.

The HPD is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the international program, including managing staff and team development. The HPD will work in conjunction with the NTOC on all issues listed above in order to ensure that international program, including domestic plans that impact international development, and budget goals are met.

Although not limited by such membership, the NTOC proposes that members of the NTOC should be composed of coaches, who have trained and traveled with elite athletes to international tournaments, other than national coaches, as well as a representative, or a designee, each from the Tournament Committee, the Fencing Officials Commission, the Youth Development Committee, and the Wheelchair community. In addition, there must be at least 20% athlete representation on this committee.

No full-time or part-time member of the National Office may serve on this committee as a voting member. The High Performance Director shall be independent of the NTOC reporting as a member of the National Office professional staff.

Rationale:

The National Team Oversight Committee (NTOC) was established at the February 2010 meeting of the Board of Directors and approved by the Executive Committee during its June 17, 2010 teleconference. The NTOC convened in Newark, NJ on June 2nd and 3rd of 2012. At its meeting the NTOC discussed the mission, goals, and responsibilities. After reviewing what had been proposed, established, and approved by the Executive Committee in 2010, the NTOC, along with the High Performance Director, Jim Page, and Executive Director, Greg Dilworth, concluded that in order for the international program of USA Fencing to succeed the NTOC and the HPD should work in a collaborative fashion. In order for that to happen the members of the NTOC felt that the committee should have more than just an “advisory” role but should have more of active decisive role with the HPD and the National Office regarding the international programs. The HPD and ED agreed. This motion has been reviewed and approved by the NTOC, the HPD, and the ED.

Below is the original NTOC motion that was passed by the Executive Committee in June of 2010.

Primary Responsibilities:

- Review High Performance Plans to be submitted to the USOC, and to monitor progress in fulfilling those plans;
- Review national coach plans on an annual basis;
- Review international team selection criteria and systems on an annual basis;
- Review budgets for all weapon squad programs, national team camps, World Championships; and the Olympic Games;
- Provide oversight of appointments of cadre for teams selected for international tournaments and World Championships;
- Recommend actions that pertain to High Performance Plans, annual national coach plans, international team selection criteria, cadre selection, and budgets;
- Review plans regarding practices and procedures affecting athlete performance;
- Recommend actions to improve opportunities for elite athletes who compete on the international level;
- Recommend policy matters affecting sport performance.

The committee will report to the Director of Sport Strategy. If any actions or recommendations are overruled by or are in conflict with the Director of Sport Strategy's decisions, such decision-making responsibilities will then be transferred to the Executive Director. The Executive Director, in his or her discretion, may refer such decisions to the Board of Directors and, as timing requires, to the Executive Committee. Furthermore, the NTOC will be guided by the Budget Committee on matters regarding funding other than USOC grants.

The Executive Committee proposes that members of NTOC should be composed of the following types of people with the following types of expertise:

- High Performance/Elite Coach – a coach that has trained and traveled with elite athletes to national/domestic and international tournaments (national coaches are excused from filling this slot);
- USFA Budget Committee representative – a member of the Budget committee should serve on this committee to provide some perspective on budgetary concerns;
- Cadre member of Olympic, World Championship, or Pan American team who has current knowledge of international issues/policies/procedures;
- A Veteran Fencer – an athlete who still competes in the Veterans' age group who competed at high-level international tournaments in the past;
- Athlete representative – an athlete who has competed at the World Championships, Olympic Games, or Paralympics within the past 10 years (all athletes who are currently aspiring for such teams are excused from filling this slot though).

In addition, a member of the national coaching staff, selected by the national coaches, will be a non-voting member, as will the Director of Sport Strategy. No full-time or part-time member of the National Office may serve on this committee as a voting member. The chair of the group is to be selected by the committee from among its voting members. Furthermore, as the agenda dictates, representatives of the Tournament Committee and Fencing Officials Commission will serve as advisors.

Appendix E Safe Sport Task Force

To: USA Fencing BOD

From: Steve Sobel, Chair and Felicia Zimmermann, Vice-Chair Safe Sport Task Force

Re: Report on actions and recommendations

1. Non-Fencer's Code of Conduct and USA Fencing Massage Policy

At its last face-to-face meeting the USA Fencing BOD considered proposals from the Safe Sport Task Force on these two policies. Changes were suggested and the documents were returned to the SSFT for further consideration and clarification. The documents now presented contain the recommendations from the BOD and have been reaffirmed by the SSTF.

Non-Fencer Code of Conduct – Appendix A – The major change was elimination of a provision referencing past criminal actions and disqualification criteria. The document is now more specific in terms of the competitions covered and forward looking in suggesting appropriate actions and guidelines for inappropriate behavior around the teams.

USA Fencing Massage Policy – Appendix B - There were two major changes to this document. A second sentence was eliminated in item 4 that seemed to contradict the statement remaining and at a minimum confused the meaning of the provision. Item 6 was completely changed by adopting language suggested by Aaron in his explanation of BOD concerns to the SSTF.

2. Disqualification criteria used by NCSI to issue Red Light Finding- Appendix C

It appears the BOD has never reviewed this proposal from the SSTF to redefine the criteria under which NCSI would issue "Red Light" finding. The effect of the proposed changes is to divide possible finding into two categories, i.e. those that are so egregious that there is no possibility of an appeal and those that could be considered conditional findings and appealable to the Athlete Protection Officer and to the BOD. The effect of this change is to more carefully define the opportunities for appeals to insure that persons guilty of offenses that may not threaten fencing athlete safety have a chance to explain and when appropriate to continue to be involved in the sport.

3. Change to remove referees from the motion adopted by the BOD on mandatory screening requirements.

The SSTF proposed the following amendment to the BOD for consideration at the last face-to-face meeting:

"All USA Fencing paid staff and any person representing USA Fencing at an international event (e.g. U-17 Int'l Event, World Cups) in an official capacity (e.g. Captain, etc) and receiving monetary support to attend an the event must successfully pass a background screen administered by NCSI."

During the discussion at the BOD the motion was discussed, changed to provide clarity and passed as follows:

"All USA Fencing paid staff and any person representing USA Fencing at an international event in an official capacity (including cadre and referees) and receiving monetary support to attend the event must successfully pass a background screen administered by NCSI at their own expense. This policy will take effect on August 1, 2012"

While it may be the case that referees should be included specifically in this proposal, the SSTF thinks it is inappropriate to include them at this time, as there have been no discussions with the FOC on the intent or the implications. Therefore the SSTF suggests the following changes to the approved motion:

"All USA Fencing paid staff and any person representing USA Fencing at an international event in an official capacity (including all members of the cadre) and receiving monetary support to attend the event must successfully pass a background screen administered by NCSI at their own expense. This policy will take effect on August 1, 2012"

4. Recommendations dealing with membership categories and those who should be required to pass a background screen as criterion of membership.

(This is where Felicia's new wording would go)

Appendix F NON-FENCER CODE OF CONDUCT

The following rules of conduct will be strictly applied to all USA Fencing personnel ~~including, but not limited to, who are~~ members of the cadre at any international or domestic World Cup, World Championship, Pan American Games, World University Games, Youth Olympics, Olympic Games, or Paralympic Games competition, ~~camp or other fencing activity~~. Any failure to adhere to this code of conduct may result in disciplinary action.

The following shall be considered violations of the USA Fencing Code of Conduct for Non-Fencing personnel:

- Violation of the Amateur Sports Act, which requires that USA Fencing must provide an equal opportunity to amateur fencers, coaches, trainers, administrators and officials to participate in amateur athletic competition without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, age, sex or national origin.
- ~~Conviction of, imposition of a deferred sentence for, or any plea of guilty or no contest at any time, past or present, or the existence of any pending charges for any felony, any offense involving use, possession, distribution or intent to distribute illegal drugs or substances or any crime involving assault or sexual assault.~~
- Any inappropriate sexual contact or advance or any other inappropriate sexually oriented behavior or action directed towards a fencer by a cadre member, including violation of any sexual misconduct or harassment policy of USA Fencing that may be in effect.
- The sale or distribution of illegal drugs or the illegal sale or distribution of any substance on the World Anti-Doping Agency's (WADA) recognized list of banned substances.¹
- The illegal possession or use of illegal drugs in the presence of a fencer by a cadre member.
- Engaging in any activity that contravenes the stricter of the laws of the United States of America (USA) or the host country in which the activity is taking place.
- Providing alcohol to a fencer by a cadre member when the fencer is under the legal age and therefore prohibited from purchasing or consuming alcohol.
- The act or the appearance of intoxication from the use of alcohol or illegal drugs in the presence of a fencer or cadre member.
- Any non-consensual physical contact with or abuse (including verbal abuse) of any person by a cadre member.
- Any intentional act of dishonesty in connection with any USA Fencing-related activity.

¹ The United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) adheres to WADA guidelines. USADA at www.usantidoping.org, drug reference number: (national: 800-233-0393), (international: 719-785-2020)

- Any non-consensual physical contact, obscene language or gesture or other threatening language or conduct directed toward any official, which is related to any decision made by such official in conjunction with a USA Fencing-related event.
- Violation of any team rule of conduct as established by the United State Olympic Committee (USOC), USA Fencing, the Federation International d’Escrime (FIE), or person in authority leading an international team, including but not limited to deportment, curfew, practice, team meeting attendance, and prompt attendance at competitions.
- Any other act, conduct or omission not provided in this code which is detrimental to the image or reputation of USA Fencing, the USA or sport of fencing, or which violates a rule established by the USOC, FIE, International Olympic Committee (IOC) or other governing body.

All members of any traveling party including personal coaches are expected to adhere to and reinforce the rules and regulations listed above.

AFFIRMATION

I have read and accept this Code of Conduct, including the USFA Grievance Procedure contained in the USFA Athlete Handbook. I agree to the rules, guidelines, jurisdiction and procedures stated in this document as a condition of being authorized to participate as a member of the cadre or to coach any USA Fencing athletes at any international or domestic World Cup, World Championship, Pan American Games, World University Games, Youth Olympics, Olympic Games, or Paralympic Games competition, camp, or other fencing activity.

Signature

Date

Appendix G

US Fencing Policy on Massage

Introduction:

Massage is an important injury prevention and rehabilitation therapy that is used extensively with athletes. However, the application of massage can also create an opportunity for exploitation and abuse as the athlete receiving the massage may not be fully dressed during the treatment and the massage may involve touching sensitive areas of the body including the buttocks, upper thighs and chest. This is of particular concern if the athlete is a minor. As protection of athletes is the primary concern of US Fencing development of a policy on massage is needed to diminish the possibility of any unethical and/or unprofessional behavior by those assigned by US Fencing to provide massage to its members in specifically sanctioned circumstances, including, but not limited to, World Cup, Zonal and World Championships teams and any US Fencing-sponsored training camps and housing. Additionally, as the massage therapy provider is regarded as representing the organization in these situations, any liability associated with misconduct by the provider can extend to the US Fencing as well. Finally, a policy is necessary to protect the massage provider from unfounded claims of misconduct.

Recognizing this, in 2003 USFA President Stacey Johnson appointed a Task Force consisting of Donald Alperstein, Irwin Bernstein, and Steve Sobel to develop a USFA policy. In 2010, USFA President Kalle Weeks appointed an Athlete Protection Task Force (APTF) consisting of Steve Sobel (Chairman), Hector Cruz Lopez, Dale Rogers, Felicia Zimmermann, and Jim Page (USFA Staff Liaison) to review the general subject of providing a safe environment for athletes in fencing. The APTF has reviewed the work of the USOC, and other NGBs in various areas of potential abuse, and the role of NGBs in general. Reviewing various issues related to the use of massage in sport, the APTF determined that any policy must have the following priority goals:

- a) protect the athletes, especially minors,
- b) protect the organization, and
- c) protect US Fencing Sports Medicine staff and personnel assigned to athlete healthcare.

Moreover, the policy must have the following characteristics:

- a) be appropriate and rational
- b) be implementable,
- c) account for the varied circumstances in which massage may be legitimately utilized with US Fencing athletes, and
- d) contain a mechanism for reporting and adjudicating instances of misconduct.

As noted previously, the policy will be applicable to all US Fencing-sponsored teams (World Cups, World Championships, Zonal events, etc) as well as US Fencing-sponsored training camps housing.

The APTF proposes that the policy detailed below be adopted by the Board of Directors.

US Fencing Policy on Massage

1. Only US Fencing members who hold an appropriate certification as a healthcare provider (MD, DO, DC, certified athletic trainer (ATC), physical or occupational therapist, or massage therapist (LMT, CMT)) and who are appointed by US Fencing to a team or sponsored event in an official capacity as a healthcare provider can provide massage therapy to team members.
2. Any athlete who is a minor must have a signed consent form, release or waiver of liability from his/her parents to be eligible for massage therapy services from the designated US Fencing staff. The appropriate form will be provided to all athletes in settings covered by this policy by US Fencing prior to the beginning of the covered trip, competition or camp. Any US Fencing member who engages in massage of a minor in violation of this policy shall be deemed acting in a manner detrimental to the welfare, interests or character of the US Fencing and shall be subject to disciplinary action that can result in suspension, expulsion or denial of membership.
3. Under no circumstances will an athlete be required to be naked to receive massage services from the designated staff. At a minimum, all athletes will wear shorts and females will additionally wear a bra or top. In all cases, the athlete will also be appropriately draped during the massage.
4. Although the US Fencing has no authority over private activities involving US Fencing members in private settings, it nevertheless recommends due diligence by all members of US Fencing to avoid unprofessional conduct, exploitation or abuse involving massage.
5. Nothing in this policy is meant to prohibit ad hoc massage of athletes in exigent circumstances by others (for example a coach or teammate) in a public setting when the personnel designated in Section 1 are not immediately available (this situation would generally involve massage of the extremities due to cramping during a bout).
6. Any USA Fencing member who provides massages in violation of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action that can result in suspension, expulsion, or denial of membership. USA Fencing will maintain a reporting and adjudication system and will mandate case reporting to the Athlete Protection Officer (APO), who will oversee and coordinate investigations of all instances reported by members of USA Fencing who believe they have been subject to misconduct in regards to receiving massage or who are aware of cases that contravene this policy. On recommendation of the APO, USA Fencing may institute disciplinary action through its adjudication system. Details of the reporting system and the designated APO will be published prior to any event covered by this policy on USA Fencing's website and, if possible, in the Athlete's Handbook, and such details will additionally be included in any event-specific communication issued by USA Fencing (such as the Athlete's Packet for national tournaments).

Appendix H

USA Fencing Criminal Background Check Disqualification Criteria

The USA Fencing Safe Sport Task Force proposes that USA Fencing work with the NCSI, the agency authorized to conduct background screens on behalf of USA Fencing, to amend to criteria under which “red light” designations are provided to USA Fencing and the circumstances under which such designations may be appealed.

USA Fencing Criminal Background Check Disqualification Criteria

Automatic Disqualifiers (“Red Light”): An individual will be disqualified from USA Fencing membership if a background search reveals that such individual has been convicted of, received an imposition of a deferred sentence for, or for any plea of guilty or no contest at any time, or the existence of any pending charges for any crime involving:

- a. Any felony involving violence against a person (including crimes involving firearms) or animal abuse
- b. Any felony or misdemeanor involving:
 - i. Sexual misconduct
 - ii. Drug distribution or the intent to distribute, within the previous 7 years;
 - iii. Child endangerment, neglect or abuse

Individuals subject to disqualification may request an appeal through the USA Fencing Athlete Protection Officer (APO) to evaluate the accuracy of the reported information, but not the consequence of disqualification if the above criteria are met.

Appealable Disqualifiers (“Red Light”): An individual will be subject to review for disqualification from USA Fencing membership if a background search reveals that such individual has been convicted of, received an imposition of a deferred sentence for, or for any plea of guilty or no contest at any time, or the existence of any pending charges at any time of any crime involving:

- a. Other Felonies not included in 1 above;
- b. Other Misdemeanors for:
 - i. Drug use or possession (including the use of drug paraphernalia) within the previous 3 years and any other drug related crime not covered in i. above
 - ii. Violence against a person (including crimes involving firearms);
 - iii. Destruction of property;
 - iv. Animal abuse

Individuals subject to disqualification may request an appeal through the USA Fencing Athlete Protection Officer (APO) to evaluate both the accuracy of the reported information, and the consequence of disqualification if the above criteria are met.

Appendix I

Safe Sport Task Force Recommendations

Original SSTF Motion Amended/Approved – April 26, 2012

All coaches employed by Member Clubs must be Professional Members of USA Fencing by the 2012-2013 season. This requires each coach to successfully complete a pre-screening interview at the club and successfully pass a background screen administered by the NCSI. The National Office is directed to publish procedures for implementing this policy no later than July 1, 2012.

Table 1:

Type	Background Screening	Note
Competitive	No	
Professional / Coach	Yes	
Non-Competitive	No	
Supporting	No	
Lifetime	No	
Plus	Yes	Provided to other types so that an individual does not need to change their membership type. For example, a lifetime member can be a coach and adding the “Plus” designation will allow them to keep their type as well as be identified as successfully passing the background check

SSTF Proposals

- Proposed Membership Class Name Changes**

To rename the existing membership class “Professional” member to “Coach Member”. Individuals in Coach Membership class must successfully pass a background screen, administered by USA Fencing's selected background screening company, within 30 days of membership registration. In addition, other membership categories would be reflected as a “Plus” Membership after successfully passing the screening within 30 days of purchasing a membership upgrade to “Plus”. This provision will be implemented for the 2012-2013 season.

Rationale: *The various categories currently for the membership describe the clearly the type of segment, e.g. Athlete. The taskforce highly recommends and encourages the change from Professional to Coach for clarity. At this time USA Fencing does not provide testing or certification to designate an individual as a professional coach and the category of Professional can be misconstrued. See Table 1 for the types of membership and definition of Plus.*

- Proposed SSTF Amendment**

All coaches employed or receiving compensation by Member Clubs and Affiliate Clubs must be Coach Members of USA Fencing or have successfully passed a background check. This requires each coach to successfully pass a background screen administered by USA Fencing's selected background screening company, within 30 days of registration. This provision will be implemented for the 2012-2013 season.

Note: Addition of “receiving compensation” to cover contract coaches or individuals receiving any form of compensation to the background screen requirement. Membership class name change is also reflected, from “Professional Member” to “Coach Member”.

Rationale: *As part of one of the key categories to create a successful Safe Sport environment, it is important that a background check of the coaches is undertaken. By requirement through lessons, coaches in the sport of Fencing are in close proximity and relationship with their athletes, many of them children. It is important that parents and owners are clear about the history of their coaching staff. Club owners can promote and demonstrate successful background checks of their coaching staff and parents can be assured given the policy of USA Fencing and the process of the screening company.*

- **Proposed SSTF Motion**

All Owners and Principal Officers of Member Clubs and Affiliate Clubs must be a member of USA Fencing with a Plus upgrade or a Coach membership. The Membership Plus upgrade or Coach membership requires the individual to successfully pass a background screen administered by USA Fencing's selected background screening company, within 30 days of the upgrade or membership registration. This provision will be implemented for the 2012-2013 season.

Rationale: *As part of one of the key categories to create a successful Safe Sport environment, it is important that a background check of the owners and principal officers of a USA Fencing club is undertaken. USA Fencing can provide evidence to its insurance underwriters that there is active screening not just of the coaches, but the owners as well. It is just as important to provide parents clarity and re-assurance that USA Fencing is proactive in providing a Safe Sport environment and atmosphere.*

Appendix J

Tournament Committee Report - June

2012 SN Update. This year's Summer Nationals in Anaheim, as of June 8, has 7,074 individual and 427 team entries. (Last year in Reno, we had 6,221 individual and 340 team entries.) We do not project finishing before 7:00 pm on any day, though we do project two days to end by 7:30 pm. The rest are expected to finish at 8:00 pm or later, with three nights expected to run past 9:00 pm. This tournament will also feature our first planned triple-flighted event, because of the unusually large number of entries in the Junior Men's Saber on our largest day (931 individual and 62 team entries).

BC staffing for SN continues to be problematic. While we will have several new staff members who served successfully as trainees during the regular season, tournament conditions this season have not been conducive to developmental training of new computer leads and bout committee chairs. Of the four staff members with current experience chairing SN, two were not available this year, so the stress on senior BC staff will be considerable.

FencingTime. The new software continues to work well. Most BC staff have been trained on the new software and on the new procedures entailed by its use, though several staff members who were competent on XSeed still need cross-training on FencingTime to be available to work both computer and table side at national events; that process could take most of next season.

BC Recruiting & Development. Due to the very large SN entry numbers, we decided to postpone the entry-level BC workshops we'd intended to launch in Anaheim to this fall, when BC staff would be more readily available to lead them. Other elements of our recruiting and development plan will also be pushed back somewhat, due to the number of our training materials that need to be updated with the new FencingTime procedures. Further information on our timeline will be included in the TC report for the July board meeting.

Qualification path revision proposal. There were numerous serious problems with divisional qualifiers this spring. It appears that these problems have always occurred but we are seeing them now because the current report forms require complete results instead of simply a list of qualifiers as they formerly did. Some problems can be reduced by improvements in the instructions and training provided to the divisions, but others are due to failure to follow those instructions, such as failing to check for valid USFA membership, age eligibility, classification eligibility, country representation. Other problems have involved failure to use an approved tournament format or to follow the announced format properly.

In addition, a huge portion of division events—approximately 60% of the possible qualifying tournaments—had three or fewer entries and did not need to be fenced at all, meaning that a good portion of the entry fields in the Division II, Division III, and Youth 14 championships did not have to compete at all in order to qualify.

We therefore offer a motion to move to points-based qualification for these three categories for next season.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Griffith
Chair, Tournament Committee

Appendix K

USA FENCING POLICY FOR RESPONDING TO ALLEGATIONS OF CERTAIN MISCONDUCT

Preamble

Realizing that certain types of misconduct may jeopardize the SafeSport environment embraced and fostered by USA FENCING, the following policy is in effect for responding to allegations of certain forms of behavior by, or of conduct that threatens the well-being of, USA FENCING members, as specified herein.

Procedure

1. Regardless of whether a member has previously been subjected to a background check, or has been excused on appeal from a “red light” resulting from a background check, additional investigation, perhaps leading to disciplinary, protective or remedial action, will be taken if any executive employee, officer, member of the Board of Directors, principal committee chair or the Athlete Protection Officer receives any credible information that a current USA Fencing member:

- a. has been convicted of, or
- b. has received a deferred sentence for, or
- c. has entered any plea of guilty or no contest to, or
- d. has pending charges

for any crime that under prevailing USA FENCING criteria would result in a “red light” background check or for any conduct that constitutes a disreputable act pertaining to minors or athletes and that contravenes USA FENCING’s SafeSport commitment. To invoke the procedures described in this Policy, the information need not satisfy the rules of evidence or the standards imposed on law enforcement agencies.

2. If the information consists of, or is supported by, published or official documentation, the recipient shall report the information and any supporting explanation, evidence and documentation to the USA FENCING Athlete Protection Officer (APO), who shall inform the President, the Executive Director, and General Counsel that an evaluation has been undertaken, as described in Section 5, below.

3. To preclude the submission of claims without substance, if the information is not supported by published or official documentation, it shall be reported by the recipient to the President, who shall designate a member of the Board of Directors to further investigate the information, to determine whether the report is sufficiently reliable that it should be conveyed to the APO for disposition under Section 5 below. This designated member shall be free to consult with USA Fencing General Counsel to assist in the evaluation of the information.

4. If any person specified in Section 1, above, receives information of the nature there described that concerns an individual who is not a USA FENCING member but who is involved in the sport of fencing or comes into close proximity with fencers or fencing activities, that information shall be reported by the recipient to the President, who shall designate a member of the Board of Directors to further investigate the information. This designated member shall consult with USA FENCING General Counsel and the APO, and shall then determine whether to submit a proposed recommendation for action to the Board of Directors. Such action may include, but is not limited to, barring the individual from entering any USA FENCING sanctioned tournament, venue, or club.

5. Upon receipt of a report or information as provided in this Policy, the APO shall evaluate the accuracy of the allegations and material received and shall attempt to gather any additional evidence necessary to determine whether there is good reason to believe that the conditions stated in Section 1, above, have been established. The APO shall report his or her findings and recommendations to the President, the Executive Director, and General Counsel, who shall individually or together recommend proposed disciplinary, remedial or protective actions to the Board of Directors for consideration and disposition.

6. If any allegation or information that would invoke the procedures set forth in this Policy concerns the actions of the person to whom the Policy otherwise requires a report be made, or to a family member, student, or other individual closely affiliated with that person, then the informant shall be in compliance with the Policy if he or she makes the required report to any of the President, the Executive Director, General Counsel, or the APO who is not the subject of, or affiliated with the individual who is the subject of, the allegations or information, and that person shall thereafter have the duties assigned herein to the person being accused.

7. Any information or report submitted under this Policy that is deemed at any level of review to be frivolous, fraudulent, vexatious, vindictive or intentionally defamatory shall subject the person providing the information or report to disciplinary action.

Appendix L

Pre-Screening Questionnaire

Utilizing a Pre-screening Questionnaire as part of the Background Check Process

A good proportion of non-violent criminals often demonstrate excellent social engineering and deceiving skills. They utilize these skills in many aspects of their trade that span from gaining trust and confidence from their intended victims, gaining access to whatever is they are after, concealing their actions, and even justifying and defending their actions in the event of confrontation.

They are often very good liars and have the ability to substantiate their claims about themselves. This is the result of careful thinking and even rehearsing. Since they usually have a history of participating in the type of activities they conceal, they become proficient at telling their story to the point that even trained interviewers have difficulty identifying potential red flags.

While developing a tool to screen potential instructors for a national aquatic education program, a group of program coordinators developed a tool to pre-screen adult leader candidates before they were allowed to work directly with the public. After various processes were implemented, an evaluation revealed that the pre-screening phase was the most successful tool in identifying potential problem individuals.

The pre-screening process involved a short questionnaire and a short interview. The purpose of the pre-screening process was to advise the applicants that background check was part of the application process and that we would compare the questionnaire with background check results for inconsistencies. The questionnaire included questions such as:

1. Have you ever been convicted of any crime against children or other persons? Yes No
2. Have you ever been accused of any crime against children or other persons? Yes No
3. Have you ever been found in any dependency action to have sexually assaulted or exploited any minor or to have physically abused any minor? Yes No
4. Have you ever been found by any court in a domestic relations proceeding to have sexually assaulted or exploited any minor, or to have physically abused any minor? Yes No
5. Have you ever been convicted of the possession, use, or sale of illegal drugs or other controlled substances within the last seven (7) years? Yes No
6. Within the past 30 days, have you abused alcohol, legal or illegal drugs? Yes No
7. Please to disclose any other convictions or pending charges at this time, including driving charges other than minor traffic infractions? Yes No
8. Have you ever been subjected to a background check? Yes No
9. Are you aware of anything that may turn up in the background check that may disqualify you from participating in the capacity for which you are being considered? Yes No

This is usually followed by a statement like:

I hereby certify that the above answers are true and accurate. I understand that any misleading, false or inaccurate information may be cause for immediate disqualification from participating in activities (fill this blank with whatever activities are relevant) I further understand that "yes" answers will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and will not necessarily disqualify me from (whatever ...)

Signed _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____

We strongly believe in pre-screening, especially when done in conjunction with a thorough background check and interviews. We suggest we consider this as part of the process of recruiting and appointing coaches, trainers, and other personnel that can potentially be in direct contact with our athletes. Further, we strongly suggest we implement a policy in which club owners and club coaches submit themselves to answering a questionnaire in conjunction with their application process to obtain liability insurance and register their clubs.

Appendix M

Tournament Committee Proposed Changes to the Athlete's Handbook

2.11.3.2 Division II National Championships

A. Eligibility (age, classification, qualification path)

Fencers must be 13 years old before January 1 of the current season or on the Junior NRPS. Fencers must have a classification in the weapon of "C", "D", "E" or Unclassified at the time of the qualifying competition AND meet age requirements as above **AND**

- Be among the top 150 (with ties qualifying) on the current season's Division II Regional Open Circuit point standings at the regular fee deadline for these Championships. ~~Place in the top 25% of the current season's Division Qualifying competition (see Table 2.7.3.1 in Chapter 2.7) [BoD, September 2006] OR~~
- Qualified for Division 1A, if classification eligible. [BoD, September 2008].
- ~~Finish in the top 10% (with a minimum of 4) of a Division II ROC (see Table 2.7.3.2 in Chapter 2.7) [BoD, September 2010]~~

2.11.4.2 Division III National Championships

A. Eligibility (age, classification, qualification path)

Fencers must be 13 years old before January 1 of the current season or on the Junior NRPS. Fencers must have a classification in the weapon of "D", "E" or Unclassified at the time of the qualifying competition AND meet age requirements as above **AND**

- Be on the current season's Division II Regional Open Circuit point standings at the regular fee deadline for these Championships. Place in the top 25% (see Table 2.7.3.1 in Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) of the total number of "D", "E" or "U" fencers competing in the current season Division's Division II Qualifying competition (when Division II and Division III qualifying competition held together; See Appendix 2.7 for more details) OR
- ~~If separate Division III qualifying competition held by Division, then top 25% of the field will qualify for Division III National Championships [BOD September 2006] OR~~
- Qualified for Division II. [BOD, September 2008].

2.11.6.2 Youth 14 Championships

A. Qualifying Path

Fencers must meet age eligibility above **AND**

- Earn Youth 14 points at a current season Super Youth Circuit Competition **OR**
- Earn points at a current season Youth 14 NAC, Cadet NAC **OR**
- Earn points at the previous season's Youth 14 or Cadet USA Fencing National Championships **OR**
- ~~Place in the top 25% (see Table 2.7.3.1 in Chapter 2.7) of the fencer's Division's Youth 14 qualifying competition held in the current season~~ **OR**
- Place in the top two of first in the Y14 event at a current-season RYC tournament [BoD, October 2010]. In mixed events, only the top two first place finishers is recognized as qualified.

Rationale: Divisional qualifying tournaments for the Youth-14 and Division II and III championships at Summer Nationals are no longer an effective qualification path. This spring, of 894 potential events, 525 (59%) had three or fewer entries and did not need to be fenced. Only two divisions fenced all events; six divisions had no Youth 14 qualifiers, and 13 divisions held no qualifiers at all. In addition, over 50% of the qualifying reports submitted to the national office had problems severe enough (mostly competitors who were non-members or ineligible by age, classification, or division representation) to delay processing until resolution.

These proposed changes would use existing points standings and events to replace the divisional qualification paths for these three event categories, with the following benefits:

- Fencers would be required to compete at least once to qualify for these championships.
- Divisions would regain a calendar date for more competitive and profitable tournaments.
- Confusion within divisions and among fencers over the qualification paths would be reduced.
- These qualification paths would increase incentives for entering regional events.
- The national office workload processing division qualifying reports would be significantly reduced during the six to eight weeks leading up to the SN entry deadline. Petitions for SN entry would also be fewer, further reducing the office workload.

Appendix N

Hall of Fame Committee

The 2011-2012 Hall of Fame year was a successful one. We nominated a strong ballot for 2013 induction and although the membership's willingness to vote was tepid, 6 great American fences were elected. The results of the voting for Hall of Fame are as follows:

Total voters 987

The Standard Era

Leonardo Terrone	510 ELECTED
George Breed	477

Era of Inequality

Larry Anastasi	467 ELECTED
Dick Berry	329
Ed Vebell	326
Hans Halberstadt	693 ELECTED

Modern Era

Cliff Bayer	714 ELECTED
Buckie Leach	850 ELECTED
Iris Zimmermann	949 ELECTED
Elliot Lilien	231
Dick Oles	318

A very large throng of individuals are expected at the Anaheim induction ceremony on June 30th and we will be ready.

Andy Shaw, Chair, HOF

Appendix O

Veterans Committee

1. Some veterans would prefer V40-49 as an event at Summer Nationals. Others would favor “Veteran Combined.” Issues surrounding scheduling for single-weapon and multiple-weapon fencers have been raised. It is recognized that an additional event is unlikely to be added, so that Veterans are likely to face the choice of one or the other. There is no consensus. The community appreciates Board consideration of this matter.
2. There are concerns surrounding fencers who “age-up.” This is not comparable to the situation when cadets enter junior (for instance), since the age effect is reversed, so that V50-59 cannot hold V60-69 points (or the reverse). Currently, a 59 year-old who turns 60 is seeded only by classification (as if they had not fenced at all during the prior year). This may drop a world medalist into the pools for the new age category without regard to their true strength as fencer. Everyone recognizes that this disrupts the seeding, but there’s no consensus on how to address the problem. A subcommittee has been recommended and several veterans have volunteered to serve. The Committee would appreciate Board recognition of the subcommittee recommendations when delivered.
3. The 2012 Can/Am Veterans Cup was held in Toronto. A summary from Gaby Weisz is attached. With the exception of V70+ MF (won by Weisz) and V70+ MS (won by Fine, who lives in the USA but fences internationally for Canada), all gold medals were won by Americans. Next year’s Can/Am will probably take place in Buffalo. The Veteran Committee has endorsed the last two tournaments, and its continued support is anticipated.
4. There will be a Veteran Meeting at Summer Nationals on Sunday evening, the 1st of July. World Team members will largely have been determined.

Respectfully

Drew Ridge

Appendix P

Scholastic/Collegiate Task Force

Laurence Schiller, Chair, George Janto, Kathy Vail, Greg Schiller, and Rafael Suarez

1) The President of USA Fencing called for mission statements from each USA Fencing committee and task force in 2011 and it is as follows:

Mission statement for the USA Fencing Scholastic/Collegiate Committee

Although the number, and success, of our junior fencers has been greatly expanding in the past few years, little has been done in an organized fashion to encourage the creation and growth of scholastic and, especially, collegiate programs. In order to facilitate the growth of such programs the Scholastic/Collegiate Committee will:

- Compile as complete a list of scholastic and collegiate programs (both NCAA and club) with contact information in order to provide USA Fencing with a database of such programs.
- Devise ways to connect these programs together so that they may form a more powerful association to support each other and grow new programs
- Create a plan to grow scholastic and collegiate programs, including the creation of materials that would help an athletic administration to decide to sponsor a fencing program

2) I am sorry to say we have not made a huge amount of progress on this. We met in Reno at Summer Nationals and shook out a number of good ideas, but all of them required the creation of a data base of collegiate and scholastic programs.

- We obtained a list of varsity NCAA programs from the NCAA and have contact information for head coaches.
- We obtained a list of collegiate club teams that belong to the US Association of Collegiate Fencing clubs, but we know that that is not a comprehensive list. We do have their contact information.
- We asked the USA Fencing ED and National Office to help us create a database of programs, one for collegiate and one for scholastic, but have not received any real response. The problem has been that the NO really doesn't have such a list and hasn't had the man-hours to help us create one at this time. We were hoping that Rail Station might be utilized for such a project, but the efforts on Rail Station have been absorbed in getting registration, membership, and tournament services on line. Now that a new contract has been signed, we may be able to work on this specific problem.
- We wanted to see how the USFA rules might be modified to allow high school and collegiate tournaments to be nationally sponsored, as opposed to divisionally, and have the capability to award rankings. The membership task force committee and Tournament Committee have heard these ideas but we are not yet close to a solution.
- We hoped to see if we could organize parents in a group to put pressure on schools to create new collegiate and scholastic fencing programs, but we have not made progress towards that. We would need help, again, from the National Office to identify parents and help us contact them.

3) We did ask members of the Committee to try and collect some data on scholastic programs in their area and we identified some in areas such as Georgia, the Midwest, and West Coast, in addition to the numerous programs in the New York/New Jersey area, but the members of the committee have not followed through on this as well as we would all like. Unfortunately, our schedules, and especially the Chair's, have been very busy and have not been conducive to doing the job that should be done. When the Olympics are concluded, I hope to be able to engage the National Office in helping us collect data, for we cannot move on other ideas until we put that data base together.

We welcome any input from any USA Fencing member as to how they think USA Fencing can help sustain and increase collegiate and scholastic programs.

Laurence D. Schiller
Chair

Appendix Q

USFA Sports Medicine

The 2011-12 season has been a significant one for the US Fencing Sports Medicine program for a variety of reasons and its success is due to the unstinting dedication of the members of the group and associated US Fencing staff and volunteers. As usual, during the past season we provided coverage to all domestic USFA national events, Zonal competitions, the Cadet/Junior World C'ships and Senior World C'ships. However, in addition, the program was able to meet a 350% increase over last season in the number of requests for sports medicine support at international (Olympic qualifying) events this season. This demand placed significant strain on our personnel resources but our members really went above-and-beyond to ensure that US Fencing athletes had the best support possible as they worked towards their goals of representing the USA in London. I want to thank not only those who made themselves available for the international assignments but also those who stepped in to make sure that all of the domestic events would also be covered and that the program's service to all members of the US Fencing family was maintained. Thus at this juncture I gratefully acknowledge the following for their professional expertise and commitment to US Fencing over the past season: Lonnie Sellers (Integrated Manual Therapy, WA), Doug Rank (MarRan Physical Therapy, WA), Kyle Momsen (Gustavus Adolphus College, MN), Kaitlyn Silbaugh (Indiana State University, IN), Jen Krug (Silverton High School, OR), Jim Wallis (Portland State University, OR), Peter Harmer (Willamette University, OR), Susan Hurst (CA), Jeremy Summers (CA), John Carollo (Theodore Roosevelt High School, TX), Brian Hardy (UC – Colorado Springs, CO), Ronda Peterson (Minnesota State – Moorhead, MN), Kristin Wimp (Regis University, CO), Nick Tobanski (MI), Brian Russon (Peak Orthopedic and Sports Physical Therapy, WA), Margaret DeLong (TX) and Jim Gossett (Columbia University, NY). I would also like to provide a special acknowledgement for the support of others with medical expertise who have generously provided their expertise when needed, especially to Annie Mannino.

Finally, I would like to recognize the support of US Fencing staff and volunteers who have helped us in meeting our responsibilities to the athletes: for international events – David Sach, Cathy Zagunis, Raoul Rodriguez, Jennifer Yamin and Courtney Kulick; for domestic events – Amanda Ward, Tanya Brown, JR Bourne and Joe Sibley.

In addition to clinical coverage, the Sports Medicine program was designed as an avenue for professional development of its members, both for their own benefit and for that of US fencers. As a measure of success of this aspect of the program, for the third consecutive Olympic Games, the USOC has selected a member of our program to work with the US Fencing Team. For the London Games, John Carollo (San Antonio, TX) has been designated to assist the team.

One of the long-term problems with effective healthcare for US Fencing teams has been the difficulty of collecting, maintaining and effectively using athlete medical records. Athletes have had to fill out health histories before each World C'ship and there was no efficient means to up-date the information or to make it easily accessible to the Sports Medicine personnel (except as paper files). Fortunately, due to the diligent efforts of Brian Hardy (UC-Colorado Springs) and the support of Executive Director Greg Dilworth, US Fencing has been able to enter into an agreement with ATS software, which provides secure medical records with real time access anywhere in the world. Once the system is fully implemented, athletes will only have to enter their data once but will be able to up-date anytime. The Sports Medicine staff can access the information via internet or smart phone and can also up-date records as necessary. This is a significant step forward for the program.

The Sports Medicine program has continued to meet its mandate in its two other focus areas: research and education. US Fencing remains the only federation in the world with an exposure-based injury surveillance system and the information gained from this database is being used to provide news sources, other federations and international agencies, including the International Olympic Committee (IOC), with a scientifically sound understanding of both the low risk of injury in fencing and an accurate overview of the distribution of the types and locations of acute fencing injuries. Research on non-broken blade penetrating hand injuries in sabre originated in the US Fencing Sports Medicine program and resulted in the formation of a special working group in February, 2011, authorized by FIE President Usmanov, to address and resolve this issue. Following a year of additional work, a proposal was sent to the FIE Executive Committee on May 28 for consideration. I have also been fortunate to have been authorized to establish an injury surveillance system for the FIE, similar to the one that I put in place for US Fencing, to assist the FIE in providing information to the IOC to meet the 2008 IOC agenda item of Athlete Health and Safety. The success of the US Fencing system, due to the professionalism of the members of the Sports Medicine program and bout committee members Tanya Brown, Al Frantz, Joe Salisbury and Sheryl Eberhardt, was the platform from which the FIE initiative was launched.

In terms of education, the Sports Medicine program provides USFA members with current and emerging information on matters of injury prevention and treatment through the Sports Medicine Q&A in each issue of *American Fencing* and I have remained the primary contributor to the Sports Medicine column in *Escrime* for the past 12 months.

As noted in the report to the Board of Directors last year, despite the growth and success of the program there are difficulties. Chief among these continues to be appropriately matching our resources (personnel; funding) to the needs of US fencers as the scope of our responsibilities continues to increase.

Finally, I have attached a report from Dr. John Heil, the long-time leader of the Sports Science and Technology Committee (SSTC). For many years, the Sports Medicine program and the SSTC worked in partnership and in parallel to advance the welfare and success of US fencers. The recent dissolution of the latter group by the Board has left an official void in the areas of research and service provided by Dr. Heil and his colleagues and no clear avenue to inform the Board or the membership of the work that is continuing in these areas. I trust all will find the report informative.

I believe the Sports Medicine program will remain a vital part of US Fencing and I am grateful for the opportunity to continue to lead this effort in concert with so many extraordinary professionals. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Peter A. Harmer, Ph.D., MPH., ATC., FACSM

Chief Medical Officer

Email: pharmer@willamette.edu

Appendix R
SPORTS SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY REPORT
Dr. John Heil

PROGRAMS & SERVICES

Sport Science Seminars @ Junior Olympics

Collaborative program with revenues shared by USA Fencing and Dr. John Heil

Seminars are well received with positive evaluations and repeat attendance.

Continuing to work on optimizing scheduling, marketing and logistics to increase attendance and revenues – with seminars scheduled for Summer Nationals 2012

Small return of revenue to USA Fencing after expenses paid

Sport Science information provided to fencers, coaches & parents- contributing to scope of JOs event.

Parents have been showing interest – providing an event service to an important group of stakeholders

Provides a budget neutral sport science service via additional “pro bono” services provided to members at events.

USFA Event Consultation

Event Consultation-2012 Junior Olympics, Salt Lake City, UT

Sport Psychology & Sport Science Consultation.

Requests for individual consultation while at event are documented in a separate report (submitted to National Office)

Presence of a sport psychologist at event identified as an asset for the membership.

Sport Science Video Project

Arnold Film Festival

Iris Zimmermann: An Olympic Fencing Quest

Entered in *Arnold Film Festival 2012*

Sport Science Videos – Internet

Series of 4 internet videos. **Total views = 13,000+**

American Fencing: Olympic Spirit (Posted: December, 2011)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5FeKO0TKgVA>

2,900 views

US Olympic Fencing (Posted: January, 2011)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N60_qvEl63E

6,400 views

Fencer...Chess Master-Zen Warrior (Posted: August, 2011)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NZfYPLWQqmQ&feature=youtu.be>

2,600 views

Iris Zimmermann: An Olympic Fencing Quest

(Posted: February, 2012) 300 views <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wZDpgrgvCmw&feature=g-all-u>

Enhanced version of **Iris Zimmermann: Shattering Fencing Barriers**

(Posted: June, 2011, with 600 views before replacement)

900 total views (2 videos)

EDUCATION & TRIAGE

Ongoing services provided to general membership

Information/Education

Provision of materials to coaches, athletes and administrators on Sport Science & Technology topics upon request.

Intervention/Triage

Direct consultation to coaches, athletes and administrators on Sport Science & Technology topics by phone, email or face-to-face.

Seminars at local clubs

Referral to local sport science specialists

Publications

American Fencing Magazine

Ongoing articles in *American Fencing Magazine* Sport Science Column

LIAISON TO PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Contact as appropriate with professional organization

Fencing Special Interest Group of Association for Applied Sport Psychology

Organized and lead by Dr. John Heil

With goal of increasing local access to sport psychology for fencers and clubs.

Collaboration with University of Utah Graduate students who attended seminars and interacted with participants on a limited basis at Junior Olympics 2012.

Contact: Dr. John Heil, Psychological Health * Roanoke; 2727 Electric Rd., Suite 100, Roanoke, VA 24018;
Phone-Direct: 540-772-5147; jheil@PsychHealthRoanoke.com

Appendix S

Tournament Committee Report – July

Month/Site	Event	Individual Entries	Team Entries
October Richmond, VA	D2/3/Cadet NAC	1809	--
November Austin, TX	Junior/Cadet/Y14	2138	--
December Kansas City, KS	D1/Vet/Chr	1551	--
January Portland, OR	D1/Junior	1619	--
February Salt Lake City, UT	Junior Olympics Junior/Cadet/JrTm	1867	94
March Cincinnati, OH	D2/3/Vet/Chr	1771	--
April Virginia Beach, VA	D1/Chr Championships Y10/12/14 NAC	1475	24
July Anaheim, CA	Summer National Championships/NAC	7074 (entered)	427 (entered)
2011–2012 Total Entries:		19304	545

BC Recruiting & Development. Tentative Timeline:

Late August/September 2012

- Start work on BC website with list of qualified BC staff available for hire for SYCs/ROCs and BC recruiting information.

Fall 2012

- Transition existing ad hoc BC Research & Development Group into formal “Bout Committee Resource Group” as described in our February 2012 report.
- Develop content & make trial presentations of BC workshops (“How Tournaments Work” and “How To Run a Fencing Tournament”) at fall 2012 NACs. (Originally projected for SN 2012 but delayed due to large entry numbers and resultant stress on potential presenters.)
- Revise and update existing BC checklists and best practices with new procedures created in conjunction with FencingTime adoption. Add to BC website resources as completed.

Fall 2012–Spring 2013

- Finalize BC rating levels and descriptions.
- Continue development of BC knowledge and skill standards.
- Begin formal development of written examination based on knowledge and skill standards.
- Develop process for determining provisional ratings for current BC staff.

2012-2013 Projects.

- Work with the Competition Manager to further develop instructional materials and policies for handling problems with local tournaments, to reduce both the office workload and referrals/appeals to the TC and Board.
- In consultation with the NTOC, FOC, and regional tournament committees, develop a comprehensive tournament structure for the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Griffith
Chair, Tournament Committee

Appendix T

Youth Development Committee

Youth Tournament Update: This season 11 SYC tournaments and 43 RYC tournaments were held throughout the country. Program support fees paid by the organizers of these tournaments totaled \$32,685 (RYCs= \$9095, SYCs = \$23,590). SYC bids also generated \$1600 in revenues.

SYCs: The goal of increased transparency in the selection process was addressed this season. The YDC worked collaboratively with Aaron Clements and David Sierra (ROCAG) Bill Becker (chair, TOC) and Tanya Brown to create a consolidated, streamlined process for ROC/SYC Organizers submitting bids to host ROCs or SYCs in 2012 -2013. The result was an online bid submission with a Tournament Organizer Requirements and Bid Overview Packet as well as access for all bidders to review the rubric used by the ROC and YDC when evaluating bids.

The bid evaluation process was clearly explained in the materials made available to organizers on the USFA website. It was broadened to include 2 steps. Bids were evaluated by the relevant committee through quantitatively (rubric scores) as well as qualitatively (survey results, observer feedback and discussion). Bids found to be viable were ranked within their respective region without consideration for date or location. Committee rankings were then sent to a TOC subgroup which also reviewed the bids and considered the overall calendar.

A total of 9 SYCs were awarded for the 2012-2013 season. Each Region has at least one tournament. Additional SYCs were awarded to regions with more concentrated youth fencing populations. All organizers submitting SYC bids were contacted personally by Mr. Becker with the results of the selection process. Those who were not chosen were encouraged to reach out to Mr. Becker or the YDC for feedback.

SYC Guidelines are under review and final revisions will be made by August 1, 2012. Upon receiving feedback from the ROCAG and the TOC, the evaluation rubric for SYC bids will also be revised for next season's selection process.

RYCs: The YDC is finalizing plans to have an online bid available for organizers wishing to host RYCs. This will create a clear line of communication between organizers, Regional Coordinators and the National Office. Once received, the National Office will forward bids to the appropriate Regional Coordinator for approval. Once approved, the tournament will be added to the competitive calendar on the USFA website.

A principal goal for RYCs moving forward is to increase participation, especially in underserved areas. A Regional Ranking Point System is in the final planning stages for the 2012-2013 season which will recognize both participation and accomplishment at the RYC level. All athletes participating in an RYC will receive points for ranking within their Region only. Points awarded will increase with the number of competitors in the event. This will provide incentive for participation. In turn, this will encourage organizers interest in hosting these important developmental tournaments. Athletes at the top of their Region's ranking will receive recognition at the end of the season. Regional recognition awards will be funded by accessing a portion of the program service fees generated by RYC tournaments. The YDC would like to implement a \$20 bid fee in order assist in funding. The committee agrees it will not charge such a fee without the assurance that it will have access to these revenues for use in serving youth development programs. We feel the amount of \$2000, on top of the \$3000 already allocated in the Budget for Volunteer Administration is sufficient

at this time and warranted given the revenue generated by program service fees each season through youth tournaments.

The RYC Guidelines are currently under review and final revisions will be made by August 1, 2012.

Policy Recommendations:

- 1) **SYC vs NAC seeding:** Currently seeding at youth NACs is different than at SYCs. The YDC reviewed both approaches and considered whether or not a consistent seeding principal is warranted. Both approaches have merit and the committee determined that given the size and varying strength of the fields as SYC tournaments, the current system for SYC seeding should stay in place.
- 2) **Changes to AH 3.2.2:** *Senior, Junior, Cadet, ROC, SYC tournaments are required to have at least 6 competitors for points to be awarded and cannot be a mixed competition. If there are less than 10 competitors there must be a fence off for third.*

The YDC recommends 2 changes in this policy regarding field size and fencing off for third at SYCs. The current rule states that a field of 6 is required for points to be awarded and that in events with less than 10 competitors, there must be a fence off for third place. We recommend both be removed. The rule against mixing events should NOT be changed.

Rationale:

Only SYC events in the Y10 Epee and Y10 Sabre fields were affected by this rule this season. Senior, Junior and Cadet NACs do not have events in any weapon with less than 10 competitors. To our knowledge, there was only one ROC event this season with less than 6 competitors.

I. The requirement of 6 fencers to award points was found to be counterproductive in the Y10 events that generally have small SYC competitive fields.

-Needing 6 competitors for points was seen as a deterrent to registering for these events, as fencers would wait for others to register to fill the field. The committee believes that by lifting this restriction, more fencers will register once they know they can earn points by placing well.

- Encouraging participation is a key aspect of our youth point system.

-Quantity does not necessarily equal quality in the Y10 age group. There are fewer fencers in this age group (especially in WE, ME, WS and MS) competing at SYCs and these small competitive fields often include the best fencers in the age group.

II. Fencing off for third is not done except for at the Olympic Games and some small divisional qualifiers. Our sport calls for the two fencers who lost in the semi-finals to be tied for third. They should both receive the rewards of that placement. The committee did not see the benefit to the young developing (Y10) fencer completing their day by losing 2 DE's, finishing just outside of points and taking 4th place.

The YDC recognizes that in following the 40% rule, with 8 or 9 competitors, $3 = 40\%$. Yet, in the interest of what is best for the young competitive fencer, we feel an exception should be made in the rare instance that an event at an SYC is run with a competitive field of 8 or 9 fencers.

3) **Changes in the Y14 qualifying path to Nationals:** With the implementation of at Regional Point Ranking System, the YDC sees the potential for increasing the number of qualifiers through an RYC path as participation grows. Removing the divisional qualifying path should be looked at in stages and not implemented without time to make meaningful comparisons between the 2 paths the total number involved and event participation numbers within regions. We hope to work with the TC in looking at the ramifications of shifting qualification paths on opportunities for developing youth fencers and their families.

Communication: Members of the YDC continue to look for ways to enhance the lines of communication with youth parents and coaches. Updates are being made in the Parents Handbook. Ways of accessing more ways to use social media to create meaningful and timely outreach are being explored. Long term initiatives, such as a Code of Conduct Handbook and a Standards and Best Practices Manual for Tournament Organizers are also part of our current discussions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Salmon
Chair, YDC

Appendix U
Divisions Best Practices Task Force

I. What the research showed us. (Estimate 10 minutes needed)

- A. Divisions are an important part of US Fencing governance and operations.
- B. Divisions need information, support, assistance, and resources to accomplish their jobs.
- C. Major areas of concern identified and needed to be addressed.
 - 1. Sanctioning of local competitions. What are some basic principles and suggestions?
 - 2. How to get help with questions, problems, and conflict resolution among members?
 - 3. The running of National Qualifiers. What are the needed resources & responsibilities?
 - 4. The need for useable and current bylaws. How they should openly govern themselves?
 - 5. The need to have open communications and transparency to Divisional members.

D. Who is responsible for what and what is the “chain of responsibility”? Is it a structure or operations problem? Do we need another system or learn how to work the one we have?
(Estimate 5 Minutes needed)

II. Items C1-C5 are addressed with attached documents with recommendations for changes and resources for the Divisions.

III. Item D needs discussion at meeting with Board of Directors (Estimate 15 Minutes needed)

Respectfully submitted,
Jerry Benson, Chair
US Fencing Board of Director’s Task Force on Divisions

Appendix V

Divisions Best Practices Task Force - Principles for Sanctioning

Principal #1: All clubs should have equal access to the Division calendar for hosting sanctioned events. The process to host a sanctioned event should be public, and transparent.

Principal #2: Each Division will have several Premium Events that should occur on or near the same date every year. These events should be fixed in the Division calendar, and the Division should have a criteria to identify and fix Premium Events.

Principal #3: Reasonable tournament conflicts should be avoided. Tournaments within the Division should not be scheduled on the same weekends, and "like" tournaments (Opens, Vet, Youth, Ratings restricted) should not be in close proximity. The Division should avoid (where possible) conflicting with major National events, and Premier Events in neighboring Divisions, where possible.

Principal #4: Tournaments must be hosted with adequate resources for the expected turn out, and level of competition. The venue should be able to handle the expected size of the event, and referees and technical committee should be trained adequately for the level of the event.

Principal #5: Division events that are hosted by a club are treated on the calendar as if they were club sponsored events, unless the club takes no income from the tournament and hosts it pro-bono.

Samples of Sanctioning Processes

Example for a Small Division:

The Division wants tournaments in the Division for its members and to build exposure of fencing to the general community. Most tournaments are sanctioned, unless there is a reason to withhold sanctioning. Tournaments are sanctioned by the Division and published to the world if they appear on the Division web site: okdivisionfencing.org. Publicizing a tournament is up to the organizers. Since the Division EC has someone from each USA Fencing club, the sanctioned tournaments are known (or knowable) to most of the Division - even those without Internet access.

Tournaments are sanctioned on a first come, first sanctioned basis, starting early in the current season. The Division EC considers each request and each EC member votes to sanction or raises an objection. Objections are discussed and resolved. Organizers can either provide the Division a list of tournaments for the entire season, or request sanctioning one at a time. Deliberations of the EC are conducted via an email list, the US Fencing Board of Directors 2011-2012 – July 4, 2012 Minutes Draft v2

Division holds one General Membership Meeting each year in the Spring at the Summer Nationals Qualifying Tournament. The email list is private to EC members and administered by the Division Chair. Any EC member is encouraged to bring any topic to the attention of the EC by sending an email to the list.

Reasons to withhold sanctioning:

1. Organizers are holding competition(s) similar (same weapon, same population, same date) to an already sanctioned tournament.
2. Organizers are requesting sanctioning for a tournament less than 2 weeks in the future. Everyone in the Division should have some reasonable time to discover a tournament and plan for attendance. A short lead time discourages attendance by those not specifically invited.
3. Organizers have a history of disregarding USA Fencing rules. (Such as, but not limited to, allowing non-members to fence, not strictly following age rules, using referees unqualified for the level of fencing.)

Medium size Division Example:

1. Every US Fencing club in the Division has a member of the Tournament Committee, which has an online discussion section on the Division web page (much like F.net). All meetings and discussions of the TC take place in the forum, which is visible to all club representatives, and is moderated by the officers of the Division.
2. At the start of the sanctioning process a random list of the current clubs in Division is generated to start the "turn" process of selecting weekends. As new clubs come into the Division, they are put at the bottom of the list at the end of the season, joining the selection process at the start of the new season.
3. Scheduling starts on August 1st for the new season. In order, each club picks a date for a tournament, rotating through the list of clubs until:
 - a. All the available weekends have been allocated, or
 - b. All clubs choose to pass on their turn.At which point the EC "closes" the scheduling process for that season. (We are currently experimenting with scheduling in "half seasons" to speed up the process and make it more flexible). Each club has 24 hours to announce their choice of a weekend when their "turn" starts, after which, if they have not made a decision, they must "pass" on their turn. Depending on the number of weekends left, they will have another -- or more than one -- opportunity to select additional dates. At the end of the scheduling process, the list is "frozen" and in the next season, the allocation process starts where it left off.
4. In any given calendar month, only one of the following types of events may be held:
 - a. An open
 - b. A youth tournament
 - c. A ratings rally event (Usually considered "C" and under).
 - d. No weekends may be double booked.

In addition, NAC's, holidays, and certain other dates are blacked out. No tournaments may be scheduled on these dates.

5. If a club has consistently picked the same date for the same event three years running, they may apply to make that event a "reoccurring" tournament, which is permanently put on the Division calendar. No club may have more than two reoccurring tournaments in a given season. The club must then pass on picking a weekend equal to the number of reoccurring events that they have (if they have two permanent dates, they must pass twice on the rotation). If a reoccurring event fails to be held in a given year, the reoccurring event is "lost" and that date then becomes open in the future, unless by decision of the EC it remains allocated to that club (for example, in the case of a weather cancellation).

6. The Division may, at the start of the season, set aside additional blackout dates to hold referee training, or other Division activities.

7. Dates, once selected, are put on the Division calendar, making them "sanctioned". In addition to appearing on the Division calendar and Ask.Fred, a Division Officer must attend any sanctioned event. Since all the officers are either referees, members of the local technical committee, coaches, or fencers, rarely are there fewer than two officers at any event.

Example of Large Division with comprehensive document:

Definition of from the United States Fencing Association (USFA) Operations Manual: as: "official permission or approval." has been sanctioned by recognized entities under the jurisdiction of the USFA Board of Directors: e.g., Officers of Divisions or Sections, Regional Youth Coordinators or the Tournament Committee. For a competition to be considered sanctioned it must be included in the Division or Section official schedule mailed to the members and/or posted on the corresponding web site or, in the case of Regional Youth Circuit tournaments or National tournaments, published in the annual Athlete Handbook and/or posted on the Youth Committee web site, www.usfaryc.org, and the USFA web site, www.usfencing.org, respectively. – USFA Operations Manual

The following paragraphs outline the conditions for application of the term sanctioned competition. Succeeding paragraphs of this document expand on specific areas with regards to the conduct of sanctioned competitions in the Division. Nothing in the USFA Operations Manual, Division Operations Manual, or this document shall be understood to contradict the specifications of the USFA Rules of Competition, Part 5, Disciplinary Rules for Competition. USFA safety requirements must be followed at all USFA sanctioned competitions.

For all USFA sanctioned competitions that take place in the Division, the following rules, regulations and operating procedures shall be agreed upon in advance by the Local

Division Organizer (LDO) and a signed copy of this agreement shall be submitted to the Division Secretary a

minimum of 30 days prior to the tournament.

Failure to comply with any of these rules, regulations or procedures shall result in removal of sanction and the tournament shall be uninsured by the USFA.

In addition, no ratings may be earned by fencers who compete in non-sanctioned events.

This is the only OFFICIAL listing for Division-sanctioned tournaments.

The Division shall include all sanctioned competitions on the Division Calendar on the Division web site.

The Division shall hold at least one annual calendar meeting each year. Clubs shall select dates for tournaments at this meeting, including tentative dates for tournaments whose venues have not been secured.

Additions to the calendar may be made throughout the year.

LDO's shall submit this signed agreement requesting sanctioning to the Division Chair,

Vice Chair, or Secretary as soon as possible. The request shall be sent via email to the Executive Committee requesting approval. Approval shall be granted by a simple majority vote. No proxy voting is allowed.

Failure to respond by the requested date shall be accepted as a vote to abstain and not be counted against the requestor.

The Division Secretary shall include tournament information on the calendar within 5 days of notification by the Executive Committee that sanction has been given.

The Division sanctioned tournaments on the same date without express approval by two-thirds of the Executive Committee.

LDO's shall, as much as possible, schedule tournaments so as not to conflict with:

USFA North American Cup, Junior Olympics, Summer National tournament dates, Section Circuit Cup, Regional Youth Circuit, or other regional circuit events as they develop, also Division Qualifiers for Junior Olympics or Section Qualifier for Summer Nationals.

Consideration shall be given to referee resources when scheduling tournaments on concurrent dates with other tournaments in the Section.

Ratings restricted tournaments (Unrated, "E" and under, "D" and under, etc.) generally do not conflict with larger, well established tournaments.

Another example of a larger Division process

The eleven-member Tournament Committee serves at the pleasure of the 13-member Executive Committee, which is elected by the voting membership of the Division. The Nominating Committee submits names to the Executive Committee for consideration for seven open positions each year. The four officers of the Division are ex-officio members of the Tournament Committee.

Principals:

All clubs in good standing are able to submit requests to get their tournaments on the Division's sanctioned-

tournament calendar. The TC endeavors to have an Open, a Division II/III or Unclassified event, a junior/cadet event and a youth event in each weapon each calendar month.

The Tournament Committee tries to limit each weekend or evening to one event in each weapon and age group. For example, a saber open and a saber Division II event would not be scheduled on the same day or weekend at different clubs in the Division.

There will be no other sanctioned events of any kind on days of the Division-run events, such as the qualifiers or the High School Championships.

Clubs that schedule non-sanctioned events against similar sanctioned events on the Division calendar will lose their ability to apply for and win sanctioning for events they would like to put on our calendar. 1. In July each year, the Tournament Committee sends an e-mail to all the clubs immediately after USA Fencing announces the schedule of NACs, ROCs and SRYCs asking them to submit:

2. The Tournament Committee gives priority to successful signature events from previous seasons that the clubs propose to run again at the same time of the season.

3. For tournaments that coincide with things like summer camps or because of NAC, SYC or ROC schedule changes out of our control. The TC endeavors to reply to each request to merely acknowledge receipt within one day and with a definitive answer regarding sanctioning within one week.

All sanctioned events must be posted on FRED at least a month before the event date, the tournament must be run in Fencing Time software and the results must be posted back into FRED for approval by the Secretary of the Division before being forwarded onto USA Fencing.

Organizers do not have to hire referees, but the referees used must be from outside the event in question. An individual can compete in one event and referee in another within the same tournament.

Refereeing by competitors in an event is not allowed.

Appendix W

Divisions Best Practices Task Force – Conflict Resolution Process

One of the pressing needs expressed in all of our interviews with the volunteers is the need by the Divisions for access to expert information in order to answer questions, and for resolving conflicts that are beyond the scope of the Divisions expertise or ability.

In addition, there is evidence that members of US Fencing, and Division Officers need information and are or not knowledgeable or informed about where that information lies, or the best way to acquire it. In the past, this has resulted in the National Office staff being consulted on questions that would better be handled by Division Officers, or, in some cases, resources outside of the National Office Staff.

To that end, the Task Force has the following recommendations:

Recommendation A: US Fencing should establish a “chain of information/response” for the most common questions that Divisions face and make this information available to both members of US Fencing, and all Division Officers.

This chain of information/response should start at the club/Division level and outline a chain of increasing responsibility up to the National Office or Board of Directors for US Fencing, where appropriate.

Recommendation B: As part of establishing this chain of information/response, US Fencing should accurately identify members of the National Office Staff, Committees, Commissions, Board of Directors, and Officers of US Fencing, their areas of responsibility, their areas of expertise, and where their local focus—where appropriate—is in regards to the Divisions and members of US Fencing.

Recommendation C: US Fencing has several standing committees and commissions with areas of expertise that would be very helpful to Divisions and members. In some cases, these committees and commissions are not fully utilized, may not be meeting, or may not be properly focused on their areas of expertise. The Task Force recommends that US Fencing revitalize its Committees and Commissions with the following steps:

Step 1. Existing Committees and Commissions should be identified on the US Fencing web site. Their members should be listed, along with their areas of responsibility. on-going duties, and any mandates from the Board of Directors or elected Officers of US Fencing. Those Committees and Commissions that are not meeting should be disbanded, and their functions more appropriately, or reconstituted with a plan of oversight by the Board of Directors or an elected Officer.

Step 2. For those Committees and Commissions that can provide a service to the Division and Membership, each Committee or Commission must designate a committee member whose role it is to respond to questions in the chain of information/response, both above and below the organization level of the Committee/Commission.

Step 3: Existing and future Commissions and Committees should have a responsible Board of Director member or elected officer whose role it is to ensure that the Committee and/or Commissions they are responsible are active, communicating, and on task. The responsible BoD member or officer must be the next step in the chain of information/response for their respective Commissions and/or Committees.

Step 4: US Fencing should publish this information to the membership at large as a series of FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) to assist the membership in addressing their questions to the correct chain of information/response.

Examples of the chain of information/response:

Example 1: A member's rating is inaccurate in the US Fencing database. The chain of information/response might be:

Member → Tournament Organizer → Division Secretary → Tournament Committee

In this example, it is very unlikely that the member would require action beyond the Head of NTC. The NTC Head should automatically reject any appeals that haven't gone through the previous steps.

Example 2: A member feels that an event is improperly run. The chain of information/response might be:

Member → Local Tournament Committee (if in existence) → Division Chair → Fencing Officials Commission OR National Tournament Committee

This chain may differ depending on whether the event is a National Qualifying event, or simply a local event.

Example 3: A member feels that there is improper behavior by a Division Officer. The chain of information/response might be:

Member → Division Chair → US Fencing Division Committee → Member of the Board of Directors → Disciplinary meeting of the Executive Committee of US Fencing

Appendix X

Divisions Best Practices Task Force – Recommendations for Running Qualifiers

Currently, US Fencing is building regional qualifying paths to many of its important tournaments. These paths are still in a state of flux, and seem to serve some areas of the country better than others. In addition, the density of fencers in the US means that a regional qualifying path may not be appropriate for those events that are seen by US Fencing as "developmental", most specifically, Division II and III Nationals, Y14 Nationals, and Junior Olympics. For fencers not in a high-density area of fencing, qualifying for National events through regional events are not convenient or cost effective for them. Therefore:

It is the Task Force's recommendation that Divisions keep the responsibility of holding yearly qualifying tournaments for Division 2, 3, and Y14 for the US Summer Nationals, as well as Junior Olympics (Cadet and Junior).

It is the Task Force's understanding that these qualifying events are sometimes ran in a manner not in accordance with USA Fencing Rules and Policies. There is often confusion over what formats are allowed, the staffing required to hold these events, and even who is eligible to compete (recently, a Division allowed a non-United States citizen to fence in their Division 2 qualifier). Many Division do not have the experienced bout committee staff to deal with questions of medical withdrawals, seeding of club mates, and so forth. Therefore:

It is the Task Force's recommendation that US Fencing at the start of every season produce a package -- in conjunction with the National Tournament staff -- to guide the running the qualifying tournaments the Divisions are responsible for. Additionally US Fencing should move towards providing information to hold these qualifiers correctly, including training Division Officers, Technical and Bout Committee staff. This package would be as detailed as possible, and mandate only one format for holding qualifiers, including the mechanism for determining places (by seeding, by fence off of places, etc). Ideally this guide would be written as if the reader has never ran a tournament before, including athlete eligibility, proper seeding procedures into pool, proper procedures to seeding into subsequent rounds, and common problem solving (eg: how are medical withdrawals are resolved, the impact of a black card to a qualifying fencer, and so forth). This manual should not be construed in disallowing commonly used tournament software, provided all other USA Fencing procedures and current rules are followed.

Finally, US Fencing should recognize the importance of these qualifiers by asking the Divisions running these events to take responsibility for their smooth operation. Therefore:

It is the Task Force's recommendation that the Division Chair certify the submission of the results of the qualifying events to the National Office, with the understanding that they are taking responsibility for having held the qualifiers according to the current rules established by US Fencing. Included on the signed form should be a list of possible consequences if US Fencing rules are not followed.

Appendix Y
Divisions Best Practices Task Force – Suggested Bylaws

BYLAWS OF THE
_____ DIVISION
OF THE USA FENCING ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE I
TITLE, AUTHORITY AND BOUNDARIES

SECTION 1. **TITLE.** The name of the Division shall be the _____ Division of the U.S. Fencing Association, Inc.

The _____ Division shall hereinafter be referred to as “the Division”, and the United States Fencing Association, Inc. shall be referred to as "USA Fencing."

SECTION 2. **AUTHORITY.** the Division is a duly chartered, subordinate, constituent body of USA Fencing, exercising powers given by, performing duties directed under, and subject to the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and policies of USA Fencing.

SECTION 3. **BOUNDARIES.** The geographic boundaries of this Division shall be as set forth and approved by the Board of Directors of USA Fencing.

ARTICLE II
MISSION, PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

SECTION I. **MISSION.** The mission of this Division is to enhance the quality and performance of the sport of fencing and expand the network of Members and Member Clubs of USA Fencing within the boundaries of this Division, thereby offering greater numbers of people the opportunity to benefit from USA Fencing program by focusing on the goals and purposes of this organization as specified by Article II of the Bylaws of USA Fencing.

SECTION 2. **PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.** In order to carry out the Mission, the voting Officers of this Division are empowered to manage USFA programs and activities within this Division, and to act as stewards of USA Fencing's assets for this Division. Using such powers and assets, this Division shall:

- Coordinate tournaments for, but not limited to, qualifying purposes as set forth by USA Fencing.
- Encourage and assist in the training of Referees, Armors, Technical Committee and Tournament Coordinators;
- Develop a close relationship between Members, Member Clubs, and other USA Fencing Divisions within USA Fencing;
- Promote interest in, and extend the benefits of, membership in USA Fencing;
- Encourage the formation and growth of USFA Member Clubs;
- Encourage programs and projects that will increase community awareness of USA Fencing programs and meet the needs of the Division.

ARTICLE III POLICY

This Division shall not adopt any policy in conflict with any policy of USA Fencing, and its actions shall be consistent with the purposes and ideals of USA Fencing. These Administrative Bylaws shall be deemed automatically modified and amended so that they shall at no time be in conflict or inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or policies established by the Board of Directors of USA Fencing, as they now exist or hereafter may be changed or amended.

ARTICLE IV JURISDICTION, LIABILITY AND LEGAL ACTION

SECTION 1. JURISDICTION OF USA FENCING. All rules, regulations and policies set forth in the Bylaws of the US Fencing Association, the Rules of Competition, the USA Fencing Operations Manual, or actions of the National Board of Directors are hereby incorporated into these bylaws without action by the Executive Committee or the membership of the Division. In the event of conflict between these bylaws and the bylaws, rules and policies of USA Fencing, the latter shall take precedence and the former shall be considered amended accordingly. This Division shall be governed by, and these Administrative Bylaws shall be construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of Colorado, where USA Fencing is incorporated, regardless of where this Division is located.

SECTION 2. LIABILITY.

- a) With USFA Members. This Division shall have no liability to any third party for any debt or obligation of any Member, nor shall any Member have any liability to any third party for any debt or obligation of this Division or any other component of USA Fencing.
- b) With USA Fencing. This Division is an Administrative Branch of USA Fencing, a Colorado Nonprofit Corporation and, as an administrative unit of that corporation, its activities and affairs shall be managed, and its powers exercised, under the ultimate direction of the Board of Directors of USA Fencing. This Division is not an independent or autonomous legal entity.

SECTION 3. LEGAL ACTION. This Division shall not file any lawsuit as a party plaintiff, hire legal counsel, file any response to any lawsuit, respond to any subpoena, or take any other legal action without the prior written approval of the Executive Director of USA Fencing. In the event this Division is served with any summons, complaint, subpoena, injunction, or other form of legal process, the Division Officer receiving the legal process shall so notify USFA Headquarters within twenty-four (24) hours of such service.

ARTICLE V MEMBERSHIP, VOTER ELIGIBILITY, DUES AND FEES

SECTION I. MEMBERSHIP. "Membership," and "Members," as used herein shall refer to USA Fencing member clubs and/or persons. Membership in this Division, and classes of membership, shall be in accordance with the Bylaws of USA Fencing, and shall be governed by the policies of USA fencing with regard to membership year and transferability.

SECTION 2. VOTER ELIGIBILITY. Any member in good standing who is entitled to vote in elections of USA Fencing is entitled to vote in elections conducted by the Division.

SECTION 3. DUES AND FEES.

- a) **USFA MEMBERSHIP DUES.** Fees for memberships shall be determined by USA Fencing.
- b) **SPECIAL DIVISION FEES.** the Division may charge an additional fee for participation in Division sponsored activities such as seminars, education, training, and tournaments operated by the Division for the purpose of providing supplies, promotional material and distribution, travel reimbursement and honoraria for referees or educational presenters, venue rental, and other expenses related to education, training, or tournaments made available to the entire Division membership. Activity fees shall only be charged for the purpose of enabling Division-sponsored activities to be self-sufficient and shall not be used to provide special benefit to any Division Officer, Executive Committee Member, or Division Member that is not made available to all Division members.

SECTION 4. FUNDS HELD. As long as the Division is performing USA Fencing business, USA Fencing grants to the Division the right to use and manage all funds. Funds may be held by and in the name of the Division; however, the funds belong to USA Fencing. Once USFA business is no longer being done, the funds shall be returned to the USFA.

ARTICLE VI

DIVISION OFFICERS AND CLUB REPRESENTATIVES

SECTION 1. DIVISION OFFICERS. The officers of the Division shall be a Chair, a Vice-Chair, a Secretary and a Treasurer. All officers shall take office at 12:01AM on August 1st and hold office until 12:00 midnight on the following July 31st, or until their successors are elected and justified.

SECTION 2. CLUB REPRESENTATIVES. Each USA Fencing Member Club, as defined by USA Fencing, active in the Division shall be allowed to elect or appoint one member to the Executive Committee in addition to any elected Division Officer. This Executive Committee Member shall be empowered with representation of that Club through voting privileges at Executive Committee meetings.

SECTION 3. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

- a) The elected Division Officers and Club Representatives shall be voting members of the Executive Committee. A Division Officer may also be a USA Fencing Member Club's Executive Committee Member. In this case, the Executive Committee Member is allowed to cast two (2) votes.
- b) Executive Committee Members shall be voting members of USA Fencing. Members nominated to the Executive Committee shall be required to declare any and all club membership or affiliation that could be construed to create a conflict of interest.
- c) At no time may any individual USA Fencing Member Club be represented by greater than 25% of the total number of allowable Executive Committee Members.

SECTION 4. TERM OF OFFICE. The terms of all Executive Committee Members shall commence at 12:01 am on the first day of USA Fencing membership year and end on midnight of the last day of that same membership year.

SECTION 5. VACANCIES. A vacancy in any elective Office shall be filled by the Division Executive Committee based upon the recommendation of the Division Chairperson, or upon recommendation of the highest elected Division Officer if the vacancy is in the office of Division Chairperson. Such appointment shall become effective immediately and will run until the next succeeding Division Council meeting at which time such appointment shall be confirmed or another individual member elected to the Office. The Immediate Past Division Chairperson, upon appointment by the Executive Committee, may act as interim Chairperson until the vacancy is filled.

SECTION 6. RESIGNATION. Any Officer may resign at any time, provided that any resignation must be in writing, and will be effective on delivery to the Division Secretary or the Division Chairperson, unless the resignation provides for a later effective date.

SECTION 7. REMOVAL. The members of the Division Executive Committee are responsible to the Board of Directors of USA Fencing, and may be removed at any time by that Board if it finds it to be in the best interests of USA Fencing or its Members to do so. Any member of the Division Executive Committee may be removed from Office by a two-thirds vote of those voting members present at a Special Meeting of the Division Membership.

SECTION 8. RECALL. Officers and other elected members of the Executive Committee may be recalled by the Division through the following procedure:

- (a) A petition submitted to the Executive Committee, signed by at least 10% of the eligible voters in the Division, requesting a Special Membership Meeting to be held for the sole purpose of holding a recall vote.
- (b) At that meeting, two-thirds of those voting either in person or by proxy approve such recall.
- (c) Time, place and notification requirements of such meeting shall be determined as set forth in these bylaws.

SECTION 9. COMPENSATION. No Division Officer shall receive a salary or other compensation in their capacity as a Division Officer, except a return for expenses incurred for the benefit of the organization and only to the extent provided for in the adopted Division budget.

ARTICLE VII

COMPOSITION, AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

SECTION 1. COMPOSITION. The management of THE DIVISION shall be vested in an Executive Committee consisting of the elected officers and elected or appointed USA Fencing Member Club Representative. No one may hold office and/or be a member of the Executive Committee unless he or she is a current voting member of the Division as defined by USA Fencing bylaws.

SECTION 2. AUTHORITY. The Executive Committee shall operate with powers delegated to the Executive Committee by the Board of Directors of USA Fencing, and is subject at all times to the ultimate direction of the US Fencing Board of Directors 2011-2012 – July 4, 2012 Minutes Draft v2

Board of Directors and the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, policies, and decisions of USA Fencing, and these Administrative Bylaws. The Executive Committee shall serve as the administrative governing body of the Division, shall conduct all business of the Division, shall assume responsibility for the payment of all debts incurred in the presentation of Executive Committee meetings and other Division functions, and shall not assess or impose any financial obligation on any Member. (Members of this Division are responsible for their own individual competition fees, clinic fees, camp fees, and other fees or costs incurred as the result of their participation in related activities.)

SECTION 3. DIVISION CHAIR – The Division Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Division and/or its Executive Committee, and perform such duties as usually pertain to that office and are not inconsistent with these bylaws. The Division Chair has the responsibility for ensuring that all reports required by USA Fencing are filed in a timely manner. The preparation of these reports may be delegated to the Secretary and Treasurer of the Division. At their discretion, the Division Chair may assign officers and other members of the Executive Committee to chair standing or ad hoc committees. The Chair shall be an ex-officio member of all committees. The Chair is responsible for the custody and maintenance of all equipment owned by the Division.

SECTION 4. VICE-CHAIR – The Vice-Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair should the Chair be unable to perform his/her duties. Otherwise, the Vice-Chair shall perform such duties as the Chair may assign.

SECTION 5. SECRETARY – The Secretary shall conduct all official correspondence, issue timely notice to all members of meetings of the Division, keep the minutes of all meetings of the Division and/or its Executive Committee, prepare and submit, when due, all reports concerning membership as required by the USA Fencing, and any other like duties that may be assigned by the Chair or the Executive Committee. In addition, and subject to review by the Executive Committee upon the petition of any aggrieved party, the Secretary shall make all initial decisions regarding questions of membership status, rights and privileges; qualification to fence in competitions sanctioned by the Division; and issues of representation of Members.

SECTION 6. TREASURER – The Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall present a budget for the following fiscal year (August 1st to July 31st) and shall make this public prior to September 1st. The Division Treasurer shall have charge of all funds and other personal property of the Division and shall transmit the accounts and all undistributed funds to the successor. The Division Treasurer shall disburse all funds upon order of the Division Chairperson, as provided herein, and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Division Chairperson. The Division Treasurer shall assist the Division Chairperson or the Division Chairperson's designee in the formulation of proposed budgets and financial statements for consideration and review by the Division Executive Committee. The Treasurer shall present a financial report of revenues and expenses at the Annual Meeting of THE DIVISION for the Division membership to review. The Treasurer shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Chair of the DIVISION or other proper authority.

SECTION 7. The offices of Secretary and Treasurer may be combined for any year by a majority of those voting, in person or by proxy, at the Annual Meeting.

SECTION 8. USA FENCING MEMBER CLUB REPRESENTATIVE. Club Representatives elected or appointed to the Executive Committee may chair standing or ad hoc committees as assigned by the Division Chair, act as a member of such committee, or perform other duties as the Division Chair shall assign.

SECTION 9. AD HOC ADVISORS OR COMMITTEE MEMBERS. Members of the Division in good standing, with special expertise, may be appointed by the Chair as advisors to the Executive Committee or act as committee members. These individuals shall not have Executive Committee voting privileges.

ARTICLE VIII

REMOVAL FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. Officers and Club Representatives of the Division may be removed for cause upon the petition of one or more voting members of the Division to USA Fencing Board of Directors. The Board of Directors of USA Fencing shall prescribe procedures for removal that provide the accused Executive Committee Member with notice of the asserted grounds for removal and due process during removal proceedings.

ARTICLE IX

MEETINGS, PROXIES, AND QUORUM

SECTION 1. MEETINGS.

- a) **ANNUAL MEETING.** THE DIVISION shall hold at least one (1) regular meeting during each year, with the schedule of such meeting to be fixed by the Executive Committee prior to the due date on USA Fencing Annual Division Reporting form, with notification to all members at least two (2) weeks prior to the meeting date. This required meeting shall be called the "Annual Meeting."
- b) **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.** Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be held on a regular basis at a time and place designated by the Chair. Meetings may also be called upon the written request of voting members of the Committee.
- c) **SPECIAL MEETINGS.** Special meetings of the Division membership may be called by the Division Chairperson, a majority of the Division Executive Committee, or not less than one-fourth of the members of the Division Membership voting members. Notice thereof shall be sent in writing to all Division Council members at least two (2) weeks prior to the date of such meeting, and shall set forth the purpose for which such meeting is called, but any business otherwise valid may be transacted at the meeting.

SECTION 2. **PROXIES.** The Division Executive Committee may establish written procedures for electronic or proxy voting for any official meeting of the Division. Procedures for electronic or proxy voting and ballots shall be promulgated to the voting members at the same time as the notification of the meeting. If proxy voting is allowed, any voting member of that group (membership or Executive Committee) may designate, in writing, any other voting member of the group to act as proxy for him or her at the designated meeting. The written and signed proxy must be presented at the Annual meeting by the member acting as proxy.

SECTION 2. QUORUM.

- a) **Annual Meeting of the Membership.** Ten percent (10%) of the voting members of the Division membership, or their proxies as authorized by Section 2 hereof, shall constitute a quorum for the Division Annual meeting and any special meeting of the Division membership. In the event any business is transacted at any Division meeting at which a quorum is not present, the action shall be deemed as valid as if a quorum were present if it thereafter is expressly approved in writing by the

affirmative vote of a majority of the voting Members in the Division on the basis of one (1) vote per voting Member.

- b) Executive Committee. A quorum shall consist of one-third of the voting membership of the Executive Committee or 4 members, whichever number is larger.

ARTICLE X ELECTIONS

SECTION 1. POLICY AND PROCEDURES. The Division shall establish a written policy and procedures for the election of Officers and make this readily available to all Division members.

SECTION 2. CANDIDATE ELIGIBILITY. Candidates for all Division Officer positions shall be voting members of the Division as defined by USA Fencing Bylaws and policies.

SECTION 3. ORDER OF ELECTIONS. The Division Officer shall be elected before the selection of Club Representatives to the Executive Committee. The Division Officers shall be elected in this order: Division Chair, Division Vice Chair, Division Secretary, Division Treasurer. Any person not elected may be nominated, either by self-proclamation or from another voting member of the Division, for a subsequent position.

SECTION 4. CLUB REPRESENTATIVES. Club Representatives to the Executive Committee may be appointed or nominated. Persons who were nominated for Division Officer positions and not elected, may be appointed or nominated as the Club Representative to the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE XI DIVISION COMPETITIONS

SECTION 1. DIVISION QUALIFYING EVENTS. The Division shall operate qualifying events for members of the Division in accordance with recommended USA Fencing rules, policies and procedures.

SECTION 2. SANCTIONING. The Division is responsible for the sanctioning of local tournaments held by Division Clubs. The Division may not over-ride any sanctioning approval granted from USA Fencing National Office. The Executive Committee shall publish a written policy and procedures manual for Tournament Sanctioning Procedures that shall be made available to all Division members.

ARTICLE XII AMENDMENTS AND OTHER RULES

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS. Amendments to these Administrative Bylaws may be made by the Board of Directors of USA Fencing, or their delegated authority, through due process. If The Division wishes to add or delete one or more provisions, the Executive Committee shall present the proposed changes to the voting

members at least thirty (30) days prior to the Annual Division Meeting for review. If approved by a majority of the membership voting in person or by proxy at the Division Annual Membership meeting, the Secretary shall forward the requested changes to the Board of Directors of USA Fencing who will have the final determination.

SECTION 2. POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDING RULES. Policies, procedures and standing rules applicable only to this Division may be adopted by the Board of Directors of USA Fencing, or by the Executive Committee of this Division. Such policies and rules shall be submitted promptly to USFA Board of Directors to be kept on file, and shall not be in conflict with any provision of these Administrative Bylaws, the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws of USA Fencing, policies adopted by USA Fencing Board of Directors, or applicable law. The Board of Directors of USA Fencing, or their delegated authority, has the right to review, disapprove, or modify any such policy or standing rule.

Appendix Z
Divisions Best Practices Task Force
Recommendations for Posting Information on USA Fencing Website

The Taskforce on Divisions recommends USA Fencing make a portion of its website available to the divisions. Each division would have a single page on USA Fencing's website on which the division would be required to post the following four(4) pieces of information:

1. List of the Officers and Members of the Executive Committee
2. The Division's latest financial statements including income statement, balance sheet and audit report.
3. The current By-Laws of the Division
4. The current tournament sanctioning procedures of the Division

Appendix AA Budget Committee

The Budget Committee is responsible for the preparation and the presentation of the above budget based on the information received from the National Office. As of the date of this report, the Budget Committee and the Board have participated in a number of discussions related to the 2012-2013 Budget that will be presented at the Summer National Championships for approval by the Board.

Appendix AB Executive Director Search Task Force

USA Fencing has appointed Sport Search to assist with its search for an Executive Director. As of the date of this report, Sport Search has searched through a contact base of 4000 people. According to Mark Tudi, CEO, 500 people expressed interest in the position, and 200 personal interviews were conducted.

Up to 50 people are currently being taken through a more detailed evaluation (referencing, Q&A, further interviews) and a total of 10 names have been put forth to the Committee for serious consideration, i.e. a possible phone interview by the Committee. The current Executive Director did not express an interest in being considered in the search process.

As of this date the Committee has conducted 2 phone interviews with further 4-6 planned to occur over the next 10 days.

A short-list of 2-4 candidates will be interviewed in person.

The mandate of the Committee is to make a recommendation to the Board for an Executive Director, and plans to present 1-2 individuals for this purpose. This recommendation will be forthcoming in 30-60 days.

The above mandate and timeline may be altered / adjusted by the President or the Board.

Appendix AC Compensation Committee

The Committee did not receive any requests from the President, the Board or the Executive Director to be consulted on any compensation matters during the 2011-12 fiscal year.

Sunil Sabharwal
Chair - Comp Cttee

Appendix AD
Audit Committee Minutes and Report

The Audit Committee has not met since our meeting in May 2012, which was previously reported to the Board.

29 June 2012

USA FENCING AUDIT COMMITTEE
David Herr, Chair

Appendix AE

Election Committee Report

The Election Committee is pleased to report that the 2012 election is complete, the winners have been announced to the membership and the votes for the Hall of Fame have been reported to Andy Shaw.

President	Donald Anthony Jr
Treasurer	Samuel D. Cheris
Elite Coach	Wes Glon
Parent Director	Kirsten Crouse
At Large	David Blake
	Jerry Benson

We added several new facets to the process, some were successful: the addition of an advertisement in American Fencing (designed by Tyler Jacobson), candidate statements were increased to 300 words, and one more email reminder from VoteNet. The idea of the video, while an opportunity for candidates to be more visible, was not as user-friendly as we would have liked and we will not recommend it be used in the near future.

Fortunately, there was no need for a run off election, our voters turned out in the largest number to date. Approximately 20.91 % of our eligible voters cast a ballot, an increase that caused VoteNet to commend our organization and members as one of the best they had experienced.

In our February report to the Board, the committee proposed a membership requirement that no more than 2 members utilize the same email address. This request was made to prevent fraud; for this election, if there were 2 or more members per email address, the second member would be sent a postcard requesting a separate address, and the same for any others. When memberships are processed, this request for unique email addresses could be made to prevent the need for the post card mailing. This would make for a more streamlined and less costly election process.

Because this Committee has worked together for the last few elections, we have made some adjustment to the process and have more that we hope to implement for the future:

- Remove the requirement to vote for each category
- Consider adding another week for the voting opportunity
- Make the picture and bio implementation easier on the candidate, committee and the National Office
- Deny the option of electronic petitions at this time, due to the strong opportunity for fraud.

John Springgate, with the input of the entire Committee has drafted By Law changes that the Committee is proposing the Board adopt. These are changes in the Election section and are attached to this report. We would like these changes be approved by the Board at the September meeting.

Dan Berke, with the input of the Committee, has put together an Election Operations Manual for our group and future committees. This document is attached to this report.

It has been my pleasure to serve with Dan Berke, Greg Chang, John Springgate and Jeff Salmon. Our work has been challenging and a learning experience, we hope that the Board approves the Bylaw changes and appreciates the Handbook

Respectfully submitted,

Gerrie Baumgart	Chair
Dan Berke	
Greg Chang	Athlete Advisor
John Springgate	
Jeff Salmon	Board Liason

Appendix AF

Fencing Officials Commission

The FOC is in the process of completing a revision to the Study Guide and Referee exam, after which it will communicate with referees regarding re-certification by 7/31/13 for those who have not recently taken the exam.

The International Assignments Committee has been meeting the demands of our international competitors by assigning referees to go to designated events as established by the Weapons' coaches and the High Performance Staff.

The Domestic Assignment Committee has been selecting referees for the various USFA National events. Observation and training have occurred at NACs and seminars have been given by Instructors throughout the season and will be offered at the National Championships.

NTOC has decided to clarify the role of referees at events where no coach or manager is present. Please see the NTOC report for details.

The FOC website is being updated on a regular basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Cheris, Chair