

UPA Board of Directors Meeting January 17-19, 2009
Boulder, CO
DRAFT
(to be approved by BOD at its next meeting)

Board members present:

Mike Payne	At-Large representative, president (1/17)
Seth Grossinger	Central representative, treasurer (eff. 1/18)
Henry Thorne	At-Large representative
William Bartram	Northwest representative
Doug McLaughlin	Southwest representative
Peri Kurshan	Northeast representative, vice president (1/17), president (eff. 1/18)
Gwen Ambler	At-Large representative
Josh Seamon	At-Large representative, secretary (eff 1/18)
Dave Lionetti	Mid Atlantic representative, vice president (eff 1/18)
John Terry	South representative
Robin Davies	At-Large representative
Kyle Weisbrod	At-Large representative (partial attendee via telephone)

Also present:

Melanie Byrd	UPA Director of Membership and Sport Development
Will Deaver	UPA Director of Championships
Matthew Bourland	UPA Championship Series Manager
Byron Hicks	UPA Championship Series Manager
Sandie Hammerly	UPA Executive Director (HQ Staff)
Meredith Tosta	UPA Director of Youth Development
Anna Schott	UPA Manager of Membership and Sport Development
Val Nigro	UPA Administrative Assistant
David Raflo	National Masters Director
Kris Kelly	National Mixed Director
Jeff Kula	National College Director
Deanna Ball	National Women's Director
Adam Goff	National Open Director

President Mike Payne called the meeting to order.

Staff provided updates on progress on strategic plan action steps for 2008, and goals for 2009. A report on 2008 progress will be posted on the UPA web site within the next several weeks.

Will Deaver and Mike Payne provided an update on the recent College restructure committee meeting. In forming the committee, the goal was to include a broad spectrum of stakeholders: men/women, small/large schools, established/newer programs. Committee gathered data including info on structures in other sports/countries, came to common agreement on/prioritization of goals for restructure.

Two plans have been developed and will be presented to the community:

Plan 1

Teams are assigned to Conferences within each region. The regular season is tiered through a qualification process and is designed both to allocate Championship bids for each region and to pick the teams that get to play at tiered Regionals. Regionals determine the exact bid allocation to the Championships from within each Conference. Conference Championships send specific teams to Div I, Div II, or Div III (small school) Championships.

Plan 2

The regular season allows registered teams to be evaluated by a Selection Committee and to have

accurate rankings for the Series. The top 24 teams are picked by the Selection Committee to advance straight to one of 4 Super-Regionals. Sectional winners can also advance to Super-Regionals. Other teams play for spots at tiered Regionals. Super-Regionals advance 20 teams to Div I Nationals. Regionals advances teams to Div II or Div III (small school) Championships.

Proposed planning timetable

1/23 2009 Plan announced

1/31 – 2/28 Complete plan(s) feedback – full membership; blog, newsgroup, survey

2/28 – 3-31 – Review and revise

3/31 – Recommend to Board for approval

Spring/summer – detailed planning

Summer/fall – 2010 Guidelines/info

Eligibility checking incredibly important in whatever system is implemented.

Important to provide opportunity for players to provide feedback both on what they do and do not agree with on the respective plans.

When announcing plans, important to make community aware of the overall goals for college competition on which members of the committee reached agreement. How these goals impacted the plans that are being presented, and to provide context for radical changes being suggested.

Proposal: 2009.21 Assistance Provided to 2009 DIII College Nationals

Submitted by Will Deaver

Proposal wording: In line with feedback received from the Ultimate community, in line with the priorities set by the College Restructure Task Force, and in expectation of incorporating a similar event into the UPA College Series in the future, the UPA will offer its support to organizers of the 2009 D-III Nationals in the following ways:

- Offer to have a UPA representative attend the event to help on site and get a first-hand look at how the event, or something similar, might be incorporated into the UPA structure
- Offer to assist event organizers with refinement and implementation of qualification guidelines and procedures
- Offer to assist event organizers with promotion of the event and communication with teams through UPA channels
- Offer to serve as an event management resource for event organizers

Discussion

Pros of adopting proposal: Moves UPA in the direction its long-term plans are likely to take, in terms of providing a championship playing opportunity specifically for small colleges. Also helps to ensure that the D-III Nationals event will occur in 2009, in the absence of the UPA's ability to commit to running the event itself this year

Question: Would a women's division be added? Staff is unsure if this is part of the DIII organizer's plans, but certainly would be happy to assist in this process if the DIII organizers are open to it

As a result, the Board amended the proposal to include the following bullet:

- Offer to help explore the creation of a women's division as part of the event

Motion to approve as amended: Thorne. Second Bartram, Approved 12-0-0

Proposal 2009.20 – Use of Experimental Observer Roles in 2009 College Series

Submitted by Will Deaver on behalf of college restructure task force

Proposal wording: In 2009, the teams that qualify for the UPA College Championships will vote on whether to use Observers to make active, immediate referral, or the current non-active system for travel and up/down calls during the 2009 UPA College Championships. Each rule will be voted on separately. Each gender division will vote separately. A super-majority of 60% of the teams in each division will be required to approve use of the new rules for their division at the tournament.

Discussion

Do we have the observers to do this? Per observer chair Greg Connelly we have about 20 capable of doing this...will not use newly trained people. This should suffice for the experimental events and the Championships.

What is plan for providing results of feedback from experimental event since teams will be asked to vote based on this information? Have not figured it out yet, but realize this will need to be done.

Concern that we may receive anti-UPA backlash based on the fact that this will cost more and we will have to pass on the expense to the players. When we let folks know about the changes, need to let them know that costs will go up.

What do we do if women's and men's have different decisions? Concern about how it might look to spectators, impact on observers who are going back and forth between games, and gender equity. Majority of group felt that it would be acceptable for the divisions to reach different decisions.

Motion to approve: Thorne, second Davies, approved 11-1-0.

Proposal 2009.19 – Expand the UPA College Championships

Submitted by Will Deaver on behalf of College restructure task force

Proposal wording: In 2009, the UPA College Championships will be expanded to 40 teams (20 in each gender division). The event will be extended from three to four days, in order to preserve the integrity and quality of the experience, given the additional teams. Player fees will be increased in proportion to the increased costs of the event, including the additional expenses created by adding extra teams and the extra day.

Discussion

When we polled the teams, did they want a bigger event? Research does not support that they wanted the event just to be bigger with more teams – what they wanted was to accommodate need for additional strong/contender teams.

Motion to close discussion and accept the proposal: Thorne, second Bartram. Approved 11-0-1

Proposal 2009.18 – Bid Allocation Changes for the 2009 UPA College Championships

Submitted by Will Deaver on behalf of College restructure committee

Proposal wording:

Alternative 1: In 2009, contingent upon the expansion of the UPA College Championships to 20 teams, bids to the tournament will be allocated as follows:

- 16 bids using existing allocation system
 - o 8 geographically-based, automatic bids – 1 per region
 - o 4 strength bids, using existing strength algorithm, as allocated based on 2008 results
 - o 4 size bids, based on existing guidelines (current season registration)
- **4 new strength bids based on ranking algorithm, using current-season results, awarded to regions prior to 2009 regionals**
 - o Strength ranking algorithm to be determined by College Series staff

Alternative 2: In 2009, contingent upon the expansion of the UPA College Championships to 20 teams, bids to the tournament will be allocated as follows:

- 12 bids using current allocation system
 - o 8 geographically-based, automatic bids – 1 per region
 - o 4 strength bids, using existing strength algorithm, as allocated based on 2008 results
- **8 additional geographically-based, automatic bids - 1 more per region**

Alternative 3: In 2009, contingent upon the expansion of the UPA College Championships to 20 teams, bids to the tournament will be allocated as follows:

- 16 bids using current allocation system
 - o 8 geographically-based, automatic bids – 1 per region
 - o 4 strength bids, using existing strength algorithm, as allocated based on 2008 results
 - o 4 size bids, based on existing guidelines (current season registration)
- **4 new strength bids based on ranking algorithm, using current-season results, awarded to individual teams following the completion of 2009 regionals**
 - o Strength ranking algorithm to be determined by College Series staff

Discussion

Important that we keep in mind that strength of UPA Series is our eligibility system and we should support a system that does not diminish this.

Motion to vote on 1 – 3 or none: Payne, second - Seamon

Yes votes on 1: 0

Yes vote on 2: 12

Yes votes on 3: 0

Votes for none of the above: 0

2009.04 Championship Events Notification Requirements

Submitted By Colin McIntyre

Proposal wording: [INSERT APPLICABLE COMMITTEE] shall, no less than seven (7) months prior to any affected event in any UPA Series, provide notice to the membership of any changes in uniform requirements, eligibility requirements or the Rules of Ultimate. Notice may be provided through any official means of communication between the UPA and the membership, but an e-mail announcement is preferable.

Discussion

Why seven months? Why not six, four, nine? Feels like there could be situations where a change might need to be made within the non-allowed time for legal, risk management reasons and therefore we might need more flexibility to veer in rare cases from the recommended proposal. Should there be some sort of allowance that if a change has to be made within the non-allowed timeframe that it must go to the Board of Directors?

Motion to table, referred to Competition Committee to revise and resubmit to Board/ExComm for approval: Thorne, second, Seamon. Approved 12-0-0

Proposal 2009.15 Conduct Policy Revision

Submitted by Theresa Weber

Proposal wording: *Due to the proposal's length (i.e. revised Conduct Policy with addition of Grievance provisions), the proposal has not been included but will be shared with the community after further revision.*

Purpose:

Aside from the UPA's Conduct Policy, which pertains largely to on-field incidents and resultant complaints, there is currently no formal mechanism for stakeholders (both UPA members and others) to pursue resolution of grievances against UPA staff, board members, or the organization as a whole entity. Historically, complaints voiced by members and other stakeholders have been delivered informally by e-mail, phone, or in person to individual board or staff members. Such haphazard means of dispute resolution can adversely impact both those bringing grievances and those hearing them. These negative impacts may include:

- A virtually endless cycle of ad hoc "appeals" for those bringing complaints;
- A lack of transparency that encourages "tattling" and other behavior that detracts from effective dispute resolution;
- Potential for the appearance (or real existence) of partiality and selectivity in addressing complaints;
- Information asymmetries between staff and board (and within both) that may lead to misunderstanding or misrepresentation;
- General inability to reach closure.

Each of these impacts can have deleterious effects on the UPA and its stakeholders by wasting time, eroding trust, and diminishing reputations. By formalizing a single process/channel for hearing and adjudicating stakeholder complaints, the grievance procedure (modeled after the UPA's Conduct Policy) seeks to minimize the impacts enumerated above, and enhance the consistency and transparency in service provided to the UPA's most important stakeholders, its members.

Discussion

The Board agreed that it did not have sufficient time to absorb the document as presented. Those who had spent time reviewing it felt that there were still a number of language questions that needed to be resolved.

Vote to adopt: Henry, Second Seamon. Declined. 0-12-0

Board supportive of concept but needs revision. To be submitted by Executive Director after consultation with legal counsel (March ExComm).

Proposal 2009.10. Scheduled UPA Board Member Email Blasts to Constituents

Submitted by Sandie Hammerly, UPA Executive Director

Proposal wording: *That all regional Board reps implement a regular series of email communications with constituents in their region (or an assigned region).*

Discussion

It is recommended that emails be distributed four times per year. Style, content and format of each message will be left strictly to each Board member, although content should probably be reviewed by staff for typos and fact-checking and possibly the Board vice president or other officer for consistency of message.

Emails will be distributed by UPA headquarters using its email service.

Emails will contain contact information for members to respond to information contained in the email, and may include a request for information on topics for which the Board member would like to gain more information.

Motion to accept: Thorne, second Terry. Approved. 12-0-0

2009.07 UPA Magazine Ombudsman

Submitted by The Huddle (Andy Lovseth and Ben Wiggins)

Proposal wording: *We propose that the UPA hire an external ombudsman to produce a full-page article for each issue of the UPA newsletter.*

This person or group would not work for the UPA, and would be allowed limited but sufficient access to understand the actions taken by the UPA. This person or group would need to have a solid reputation for objective journalism, be respected within the Ultimate community, and be willing to put in the time and effort to describe the UPA well to the membership. This person or group might also need to do other writing or interviews on the subject as needed by outside groups.

Discussion

It is the role of the elected representatives of the members to provide this service. Newly adopted methods to better inform members: regional rep emails (see proposal 2009.10), board member blog, President's column in UPA magazine, and public statements page on UPA web site should make significant progress to providing the increased communication sought through this proposal.

Motion to approve: Seamon, second McLaughlin. Declined: 1 – 9 – 2

Meeting adjourned for the day.

Sunday, January 18.

Officer election results (2009 UPA Executive Committee):

President – Peri Kurshan
Vice President – David Lionetti
Treasurer – Seth Grossinger
Secretary – Josh Seamon
At Large – Gwen Ambler

Peri Kurshan calls meeting to order at 8am

Issue Discussion: Board Review of Competition Committee Decisions.

Both Board and Competition Committee members felt a need to clarify the process for review/appeal of decisions made by the Competition Committee.

Going forward, the Board requested that the Competition Committee develop more specific guidelines for sanctions. A taskforce was created to document a sanction structure that will be presented to the Board. Once agreement on the guidelines has been reached by the two groups, the Board will approve. During appeal proceedings the Board would only look to see if the guidelines have been followed. While it was agreed that there are concerns about the complexity and variance of the issues brought to the Competition Committee, it was nonetheless important to document the precedents, process and sanctions for various types of violations.

PROPOSAL 2009.12 – YCC BID ALLOCATION GUIDELINES

Submitted by the Youth Advisory Council (Lindsey Hack, David Vatz, Luke Johnson, Ryan Thompson, Catherine Greenwald, Miranda Roth), Meredith Tosta (Director of Youth Development) and Will Deaver (Director of Championships), Meredith Tosta presenting

Section 1 wording: *“In order to incentivize the growth of youth club play, a limit will be put on the number of consecutive years that a UPA sanctioned high school league or an at-large team can receive bids to the Youth Club Championships without developing a UPA sanctioned youth club league. The implementation of this policy would begin in 2010.”*

Discussion

One of the ways the UPA drives the growth of Youth Club Leagues is by using tournament incentives. The UPA would also like varied methods for connecting to youth members. YCC bid priority would still be given to youth club leagues, then high school based leagues, then at-large teams.

This proposal would allow for the expansion of each division at the YCCs. Bid allocation for youth club leagues would also be prioritized for leagues that are in the process of starting youth club divisions, not just based on last year’s league.

Motion to approve Proposal 2009.12.1: Lionetti, second Terry. Approved 12-0-0.

Section 2 wording: *“In order to incentivize growth in the number of opportunities for girls to play Ultimate in a single gender environment, the number of bids that a league can receive in each division and across divisions will be limited at the Youth Club Championships. The limits on the number of teams per division and across divisions will be determined according to the following guidelines:*

Open Bids	Girls Bids	Mixed Bids	Ok?	Why?
2	0	0	no	Minimum of 1 girls’ team in order to have 2 open teams
0	0	2	no	2 mixed teams would be enough players for an open and a girls’ team
2	1	2	no	Same as above
2	0	1	no	Minimum of 1 girls’ team in order to have 2 open teams. 1 mixed team is not sufficient
1	0	2	no	2 mixed teams would be enough for a girls’ team
2	1	0	yes	All of these options are providing single gender opportunities for girls to participate in.
2	1	1	yes	
1	1	1	yes	
1	0	1	yes	While this does not provide a single gender opportunity for girls, it also does not provide an overly disproportionate opportunity to boys.

Discussion

There are concerns that we do not want to limit the playing opportunities for boys. A balance needs to be reached where opportunities to play for girls are promoted and opportunities for boys are not eliminated. This proposal would allow a league to send multiple open teams for the first time.

Straw poll on the proposal: Result: 4-8-0.

Straw poll on the proposal with the amended wording: “You cannot have n+1 open or mixed teams without having n girls teams.” Result: 7-5-0.

Straw poll with the amended working: "In the awarding of multiple open/mixed bids, preference is given to leagues that are able to field a girls team." Result: 6-5-1.

Motion to amend "two open bids, one girls bid, and two mixed bids" to YES: Seamon, second Thorne. Motion passes: 8-4-0.

Motion to approve Proposal 2009.12, Proposal 2 as amended: Thorne, second Weisbrod. Approved 8-4-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.14 – YOUTH COMPETITION RESTRUCTURE PROPOSAL

Submitted by the Youth Advisory Council (Lindsey Hack, David Vatz, Luke Johnson, Ryan Thompson, Catherine Greenwald, Miranda Roth), Meredith Tosta (Director of Youth Development) and Will Deaver (Director of Championships), Meredith Tosta presenting

Proposal wording:

1. *Effective 2011, eliminate the HS Easterns/Westerns structure, in favor of four new regions (See Exhibit A for proposed regional breakdowns)*
 - a. *Northeast*
 - b. *South*
 - c. *Central*
 - d. *West*
2. *Develop a qualification system for teams to advance from the State Championships to the Regional Championships*
3. *Reevaluate plan in 2013 to decide if Regional boundaries should be redrawn and if plan is on track to hit goals, outlined below. Goal of this plan is to eliminate Regional competition by 2015 and be left with only state-level competition, but whether state organizations are far enough along for this will be determined when plan is reexamined in 2013.*
4. *Ideal Timeline (highest level of competition)*
 - a. *2009 – Easterns/Westerns*
 - b. *2010 – Easterns/Westerns*
 - c. *2011 – Northeasterns/Southern/Centrals/Westerns*
 - d. *2012 – Northeasterns/Southern/Centrals/Westerns*
 - e. *2013 – Northeasterns/Southern/Centrals/Westerns*
 - f. *2014 – Northeasterns/Southern/Centrals/Westerns*
 - g. *2015 – State Tournaments*
5. *Measurable Goals – By setting goals of how many UPA State Tournaments there are in a given year, we will be able to see how well we are progressing toward our goal of eliminating Regional competition and moving to State Level competition. These goals will also help evaluate whether in 2015, the goal year to eliminate Regionals, there are robust enough state organizations to handle this shift.*
 - a. *2009 – 22 UPA State Tournaments (Baseline year)*
 - b. *2010 – 26 UPA State Tournaments*
 - c. *2011 – 30 UPA State Tournaments*
 - d. *2012 – 34 UPA State Tournaments*
 - e. *2013 – 37 UPA State Tournaments*
 - f. *2014 – 40 UPA State Tournaments*

Discussion

There are many youth teams in the east. The western youth teams must travel great distances. There is concern that there may not be enough girls teams to support into four regional tournaments.

Motion to amend the first line to "By 2012,": Thorne, second Terry. Motion passes: 11-0-1.

Motion to amend the first line to “Effective 2012,” and increment all other dates by one year: Thorne, second Terry. Motion passes: 9-2-0.

Motion to approve 2009.14 as most recently amended: Thorne, second Terry. Approved: 10-1-1.

PROPOSAL 2009.17 – REGIONAL YOUTH COORDINATOR & STATE YOUTH COORDINATOR POSITIONS

Submitted by the Youth Advisory Council (Lindsey Hack, David Vatz, Luke Johnson, Ryan Thompson, Catherine Greenwald, Miranda Roth), Meredith Tosta (Director of Youth Development) and Will Deaver (Director of Championships), Meredith Tosta presenting

Proposal wording: *The Youth Development Director will oversee and manage four Regional Youth Coordinators to expand youth ultimate in their respective region, manage their Regional Championship tournament, and supervise and aid the State Youth Coordinators. The Regional Youth Coordinators will be paid a yearly stipend of \$1000 with the ability to earn a \$500 bonus depending on the success of their work and a budget of \$500 for travel and materials associated with their role as RYC. Regional Youth Coordinators will be appointed and in place by July 2009 in anticipation of the 2010 spring season, and will make a two year commitment to the position.*

Discussion

The SYC should spend more time on outreach. The regional positions will be more substantial than the college and club level regional coordinators, and thus should have director titles.

The proposal should not delineate the stipends to be provided. This will be determined on a year to year basis as part of the budget approval process.

Motion to amend the proposal to read as follows: Kurshan, second Seamon. Approved: 12-0-0.

Proposal wording: *The Youth Development Director will oversee and manage four Regional Youth Directors to expand youth Ultimate in their respective region, manage their Regional Championship tournament, and supervise and aid the State Youth Coordinators. Regional Youth Directors will be appointed and in place by July 2009 in anticipation of the 2010 spring season, and will make a two year commitment to the position.*

Motion to approve 2009.17 as amended: Bartram, second Payne. Approved as amended 12-0-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.13 – JUNIOR NATIONAL TEAM ASSISTANT COACH AND PLAYER SELECTION CRITERIA

Submitted by the Youth Advisory Council (Lindsey Hack, David Vatz, Luke Johnson, Ryan Thompson, Catherine Greenwald, Miranda Roth), Meredith Tosta (Director of Youth Development) and Will Deaver (Director of Championships), Meredith Tosta presenting

Section 1 wording: *Assistant coaches for the US Junior National teams will be UPA Level I certified coaches which are chosen by the UPA selected Head Coach and confirmed by the Executive Director of the UPA. It is strongly recommend that the chosen individuals represent a diverse geographic area of the United States.*

Motion to approve proposal 200.13.1 : Lionetti, second Bartram. Approved 11-0-1.

Section 2 wording: *US Junior National teams should be chosen to represent the best U-19 players the USA has to offer, while still taking into account the importance of representation of players from across the country. US Junior National team player selection, therefore, must meet the following criteria:*

- *A minimum 2 players per team be chosen from each youth region (northeast, south, central and west).*
- *It is recommended that a minimum (but not a set percentage or set number) of post-high school players be offered spots on the team.*
- *Preference should be given to players who have participated in a wide variety of ultimate playing situations in the USA over a number of years.*

Discussion of proposal 2: Are we limiting the skill of our team? Other countries can bring as many post-graduates as they'd like. Voting tabled until after proposal 3.

Section 3: *In order to provide incentives for U-19 players to seek opportunities to gain diverse playing experiences, the UPA will develop a partnership program with regional summer camps so that camps may have an avenue to provide recommendations for specific campers to be selected to attend the Junior National team tryouts.*

Discussion

Scouting would occur at events outside of the YCC, which is a limited event. This is not the accredited camps program and it is a common tactic that is done with other sports.

Motion to amend the proposal by adding “Program attributes will be subject to the approval of the Board of Directors prior to implementation.”: Payne, second Bartram. Motion passes: 12-0-0.

Motion to pass proposal 2009.13.3 as amended: Seamon, second Terry. Approved as amended 12-0-0.

Proposal 2009.13.2 discussion resumes.

Discussion

The question is raised that do we keep the team centered on HS players or open it up to mostly college players. At the summer Board meeting we decided that we were not centered on winning. There are examples of where the UPA holds itself to a higher standard than we are required.

It was agreed by the majority of the group present that it was appropriate to restrict the number of post high school players and that proposal 2009.13.2 should be further evaluated by the Youth Advisory Council and resubmitted to the Board for consideration.

Motion to table proposal 2009.13.2: Payne, second Bartram. Motion passes: 11-0-1.

PROPOSAL 2009.02 – COLLEGE ELIGIBILITY EXCEPTION (Proposed by Colin McIntyre)

Proposal wording:

Added Provisions to the Eligibility Rules:

II.B.1 A student taking classes full-time in a non-degree seeking program at the school for which eligibility is to apply may compete in the College Series provided:

- a) S/he is accepted and enrolled in a regularly matriculated degree program for the fall at that same school.*
- b) The program in which s/he is accepted and enrolled for the fall does not extend offers of admission for the Winter/Spring semester.*
- c) The classes taken will be credited towards the advanced degree.*
- d) The student provides documentation from school officials confirming the above facts before the applicable roster deadlines.*

Discussion

The UPA requires degree seeking for college eligibility. Concerns are raised that if this proposal passes the fundamental question of what it means to be a non-degree seeking student comes into question. Would this proposal make it easier to cheat? Could someone be degree seeking without declaring? Concerns are raised there is a moral hazard to having people justify they own degree seeking. Do we allow post-bachelor degree players, or not? A letter could be created for the dean of a program to sign.

The Board agreed with the general spirit of the proposal. However, in light of the fact that the entire eligibility guidelines will need to be re-written in conjunction with changes to the College series slated for 2010 and beyond, it was determined by the Board that this was not the appropriate time to make such a change, and instructed the staff to incorporate similar exemption language in future revisions.

Motion to approve Proposal 2009.02 : Payne, second Bartram. Declined: 0-12-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.22 – DEVELOP INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVER ROLE

Submitted by Will Deaver in cooperation with Youth Advisory Council and Greg Connelly, observer chair.

Proposal wording: *In order to realize the benefits of Observers in non-competitive and/or learning environments, the UPA will incorporate “instructional” training into its Observer Program. Instructional Observers will be authorized and encouraged to provide rules clarifications during competition, but will not serve as arbitrators or make active calls. Instructional Observers will be trained to help players continue play on contested calls within the rules of Ultimate and may also serve to announce time limits, keep score, and monitor conduct issues.*

Discussion

The point is raised that this proposal is less about youth vs. adults and more about the level of experience. The idea is that this person can add something to the game other than settling disputes. One benefit would be that this “official teacher” would provide a mechanism for people to really learn the rules of the game. Observers would be able to gain experience in low pressure situations. The concern was raised that this position could complicate self-officiating and also that there has been a call for observers at the youth level. There are concerns about putting observers into youth games. Instructional Observers are a compromise. The point is raised that the proposal gives the UPA the flexibility to give different tools to event organizers.

Motion to approve Proposal 2009.22: Thorne, second Terry. Approved: 12-0-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.01 – RULES REVISION PROCESS CHANGE

Submitted by Colin McIntyre

Proposal wording: *Before creating a final draft of a new edition of the Official Rules of Ultimate, the Standing Rules Committee must consult a survey of the membership to help assess members’ wants and concerns relating to the rules and how the game is played. Although the SRC is not bound to take actions based on the survey results, it must consider them during the revision process.*

When presenting a final draft of a new edition of the Official Rules of Ultimate to the membership for a vote of approval, the SRC will individually identify substantive changes from the previous edition. Where two or more changes are necessarily interconnected, the SRC will designate that group of changes as such. These discrete substantive changes (and groups of interconnected changes) will then be presented individually for approval by the membership. The SRC will also identify the remaining, minor, non-substantive changes that have been made, which will be presented as a group for approval by the membership. The new edition will include only those changes approved by the membership.

Discussion

The concern is raised of what to do with rules that are related to each other. More membership input would improve the process. The Standing Rules Committee is generally in favor of the proposal.

Motion to approve Proposal 2009.01: Payne, second Thorne. Approved: 12-0-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.05 – UPA COLLEGE ELIGIBILITY RULES REVISION

Submitted by Kyle Weisbrod

Section 2 wording: Players will be eligible to apply for and receive reinstatement of UPA college eligibility if they are unable to participate in one or more seasons of the UPA College Series while serving full-time, active-duty service in any branch of the US Armed Service.

Discussion

It was brought up that more exceptions were granted 10 years ago. When the eligibility rules were reexamined it was found that it was very difficult to define what to allow in terms of exceptions. Concerns were raised on the definition of “active duty”. Current statistics put the number of “active duty” service women and men at approximately 1.4 million. Concerns were raised about how other service commitments would be treated and that if this exception is granted, where does that take us? The point was raised that there are many possible places to grant an exception, but this might be a good place to start.

When asked whether some sort of exception should be allowed, approximately 60% of those present at the meeting said yes. However a third of those present chose to abstain.

Are we theoretically allowing the exception because they missed the series or because they missed the experience? Do we need to take in account people who play Ultimate while they are serving?

Motion to amend the proposal to state *“The UPA staff will create a policy which implements a college eligibility exemption for UPA members who serve in the US Armed Services. Details of the policy (including timing of service relative to college eligible years in the absence of service, definition of qualifying military service, definition of preclusion from UPA College Series participation, etc.) and its implementation will be submitted to, and reviewed by, the UPA Board of Directors prior to implementation.”* **Payne, second Weisbrod. Approved: 12-0-0.**

Motion to pass Proposal 2009.05.2 as amended: Thorne, second Payne. Approved 12-0-0.

Section 1 Wording: College eligibility will only begin when a player either:

- a. Joins a roster for the UPA College series OR
- b. Joins a roster for the UPA Club series after graduating from high school

Discussion

Prior to this discussion it was agreed upon with the submitter that a vote will not occur on this section at this time.

The concern was raised that some people do not like older players participating in the college series. The current system can be a disincentive for people to sanction their events (Utah Youth State Champs).

It was agreed by more than 3/4 of the Board members present that attending a sanctioned event alone should not start a player’s eligibility clock.

When asked whether in favor of starting eligibility at a) 1+ after HS (current method) or b) regardless of what you did as a HS student, eligibility would begin at the time you played in a rostered event regardless of when, no board members chose a) and more than 2/3rds chose b).

Section 3 Wording: *Players will receive a maximum of five years of college eligibility in which they can compete in a maximum of four college series.*

Discussion

Prior to this discussion it was agreed upon with the submitter that a vote will not occur on this section at this time.

The point is raised that the plan will take 5 years to implement and do we care about looking like other sports? The concern is raised that because of the 5 years of eligibility academic institutions with graduate programs are at an extreme advantage over four year institutions.

Of those in attendance at the meeting, approximately 70% indicated support for the proposal concept.

The Board encourages staff to begin exploration of the 5/4 concept through surveys of the membership as to their support.

PROPOSAL 2009.11 – VIDEO PRODUCTION PARTNERSHIP FOR DISTRIBUTION VIA UPA WEBSITE (

Submitted by Sandie Hammerly, UPA Executive Director

Proposal: That the UPA enter into a contractor relationship with Ultivillage to develop and present video content for the UPA web site.

Discussion

A partnership will be formed with UV to provide round by round highlight clips for all divisions and live streaming of finals of both College and Club Championships (subject to ability to get appropriate internet access at College Championships). In addition, it is planned that UPA will begin a partnership with UV to develop two video downloads per month that would be used to promote UPA events, provide Observer training, to help teach the rules of the game, or other specific and targeted messages for the UPA membership.

Live streaming of recent UPA events was very well received. It would be a step backward for the UPA to not cover its major events with internet media given the positive feedback from the first wave during the 2008 Club Championships.

Motion to approve proposal 2009.11: Thorne, second Seamon. Approved: 12-0-0.

PROPOSAL 2009.16 – SERVICE BOUDARIES

Submitted by Theresa Weber

Proposal wording:

To focus UPA resources on U.S.-based events and services, the UPA will do the following:

- 1. Beginning in 2009, increase the membership fee for non-U.S. members to cover the additional postage and transactional costs associated with international memberships.*
- 2. Continue to charge for shipping costs associated with sending rule books, kits, etc. internationally.*
- 3. Beginning in 2009, discontinue all sanctioning of events in foreign countries.*
- 4. Beginning in 2009, discontinue offering grants to international programs.*
- 5. By 2011, phase out providing Coaching and Observer clinics in foreign countries, while developing a licensing program so that CUPA and other interested national governing bodies may provide similar services themselves.*

6. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA Club Open, Women's, and Mixed, Championship Series events by 2012, but not before developing an additional club championship event with CUPA and/or WFDF in which U.S., Canadian and potentially other Pan-American teams compete.*
7. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA College Open and Women's Championship Series events by 2020 and explore the possibility of developing a U-23 club championship event with CUPA and/or WFDF in which U.S., Canadian and potentially other Pan-American teams compete.*
8. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA Club Masters, Grand Masters, and Women's Masters Championship Series events by 2020, but not before developing an additional club championship event with CUPA and/or WFDF in which U.S., Canadian and potentially other Pan-American teams compete*
9. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA Youth Club Open, Girls', and Mixed, Championship events by 2011, but not before exploring an additional club championship event with CUPA and/or WFDF in which U.S., Canadian and potentially other Pan-American teams compete.*
10. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA HS Open and Girls' Championship events by 2010.*

Discussion

The point was raised that this is a complex issue. The most popular option is to hold off as long as possible until other countries have similar structures before cutting teams out. We can't raise 2009 dues. The mission statement of the UPA states that we will operate in the United States.

It was agreed by the group that dates in items 1 – 5 should be delayed by one year.

It was also agreed by approximately 80% of those present that international teams playing in the UPA Series should be phased out within in the next 10 years in at least one division. When asked whether this should be contingent on the creation of comparable replacement events, vote was split almost evenly, however, approximately 25% of those present abstained from the vote.

The points were raised that we need to allow organizations like CUPA to grow on their own and that just because we say US in our mission statement doesn't mean we have to contract our current international programs. Time is needed to explore multi-country competition with neighboring countries.

Motion to amend 2009.16 as follows: change the year 2009 to 2010 in sections 1, 4; delete sections 6, 7, and 8; edit section 9 to change 2011 to 2010 and deleting all verbiage after 2010; and adding the following section "In 2011, explore desirability of restricting select UPA Series (UPA Club Open, Club Women's, Master's, Women's Masters, Grandmasters, College Open, College Women's and other UPA divisions as determined necessary at that time) to participation by US-based teams only. This exploration will include discussions with other NGB's and WGB regarding creation of additional championship tournaments that allow competition among top teams from multiple countries in those divisions." **Thorne, second Payne, approved 11-0-0.**

Revised proposal 2009.16 now reads:

To focus UPA resources on U.S.-based events and services, the UPA will do the following:

1. *Beginning in 2010, increase the membership fee for non-U.S. members to cover the additional postage and transactional costs associated with international memberships.*
2. *Continue to charge for shipping costs associated with sending rule books, kits, etc. internationally.*
3. *Beginning in 2009, discontinue all sanctioning of events in foreign countries.*
4. *Beginning in 2010, discontinue offering grants to international programs.*
5. *By 2011, phase out providing Coaching and Observer clinics in foreign countries, while developing a licensing program so that CUPA and other interested national governing bodies may provide similar services themselves.*

6. *In 2011, explore desirability of restricting select UPA Series (UPA Club Open, Club Women's, Master's, Women's Masters, Grandmasters, College Open, College Women's and other UPA divisions as determined necessary at that time) to participation by US-based teams only. This exploration will include discussions with other NGB's and WGB regarding creation of additional championship tournaments that allow competition among top teams from multiple countries in those divisions.*
7. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA Youth Club Open, Girls', and Mixed, Championship events by 2010.*
8. *Transition to U.S. team-only UPA HS Open and Girls' Championship events by 2010.*

Motion to approve proposal 2009.16 as amended: Thorne, second Terry. Approved 12-0-0.

Business meeting adjourned. Annual Members Meeting convened at 5:30. One member attending. Meeting concludes at 6:15 p.m.

Monday, January 19, 2009

Meeting called to order by President Peri Kurshan

Sandie Hammerly reviewed the 2009 proposed budget. Proposed revenue total: \$1,377,973. Proposed expenses: \$1,476,951.

It was agreed by the Board that whenever new events are created (such as Team USA Tryout Camps and Grand/Women's Masters Championships) that fees charged to the participants should cover the costs of the event (i.e. member dues should not be subsidizing them in their inaugural year).

The Board agreed that while the proposed budget reflected a deficit for the proposed profit and loss, it was appropriate to utilize reserves (if needed) in order to accomplish strategic planning initiatives.

Motion to approve the 2009 proposed budget: Grossinger, second Thorne Approved 11-0-0.

Board development session.

2009 BOD Committee Assignments (staff liaisons):
 Executive: Kurshan, Lionetti, Grossinger, Seamon, Ambler (Hammerly)
 Board Development: Bartram, Payne, Ambler (TBD)
 Nominating: Payne, Terry, Seamon (Hammerly)
 Technology: Lionetti, Terry, Seamon, Grossinger (Hammerly, Byrd)
 SOTG: McLaughlin, Davies (Hammerly. Comm staff TBD)
 Conduct: Weisbrod, Ambler, McLaughlin (Deaver)

BOD Liaisons:
 Observers: Kurshan (Deaver)
 Rules: Kurshan (Deaver)
 HOF: Thorne (Hammerly)

Competition Committee Task force: Thorne, Ambler, McLaughlin

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.