

Agenda

Special Meeting of the USFA Board of Directors

February 14th, 2010 Memphis, TN

The Board of Directors meeting is divided into six major phases:

Information: Minutes of the previous meeting; officer, director and committee reports; and general announcements.

Budget: Approval or disapproval of the budget, requests for major changes in it including staff or executive actions that may involve budget changes.

Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws (when appropriate)

Elections (when appropriate)

Unfinished Business

New Business

The latter two categories are what was formerly known as the “Decision Phase” and consist largely of motions before the Board, as well as planning discussions.

Motions before the Board (excluding those directly related to the budget) are divided into three categories:

SECOND HEARING: Motions that have had First Hearing at the previous Board meeting; Second Hearing motions must be voted upon as presented, with only minor changes permitted (if a motion requires major changes or fails completely, it must be re-presented as a First Hearing Motion at a subsequent Board meeting).

URGENT: Motions that have not had a First Hearing but must be acted upon by the Board for time or other considerations.

FIRST HEARING: Motions that are new to the Board, but for which decisions are not urgent. A First Hearing motion may not be voted upon unless the Board moves it to the Urgent category; instead, it is automatically placed in the Second Hearing category at the next meeting unless the sponsor withdraws it.

Every motion must have an individual sponsor identified in the agenda and in attendance at the meeting. The sponsor presents the motion, answers questions, takes notes on suggested changes, and shepherds the motion if it is referred to committee. Committees that are presenting motions must assign a member to fulfill this duty.

Index of Appendices

<u>Description</u>	<u>Appendices/ Attachments</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Officer Reports</u>		
President’s Report – Kalle Weeks	M	77
Vice President’s Report – Mark Stasinis	A	20
Vice President’s Report – Jerry Benson	B	21
Vice President’s Report - Jane Carter		
Secretary’s Report – Bradley Baker	C	22
Treasurer’s Report – Greg Dilworth		
Budget vs. Actual	(separate report)	
Budget Report	(separate report)	
Executive Director’s Report – Kurt Aichele		
<u>Committee Reports and other Appendices</u>		
Sports Science & Technology Committee	D	23
Hall of Fame Committee	E	24
Paralympic Development Committee	F	25
Resource Development Committee	G	26
Tournament Committee	H	27
Veteran’s Committee	I	56
Fencing Officials Commission	J	59
Proposed Amendments to the Operations Manual from Second Hearing Motion 1	K	60
Proposed Amendments to the Operations Manual from Second Hearing Motion 4	L	66
Bylaws Review Task Force	N	79
Proposed Bylaws	(separate report)	
National Calendar Proposal Financial Projections	O	81

*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.

I. Information

A. General Information and Organizational Items:

General announcements

Appointment of Parliamentarian.

B. Minutes of the September 19 & 20, 2009 Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors

Motion (Mr. Baker): To approve the minutes of the September 19 & 20, 2009 Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors (the minutes are distributed separately)

C. Officer and Executive Director Reports: (Please refer to the Index of Appendices)

Motion (Mr. Baker): To receive Officer and Director reports.

D. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee Reports of Action. The EC took the following actions:

October 20th, 2009

- The Executive Committee received a follow-up question based upon an action taken on August 11th regarding differing standards for entry to the same event by male and female fencers. The EC reiterates the previous point that the entry requirements to a particular event cannot differ based upon an athlete's gender. Specifically, athletes of one gender cannot be required to also compete in a second event as an additional entry requirement.
- The Executive Committee has received a request from the New York Athletic Club and NYAC II to officially merge into a single club, with the combined club retaining the automatic team qualification slots previously earned for the 2010 National Championships by each original club. The Executive Committee has approved this request as being within the spirit of the rules regarding clubs receiving automatic bids based upon placement within the top four of the preceding season's National Championships.

November 10th, 2009

- Approved the formation of a Tournament Format Task Force. Bradley Baker (chair) and Darius Wei were appointed, with two additional members to be determined. The TTF is charged with the following duties:
 - Examine the acceptable formats and variations used for Divisional Tournaments, for the expressed interest of benefiting the fencers in the Division and earning of classifications.
 - Explore the possibility of expanding the types of acceptable formats to be used and define or outline their structure for the benefit of the competition and competitors.
 - The Task Force will complete this process in time to have a report with recommendations for the Board to review at the Special Meeting in July 2010.
- The Tournament Committee has further revised the proposal for changes to the National Calendar, taking into account the feedback received from members and other stake-holders based upon the first

proposal. While work continues on the schedule, in order to allow for venues to be booked at favorable rates, the Executive Committee has approved directing the National Office to start making arrangements and signing contracts as necessary for the first half of the 2010-2011 season, through the Junior Olympics 2011. The tournaments during that time period under the most recent proposal are:

North American Cup A

October 15-18, 2010

Division I/II/Veteran/Senior Team

Div. I MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Div. II MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Veteran MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Senior Teams MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS (24 events) 4 days

North American Cup B

November 12-15, 2010

Junior/Cadet/Y14/Junior Team

Y14 MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Cadet MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Junior MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Junior Teams MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WE (24 events) 4 days

North American Cup C

January 14-17, 2011

Division I/Junior/Cadet/Junior or Senior Team

Div. I MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Junior MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Cadet MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Jr. or Senior Team MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS (24 events) 4 days

2011 Junior Olympics

February 18-21, 2011

Junior MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Cadet MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS

Junior Team MF, WF, ME, WE, MS, WS (18 events) 4 days

[Note: There is also a related motion (First Hearing Motion 6) on the agenda]

November 27th, 2009

- The Executive Committee received an appeal from a member regarding the outcome of the decertification of a local tournament.

The petitioning member competed in a tournament in a neighboring division in September and was told at the conclusion of her event that she had earned a C09 classification. On October 4th, the hosting division's Executive Committee found that the tournament was in violation of several provisions of their rules and policies for sanctioned events and voted to decertify the tournament in question.

The tournament organizer was informed of the Division EC's ruling and was delegated the responsibility to inform the affected fencers, a task which appears not to have been completed. The Division posted the minutes of the meeting, including this ruling, on their website, but not until November 20th.

The petitioning member had, in the interim, already made arrangements to compete in a Division I event at NAC C. She discovered the decertification of the tournament on November 17th following an inquiry

to the National Office about her entry status. The petition requests that the EC overturn the Divisional decision to decertify the tournament.

The EC has declined to overturn the decision made by the Division EC and the decertification of the tournament is upheld. Acknowledging the unusual circumstances, the limited time available, and the member's good faith reliance on the reported results when registering for NAC C, the EC has decided to make a special exception to allow the petitioner to compete at NAC C. The "C" classification that would have otherwise been earned if the tournament in question had not been decertified will not be officially recognized for any other purpose.

December 1st, 2009

- The Executive Committee approved the appointment of a Task Force to review and make recommendations regarding US Fencing's policies, practices and procedures related to international-level and National Team athletes, coaches, managers, and cadre. Contingent on their agreement to participate on the Task Force, Paul Soter is appointed chair, with additional members Peter Barton and Stephanie Haggerty.

December 15th, 2009

- The Executive Committee reaffirmed the decision of the National Office, based upon current policy, to deny an athlete request for refund of a NAC entry fee for withdrawal after the withdrawal deadline.
- The Executive Committee reviewed an athlete appeal of a decision not to allow the athlete to change club representation. Based upon historic precedent and the recent interpretations of section 5.2.B.1 in the Operations Manual, the EC determined that the athlete did not require special permission to change club representation. The EC noted that the section of the Operations Manual is in need of revision to increase clarity and that there is already a motion scheduled for a second hearing in February that would modify it.
- Approved the appointment of Daniel Berke and Wayne Jenness as the two "TBD" members of the Tournament Formats Task Force originally established November 10th.

January 12th, 2010

- Added Sada Jacobson to the Task Force examining high performance processes and procedures originally appointed on December 1, 2009.

January 26th, 2010

- The Executive Committee reviewed the appeal of a tournament organizer to be allowed to conduct an RYC tournament. The EC has approved the request that the tournament be granted sanction and included on the Youth Calendar.
- The Executive Committee considered questions about a possible error in the recently-released 2009-

2010 Athlete Handbook. These questions concerned the examples demonstrating how domestic Group I points are calculated throughout the season, as listed in Section 4.4 (Cadet Point Standings). The EC has directed that changes be made to the Athlete Handbook to reflect past practice from the 2009-2010 season and to correct what has been published.

Motion (Mr. Baker): to approve EC action items.

2. Committee Reports: (Please refer to the Index of Appendices)

Motion (Mr. Baker): to receive committee reports.

II. Budget Phase

A. Financial Reports:

Budget vs. Actual report for period ending December 31, 2009.

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

III. Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws

A. Motion (Mr. Clements; Seconded by Mr. Baker; Referred to Bylaws Review Task Force):

To amend the Bylaws of the Association by adding the following section to Article VIII:

Art. VIII, Sec. 23. **Executive Session.** The Board shall hold an executive session during each Annual Meeting at which the Board shall review the performance and terms of employment of the Executive Director or any member of the Association's staff exercising the authority of the Executive Director. At either the annual meeting or at any special meeting, the Board may take up a specific matter, including a disciplinary matter, in executive session on a motion supported by two-thirds of the ~~whole membership~~ members of the Board present. An executive session shall be open only to members of the Board and General Counsel of the Association unless the motion seeking the session expressly designates specific, named individuals who may remain present.

Rationale: Currently there are matters which come before the Board involving privacy issues, while no specific mechanism or authorization exists providing for such matters to be taken up out of full view of the membership. Colorado nonprofit law does not prohibit executive sessions, and the Bylaws of the United States Olympic Committee expressly include a provision requiring that body's Board of Directors to meet in executive session at least twice per year. USOC Bylaws, Sec. 3.2, Para. 6. There is currently a need for some provision allowing for the Board to meet in executive session while recognizing that such sessions should be extraordinary and limited to specific matters.

B. Motion (Mr. Clements; Seconded by Mr. Masin; Referred to Bylaws Review Task Force):

To amend Art. VIII, Sec. 10 of the Bylaws of the Association as follows:

Section 10 Quorum. At any meeting of the Board of Directors, the number of members present in person constituting a quorum shall be the greater of one-third of the members in office or seven members ~~present in person~~. On failure of a quorum a lesser number shall have the power to adjourn to a given time and place. The date, place and time of each meeting shall be designated by the President.

Rationale: Colorado Revised Statutes Sec. 7-128-205 expressly provides that a quorum of the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation cannot consist of fewer than one-third of the members of the board. Currently, the Association's Board of Directors includes up to thirty individuals, one-third of which is ten. This amendment conforms the Association's Bylaws to the requirements of Colorado law.

IV. Unfinished Business

A. Second Hearing

1. Motion (Mr. Clements):

Second: Mr. Dilworth

To replace the existing classes of individual memberships with new membership classes having rights, benefits, and privileges as follows:

1. **Competitive Members.** Competitive members have the right to enter and compete in local, regional, and national-level competitions, and subject to deadlines as to the date of membership or requirements as to the minimum length of membership, shall have the right to vote or run for office in USFA elections. Competitive members may join for one-year or three-year terms upon payment of dues as determined by the Board of Directors.
2. **Professional members.** Professional members, particularly including coaches, have the same rights, benefits, and privileges as Competitive members, and additionally receive the benefit of a general liability insurance policy purchased by the Association. In order to become a Professional member, an individual must pay for and successfully complete such background screening as may be required by the Association or by said insurance, and the Executive Director is hereby authorized to implement standards for said background screening.
3. **Life members.** On payment of dues as determined by the Board of Directors, Life members have the same rights, benefits, and privileges as Competitive members, and may vote in elections of the USFA membership subject to deadlines as to the date of membership. Life members retain these rights, benefits, and privileges for the remainder of their natural lives without the payment of additional dues.
4. **Benefactor members.** Life members may show their continuing support of the Association by upgrading their membership to Benefactor status. Benefactor memberships are grouped in four levels (Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Platinum), with the dues for each level as determined by the Board of Directors. Benefactor members receive additional benefits, including insignia and devices for wear, a certificate, and additional recognition through the Association's channels of communications.
5. **Non-Competitive members.** Non-Competitive members enjoy the rights, benefits, and privileges of Competitive members with respect to voting and holding office; however, Non-Competitive members may not enter into sanctioned competitions. The Association will also include access to a major medical/special accident plan at special rates. Non-Competitive members may join for one-year or three-year calendar (rather than fencing season) terms upon payment of dues as determined by the Board of Directors.

6. Non-Competitive Life members. On payment of dues as determined by the Board of Directors, Non-Competitive Life members have the same rights, benefits, and privileges as Non-Competitive members, and retain those rights, benefits, and privileges for the remainder of their natural lives.

7. Associate members. Associate members are those individuals who wish to receive American Fencing magazine, but who do not wish to vote, compete, or hold office in the Association. The Association will also include access to a major medical/special accident plan at special rates.

8. Family memberships. Family memberships include 2 Competitive memberships and 2 Associate (non-voting) memberships. Additional Competitive members living at the same address may be added on payment of additional dues as determined by the Board of Directors. Family memberships include one subscription to American Fencing magazine.

To implement these changes, Chapter 2 of the Operations Manual is amended as follows in Appendix J.

2. Motion (Mr. Streb; Seconded by Mr. Blake):

To adopt 100% promotion from pools to direct eliminations in all Veteran USFA National events including NAC's & Summer National Championships.

Rationale:

1. The 80% rule was applied to veteran fencers a few years ago in order to replicate the World Championship format. Only a very small percentage of vet fencers compete in the World Championships held annually in September, unlike the other team categories – cadet, junior and senior where there are several world cups open to a range of competitors who can qualify via their point standings. We shouldn't penalize the majority of the veteran fencers for the sake of preparing the four people in each category who are going to attend *one* international competition annually.

Furthermore, if such a rationale was applied uniformly to all other age categories, the Division 1 Nationals would have to return to a 2-day format as done at World Cups.

2. The national veteran events have traditionally been small competitions. At the last NAC, (March 2009) the largest group was 35 competitors while the average was below 25. There is no logical rationale to cut fencers out of such small events. The veteran 60 women's foil had 11 competitors. If all of these women fence in July 2009, 2.2 of them will not be able to fence in the direct elimination bouts. Dropping 2 fencers does nothing to expedite the competition, nor does it advance the sport in any manner. It only serves to ensure that those two women will think twice about paying tournament fees and taking on the expense of traveling to Summer Nationals again.

At present, there are only three national tournaments available to Veterans fencers. Unlike 14 year-olds, who can fence in upwards of 8 events at any given national tournament, Veterans are restricted by age and event timing to 1 or 2 competitions. At National Championships, without the veterans combined category, fencers are flying to a venue and booking a hotel for one event. While many have been involved in the sport for decades,

equally as many are new to fencing and the USFA. Why should one incur the considerable expense to fence in 4 or 5 pool bouts, only to be eliminated before the direct elimination bouts?

Tournament Committee Response to Motion

The Tournament Committee recommends that based on the current formats outlined below from the Athlete's Handbook, that no change is warranted at this time.

Format (NAC)

- One round of pools
- 100% promoted out of pools
- No repêchage
- DE bout format: 10 touches in two 3-minute segments. In saber, bouts are fenced to 10 touches, with a 1-minute break when the first fencer reaches 5 touches.

Format (Championships)

- One round of pools
- 80% promoted out of pools; however, if there are 8 or fewer fencers registered in the event, 100% shall be promoted out of the pools [BOD, September , 2008]
- No repêchage
- DE bout format: 10 touches in two 3-minute segments. In saber, bouts are fenced to 10 touches, with a 1-minute break when the first fencer reaches 5 touches.

3. Motion (Mr. Masin; Seconded by Mr. Kuver):

Modify Section 5.2.B.1 of the Operations Manual as follows:

A fencer may at any time resign from one club and join another, or join or hold membership in two or more clubs. ~~However, within the same fencing season, no fencer may represent in competition more than one club without special permission of the Board of Directors.~~ The fencer's first stated club affiliation at a USFA competition in each fencing season becomes that fencer's club representation for that season, unless the fencer changes club representation by January 31st or before any team qualifying competition, whichever occurs the earliest. After this deadline, fencers may not change their club representation without special permission of the Board of Directors. In any team competition, fencers can fence only for the club that they last represented before the start of the competition.

Justification

The revised wording should help clarify three ambiguities in the current wording:

- 1) The current wording first states that at no time in the fencing season can a fencer change club representation without the permission of the BOD but then later states that they can do it before January 31st or the team qualifying competition. The proposed wording makes it clear that the BOD permission is required only after the deadline.
- 2) The current wording implies that the BOD could grant a fencer permission to represent two or more clubs at the same time. The proposed wording clarifies that the BOD can grant only the changing of a fencer's club representation from one club to another.

3) In cases where fencers represent more than one club during a fencing season (for example, their school during the scholastic year and then their club later in the season), the current wording does not make it clear that they cannot fence on both their school's team and their club's team if both their school and their club qualify teams (for example, fence for their school's epee team and their club's foil team). The proposed wording clarifies that they can only fence for the team that they last represented.

4. Motion (Mr. Dilworth; Seconded by Mr. Baker)

The US Fencing Operations manual will be modified as listed in Appendix L effective on 8/1/2010.

Rationale: I believe that most people would agree that recent years have seen an increased amount of divisiveness and difficulty in our US Fencing Divisions. These problems have occurred in every part of the country, from the largest to the smallest Divisions and have taken on a number of forms. This motion is intended to address what is, in my opinion, the structural reason for these problems.

The motion contains a number of changes to the US Fencing Operations Manual and is designed to do the following:

1. Move the primary sanctioning of non-qualifier events from the division level to the Club level.
2. Create an appeals process where, if any tournament is run contrary to the rules contained elsewhere in the Operations Manual the tournament may lose its sanctioned status and where, if the fault is considered to be particularly serious or repetitive, the entity that sanctioned the tournament may be barred from doing so in the future.

I believe that changing the operations manual in this way will lessen the problems our Divisions are having because I believe that the basic root causes of those problems are money and access to fencing opportunities. Fencing tournaments, if sufficiently large and well attended can make a significant amount of money. Therefore it behooves a club to hold as many large tournaments as possible. It is much easier to have a large tournament if there are no other tournaments in your area that compete with you and if you get to have more tournaments. Fencers also want to have a large number of appropriate (in terms of age/skill level/weapon/etc.) tournaments to attend. Fencers are always happier if the tournament well run and are usually happier if the tournament is relatively big.

Currently, the division's executive committee (and sometimes a delegated tournament committee or sub-group of the division executive committee) is responsible for meeting these challenges. In some cases various groups have taken over the leadership of a division and then sanctioned tournaments to the benefit of certain clubs or groups of people to the detriment (or at least perceived detriment) to other clubs or groups of people. In other divisions, the contestants for influence, fearful or unwilling to share power, are deadlocked. In those places no one interest dominates the others, but nothing gets accomplished. Instead of developing the sport, the divisions are paralyzed and energy is diverted into unproductive, distracting and off-putting personal attacks and infighting. In either situation, instead of fostering our sport, we are driving people away.

I have no doubt that this will cause new problems and that there are a number of both intended and unintended consequences from this fundamental change to our structure. Thus, this motion

is designed to take effect on August 1, 2010, over 10 months after it is initially proposed. This is imperative so that everyone will have time to provide input on whether or not the cure is more harmful than the disease, on how this motion may be improved and to prepare should this motion pass.

5. Motion (Mr. Clements; Seconded by Mrs. Bell):

To provide for the adequate discharge of the Board of Directors' duties to manage, supervise, and shepherd the resources of the Association, contracts or purchases meeting any of the following conditions must be specifically reviewed and approved by the Board of Directors:

- a. The contract involves the purchase, sale, lease, or encumbrance of real property, or the licensure, purchase, or sale of intellectual property;
- b. The contract, by its terms, purports to impose requirements on the individual members of the Association;
- c. The total value of the contract in the present fiscal year (i.e., the potential monetary obligation incurred by the Association under the contract exclusive of any revenues which may be generated under the contract) exceeds \$25,000.00;
- d. The term of the contract exceeds four years, regardless as to value;
- e. The term of the contract exceeds one year, and either:
 - i. the total value of the contract in any single fiscal year exceeds \$10,000.00; or
 - ii. the total value of the contract in any single fiscal year exceeds ten percent of the budgetary allocation for the relevant spending category in the current fiscal year (i.e., the line-item allocation approved by the Board of Directors in the Association's budget).

Contracts for direct employment by the Association shall be exempt from this requirement, as shall contracts for which provisions are otherwise specifically provided by resolution of the Board of Directors (including provisions of the Operations Manual and existing policies for reimbursement or payment of volunteers).

The Executive Committee shall have the authority to approve contracts on behalf of the Board of Directors while the Board is in recess. The Executive Committee's approval of any contract falling within the definitions of categories (a) or (b), any contract for employment of the Executive Director, or any contract whose total value exceeds \$200,000.00 is subject to the ratification of the Board of Directors.

In addition to the foregoing requirements, all contracts whose obligations in aggregate or related financial exposure exceed \$100,000.00 must be reviewed, prior to their execution, by the General Counsel or by such other legal counsel as the Executive Committee may approve in specific cases. In addition, any contract that (1) has rights or commitments extending for more than one year; (2) contains defense, indemnification or hold harmless provisions; (3) seeks to limit the amount or types of liability of the other contracting party, its subcontractors, agents, or Association successors; or (4) establishes the choice of law, forum or dispute resolution means must be reviewed by the General Counsel or by such other legal counsel as the Executive Committee may approve in specific cases.

6. Motion (Mr. Clements; Seconded by Mr. Blake)

To amend Chapter 6, Section 4 of the Operations Manual by adding a new Paragraph 7:

7. In the event that the issuance of a penalty of exclusion from a competition would result in a reduction of the rating of a competition (either through the reduction in the number of fencers or through the reduction of rated fencers finishing at the appropriate levels of competition) or the number of qualifications awarded at qualifier events (through the reduction in the number of qualifiers awarded based on applying the appropriate percentage, e.g. 25%), the Tournament Committee may examine the circumstances of the exclusion, including through statements of the tournament organizer, officer(s) of the sanctioning body, and/or the official issuing the exclusion. Upon this examination, the Tournament Committee may award classifications and/or qualifications to the non-excluded fencers as if the excluded fencer had completed the tournament if, in its judgment, such result would be equitable. The Tournament Committee may establish a fee for this review not to exceed \$100, to be divided amongst the party/parties requesting examination.

V. New Business

A. Urgent

1. Motion (Mrs. Carter):

To refer to the Membership for its consideration, with a recommendation for approval, the Bylaws as proposed by the Bylaw Review Task Force.

The proposed Bylaws have been attached as a separate document

B. First Hearing

1. Motion (Mr. Baker):

To approve the Committee List as distributed at the Board Meeting

It is requested that this motion be moved to urgent

2. Motion (Mr. Masin):

Starting at the next meeting of the USFA Board of Directors, the committee in charge of evaluating proposals for replacing the current classification system be required to give a report on the status of their evaluation at each meeting of the Board. The first report should include a description of the replacement systems being evaluated. That report and all subsequent reports should indicate the progress being made in the evaluation and a projected date when a final recommendation will be made.

It is requested that this motion be moved to urgent

3. Motion (Mr. Masin):

Team Event Proposal

Eliminate the Divisional qualifying competitions for the Senior and Junior team events at the Summer Nationals. Teams would still be required to submit their entries at the time of close of entries for the individual events of the same competition. The team entry would still not have to

specify the names of the fencers on those teams. Clubs would be allowed to enter up to three teams. At the time the teams submit their registration at the competition, the fencers on the teams must meet the following criteria.

Senior Team

One member of each team must be a fencer who is registered to fence in the Division I Championship in the same weapon in that year. The second, third, and fourth members of the team must be fencers who are registered to fence in either the Division I, the Under-19, the Division I-A, or the Division II Championship in the same weapon in that year.

Junior Team

Two members of each team must be fencers who are registered to fence in either the Under-19 or the Division I Championship in the same weapon in that year. The third and fourth members of the team must be fencers who are registered to fence in either the Under-19, Under-17, Division I, Division I-A, Division II, or Division III Championship in the same weapon in that year. (Age requirements would, of course, still apply.)

		Current Year's					
		Division I	Division I-A	Division II	Division III	Under-19	Under-17
Senior Team Members	1	Y					
	2	Y	Y	Y		Y	
	3	Y	Y	Y		Y	
	4	Y	Y	Y		Y	
Junior Team Members	1	Y				Y	
	2	Y				Y	
	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Justification

1) The proliferation in the Spring of the various competitions (North American Cup, Regional Open Circuit, Super Youth Circuit, Regional Youth Circuit, Senior World Cup, Junior and Cadet Worlds, Sectional Championships, NCAA Championships) plus religious holidays (Easter, Passover), secular holidays (Memorial Day, Mother’s Day, Father’s Day), SAT exam dates, and school final exam periods makes it unlikely that clubs can field their four strongest fencers on any date that a Division might choose to schedule its team qualifying competitions.

- 2) NCAA regulations limit the dates that a fencer can represent a club. This means that collegiate fencers cannot be used to help their clubs qualify a team if the Division schedules its qualifying event during what the NCAA defines as the collegiate season.
- 3) Teams can currently submit a line-up at the time of the competition completely made up of incompetent fencers since there's no requirement that any of the fencers be the same ones who qualified the team at the Divisional qualifying competition. Also, in many cases, especially when the National Championships takes place a considerable distance away from a Division, the teams that the Division qualifies may not be the strongest from that Division but rather the only ones that showed up at the qualifying competition. This demeans the National Championships and wastes the time of the other fencers, bout committee, and referees as well as other resources. In short, Divisional qualifying competitions are not serving the role of making sure that only competent teams are competing.
- 4) The change allowing clubs to enter up to three teams has created a potential problem with the current Divisional team qualification process. Consider the following scenario. A club has many fencers but three are much better than the rest. Those three fence in the Nationals and finish in third place. This gives the club an automatic qualifying spot in the following year's Nationals. The following year, those same three fencers fence in the Divisional team qualifying event and earn a qualifying spot. The club can now enter two teams in that year's Nationals, one based on the automatic qualification and one based on the Divisional qualifying result, even though it was the same three fencers who earned both slots.
- 5) Verification of membership status of the team members is simplified since all of the team members will have had their current membership status confirmed at the time their entry into the individual competition was processed. The person checking the submitted team line-ups need only see if the names are on the list of entries for that year's events.
- 6) Note the proposed criteria do not prevent a cadet fencer from fencing in the Senior Team event but the cadet fencer must be competent enough to have qualified for the Under-19, the Division I-A, or the Division II Championship. Likewise D, E, or even Unclassified fencers can compete as long as they have demonstrated competence by qualifying for one of the individual Championships.
- 7) The proposed criteria would prevent a strong team from putting a totally incompetent fencer on the team with no intention of that fencer fencing just so that fencer can get a medal if the team finishes in the top three spots. In the most notorious case from the past, one year a gold medal in senior team was awarded to the son of one of the fencers on that team even though the son was less than one year old. The team did not have a fourth fencer, so the father took out a USFA membership for his son and the team registered the son as the fourth person on their team.
- 8) The Division I-A, Division II, and Division III Championships would gain additional importance since they would now attract fencers who wish to be able to fence in the team events.
- 9) The proposal might result in the loss of revenue to the Divisions of the entry fees to the qualifying events which would no longer be held. This should probably be minor. Divisions may actually benefit financially from the proposal since there are probably many cases where they've had to schedule the team qualifying competitions and no teams have shown up.

4. Motion (Mrs. Carter, on behalf of the Veterans Committee):

WHEREAS the amendment to Rule 2.11 of the Athlete Handbook was passed on condition that the creation of the new Veterans category V70 was made “on a trial basis for the 2009 Summer Nationals, and for the 2009-2010 season, in the two NAC events and the 2010 Summer Nationals;”

Rule 2.11.6 is made permanent so the V70 category shall continue without any time restraints.

5. Motion (Mr. Berke):

In order to reduce the confusion surrounding how to determine the qualifiers for events at Summer Nationals, the Tournament Committee will review the published qualification rules and edit them for correctness, clarity and consistency. At the minimum, an example will be provided that shows how qualifiers are determined at a sample combined Division II/III qualifier. These changes will be made as amendments to the 2009-2010 Athlete’s Handbook, and will be included in the packet of qualifying information sent to division and section officers each spring.

Additionally, the revised rules will include the proper procedures for handling black-carded fencers at qualifier events. Specifically, the rules must address how the black-carded fencer’s exclusion affects the number of competitors present (used when determining the top 25%), as well as what happens if the black-carded fencer finishes in a place that would earn qualification.

Rationale:

The current rules for qualification are complicated and poorly-written. That, when coupled with the frequent changes and poor communication of those changes to the membership, leads to confusion and mistakes made by those running Divisional and Sectional qualifiers. The situation is especially bad when it comes to computing qualifiers for Division II and III when a combined qualifier is held.

Last season we saw a number of experienced Division officers make mistakes in determining the qualifiers. This was often because they were referring to an old version of the rules, or perhaps were just unaware of the latest changes. We also saw confusion around how to handle situations where black cards are involved.

When mistakes are made in determining qualifiers, the effects can be significant. If a fencer is told he or she qualified and subsequently is told that they did not qualify due to such a mistake, it is very possible that he or she may have already purchased a non-refundable airline ticket. Because of this possibility, it is essential that the USFA do everything in its power to make sure the rules for determining qualifiers are clear, up-to-date, illustrated with examples, and widely communicated to the membership.

6. Motion (Mr. Stasinis, on behalf of the Tournament Committee):

Revise the National Tournament Schedule. Begin the use of the schedule in the 2010-2011 Fencing Season.

Proposed schedule:

North American Cup A October 2010
Div. 1, Div. 2, Veterans (combined, Vet 50-59, 60+), Senior Team

North American Cup B November 2010
Y-14, Cadet, Junior, Junior Team

North American Cup C January 2011
Div.1, Junior, Cadet, Jr. or Senior Team

Junior Olympics February 2011
Junior, Cadet, Junior Team

North American Cup D March 2011
Div.2, Div.3, Veterans (Vet combined, Vet 50-59, Vet 60+), Div.2 Team

North American Cup E April 2011
Div.1, Y-10, Y-12, Y-14, Wheelchair Championships (worlds held in July for Wheelchair.
Depending on the world schedule for Wheelchair Championships it could be held at the Summer
Nationals).

Summer Nationals June/July 2011
Div.1, Div.1A, Div.2, Div.3, Y-10 (NAC), Y-12 (NAC), Y-14, Senior Team, Veteran Team,
Veteran (Vet. 40-49, 50-59, 60+), Cadet (NAC), Junior (NAC)

(Note: NAC B, D and E are the same as the current schedule.)

Rationale:

1. In review of the National Schedule it was apparent that there were events that were being held that created a consistent deficit. North American Cup C, held in December, has consistently lost money for the past 5 years, up to the tune of \$30,000. It was determined that this calendar month created some very difficult combinations of conflict. First, in the month of December there are only two possible weekends to hold the NAC because of the Christmas Holiday and the semester break. In the past it has come in direct conflict with a Junior World Cup or a Cadet International Event, which have a direct relation to the event for the fact of how many Junior and Cadets fence in the Div. 1 NAC's. In addition, Universities and Colleges are giving or preparing to give Semester finals, which has impacted our numbers as well. As a result it was determined that the calendar should be adjusted to eliminate the December date and relocate the events.

2. The Juniors and Cadets annually had two sets of championships, one at the Junior Olympics and the other at the Summer Nationals. These were the only ones on our National Schedule to have dual championships. The Summer Nationals, in addition, is used as the first point event for the Junior and Cadets for the next season, as designed in the past by the National Coaches. It was determined that the showcase event for the Juniors and Cadets should be the Junior Olympics. This is the event where the Junior and Cadet World team is announced prior to the Junior and Cadet World Championships held traditionally in April. Because of this it was determined to make the Junior Olympics their only Championship, thus adding the Junior Team event to this Championship. Therefore a team qualifier will need to be held in the fall instead of in the spring for the Summer Nationals. It was also determined after much input from the membership that the Junior and Cadet events should be left in the Summer Nationals but run as a North American

Cup and not as a Championship. There would be no qualifying path for this event; it would be like all the other North American Cups, where one only needs to register to compete.

3. In discussion with the National Coaches it was recommended to move the December Div. 1 event to October and schedule it to be held three weeks prior to the World Championships. In the past, traditionally, after the Summer Nationals we have held no senior events prior to the worlds, which was 3 months without a domestic competition. It was determined that it was useful to the world team to use the October event as a “warm up” competition before the Worlds, to better prepare the team. In addition, the Veterans have been moved from December to October to keep them with the Div.1 and to add opportunity to them with the Div. 2 event, which has been traditionally held in October.

4. Adding teams to the NACs was discussed and brought to the NACs for the 2009-2010 Season. This was a point that a number of the National Coaches wanted to add to the North American Cups for the opportunity to better prepare fencers for team events. One of the Association’s concerns were cost associated to add events to the NAC but with team events the resources are already there for the support of the NAC. The referees, strips, bout committee are hired and there for the NAC so the added expense to this would be late night meals to the staff that is needed to run the events to completion for that day.

5. In the past the Cadet were held in October, the Junior, Cadet and Y-14 in November and the Junior in January. In the recommended schedule the first event in November would remain the same as the current schedule, the second would be January with adding the Cadet with the Junior and Div. 1.

In addition, traditionally in late September/October has been very heavy with international events for the Junior and Cadet. This steers away from some of the congestion internationally earlier in the season with the Cadets and Juniors.

Financial Projections for the Proposed Schedule can be found in Appendix O.

It is requested that this motion be moved to urgent

7. Motion (Mrs. Carter):

US Fencing establish a “National Team Oversight Committee.”

Rationale:

The National Team Program Group (NTPG), as initially constituted, consisted of the six national coaches, the wheelchair coach and two athletes, as a replacement for the “High Performance Committee.” The new committee’s purpose, as envisioned by the officially nominated, later elected, officers, was to determine policy and procedures in the pursuit of USOC funding and, ultimately, the successful performance of our athletes at world championship competitions and the Olympic Games.

Over the past year, the national coaches, as paid members of the USFA staff appropriately, have begun to function to fulfill the original expectations set forth for the NTPG, but without input from athletes or oversight beyond that offered by the Executive Director in role as supervisor.

To address this lack of review and oversight, a new committee is to be established, the National

Team Oversight Committee. Its primary responsibilities will be to:

- 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.

It is requested that this motion be moved to urgent

8. Motion (Mr. Baker):

That the National Office be directed to establish a mechanism for the answering and distribution of policy questions and answers from and to the membership. Any member may submit to the National Office a question on US Fencing policies. The question will be forwarded to the appropriate group with oversight responsibility (e.g. FOC, TC, or YDC). The cognizant committee, commission, or group is tasked with supplying the National Office with an official response, suitable for public distribution, within two weeks. The question and answer from each such query will be posted in designated area of the US Fencing website.

9. Motion (Mr. Baker):

The following changes made to the qualifying paths for events at Summer Nationals:

Y14 National Championships:

- Qualify for ~~U19~~ U16 event

Y12 Tournament:

- Qualify for ~~U19~~ Y14 event

Y10 Tournament:

- Qualify for ~~U19~~ Y12 event

Rationale:

Having the age trickle-down method only reference junior event qualification even for Y10 fencers makes no sense. Using the next higher age category at each stage rationalizes this path.

C. Disciplinary Hearings:

1. Review and consider the report and recommendations of panel formed January 6th, 2009.

VI. Good and Welfare

1. The next Special Meeting of the Board of Directors – July
2. Bylaws Review

Appendix A
Vice President's Report
Mark Stasinios
January 26, 2010

Over the past few months much has been developing in areas over my responsibility. The Committee Reports should be included with the agenda from the Fencing Officials Commission and the Tournament Committee.

First, over the past 9 months I have been assisting with the discussion and oversight in the development of our new National Calendar. There have been three revisions as a response to input from the membership, other Committees and the National Coaches. The current proposed schedule is the result of this input and I am grateful for all who have participated in the process to undertake this assignment, especially the Chair of the Tournament Committee, Tanya Brown, Kurt Aichele and members of the National Staff. Again, input was received in this project from the Veteran Committee, the FOC, the Parents Committee, the National Coaches, the National Staff, and many of our members and competitors.

The Tournament in addition to working on the National Calendar and been testing new tournament software and programs. Please refer to their report.

The FOC has moved ahead with a project in developing online testing and re-certification for our referees. This has a multiple level of purposes, but the most important is to update our database with referees and to see who is active and current member. This will aide directly with the ability to work and develop our up coming referees. Please refer to their report for other activities.

The Division's and Section's Resource Group Chaired by Buzz Hurst ahs provided assistance to a number of Divisions since the September Board of Directors Meeting. They have dealt with matters including elections, By-laws and residence requirements. On a side note I wish to extend my best wishes and speedy recovery to Buzz Hurst who suffered a heart attack in December and is now recovering.

In September I was asked By the Executive Committee to assist with the Nevada Division and questions that were raise with governance. After six weeks of discussions and correspondences new elections were held, seating a new Division Executive Committee and resolving the governance problems.

Appendix B
Vice President's Report
Jerry Benson
Board of Directors meeting USA Fencing Feb. 2010
Officer Report Jerry Benson, Vice President

For most of my report, I refer the Board members to the reports from the committees under my responsibility. As you will note, all have been very active and productive in their areas of responsibility and have been serving the organization well. We are moving forward in many areas, and I would like again to thank the committee chairs and members for their commitment of time and dedication to USA Fencing.

I would like to give a special thanks to our Marketing Committee members and its Chair, Kathryn Schifferle, for all the hard work and many extra hours they have given recently. The presentation to the Board about our future marketing plans is very much due to their efforts and support. I am aware that we all wanted to see money results right away, but this desire was always without a plan or model to follow. We thought we could approach large supporters or partners with an empty hand and expect them to give us money. We needed to create a “product” that was easy to see, feel, and understand. Once we all agree on the product, and how it looks, we then will have something in our hand to give. This is how a business partnership is formed. Both get and both receive. These types of relationships are the ones that last (multi-year) and are large in volume. To get six and seven figure dollar amounts, we have to have a product worth that amount. This has been the focus of our marketing plan so far. It took time, but we think we have gotten there or are very close. I just wanted the Board members to understand why it has taken so much time and work to get started. This was something we needed to do years ago but never really had the right people in place to do it or to even understand it needed to be done. We now have one of the most talented and experienced marketing groups ever. They all have various experiences in marketing for not-for profit and profit organizations. Most of the organizations for which they work are all much larger than we are. With this necessary perspective, they have understood what was needed and were in it for the long haul. They have worked very hard to get us closer to our goals. I would hope the Board realizes their commitment and will support their work and efforts. Remember, they like the rest of us, are volunteers and all this is done during their extra time.

Given their report, and those of the other committees, I can safely say we are moving forward to a better future for USA Fencing. Things are changing!

With Respect,
Jerry Benson

Appendix C
Secretary's Report
Bradley Baker

This season marked the debut of the US Fencing All-Academic Teams, a recognition offered to our academically-superior high school-aged members. The initial year has already proven to be a success, with over 200 athletes being recognized for their academic achievements at the Junior Olympics in Memphis. It is hoped that the program will continue to grow in future seasons as awareness of the award expands. This program was prompted by feedback from a fencing parent and was closely-based upon a similar program offered by USA Men's Gymnastics.

The qualification paths for US Fencing include methods of petitioning for qualification in the case where an athlete is incapable of participating in – or, in the case of injury or illness, from completing – the qualifier tournament. Such appeals are sent to the National Office, where the information is verified and a determination is made first of the validity of the given reason for missing the qualifier and second of the probability that the athlete would have qualified had he or she been able to fully participate.

For the Junior Olympics 57 such petitions were received, down from 74 in 2009. As of the writing of this report, 3 of the petitions are still incomplete. Of the 54 complete petitions, 50 were fully approved, 2 were partially approved (approved for one or more events, denied for one event), and 2 were fully denied. One of the fully denied petitions was due to lack of timeliness. The other denials were due to historical results indicating that the athlete was unlikely to have qualified for the requested event.

The meeting agenda continue to be significantly more complicated and lengthy than those in the past. The pattern of submission of reports and motions at or beyond the stated deadlines continues to complicate the task of preparing these materials for the Board. It is essential for good governance that Board members and the general membership have access to information relevant to the discussions and decisions to be undertaken in a timely manner. This can only happen if reports and other materials are submitted suitably.

Some committee chairs consistently provide well-formatted reports well ahead of when they are due. I would again like to commend their example to the rest.

Appendix D
SPORTS SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY REPORT
USFA Board of Directors Meeting – February 2010
Dr. John Heil

PROGRAMS & SERVICES
Sept. 2009 – Jan. 2010

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES 2012

Sport Science Seminars at NAC events

Seminars are a collaboration between US Fencing and Fencing.net.

Initial seminar offered

Sport Science Network

Develop a sport science network, and provide support and guidance to its members with the goal of enhancing access to sport psychology and sport science for fencing clubs and individual athletes and coaches.

Initial group has formed as Special Interest Group (SIG) with the Association for Applied Sport Psychology (the leading professional sport psychology organization)

Sports Medicine Continuing Education Training

Seminars for Event Medical staff at NACs to help meet professional continuing education requirement.

Available upon request from Sports Medicine program

Fencing Sport Science Videos

Develop 3 sport science videos (5-7 minutes each) on select topics in sport psychology. Videos will be based on seminar presentation by sport psychologists/scientists, and interviews with coaches and athletes.

Identify producer and do preliminary planning; Initial contacts with coaches and athletes regarding participation

CONTINUING PROGRAMS

eSCOUT (Electronic Scouting Project)

An electronic scouting tool intended to enhance competitiveness of US Fencers by providing tactical information including: Statistical, Descriptive and Video. Designed for use on PDA (handheld) device allowing strip side information retrieval (and real time strip side scoring). Personal Computer version provides enhanced display, data analytic and storage capacity.

Research project archives documenting funding and project development with clarification of status as US Fencing funded project

Beta testing continues with existing users

User Manual is now available to assist existing and potential users; User agreement distributed

USFA EVENT CONSULTATION

Sport Psychology & Sport Science Consultation

2009 Pittsburgh NAC (Report previously submitted).

Travel and ground costs funded by fencing.net with room costs funded by US Fencing.

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

Referral to local sport science specialists

Publications

American Fencing Magazine

Ongoing articles in *American Fencing Magazine* Sport Science Column

INTERNAL LIAISON

Collaboration with USFA Committees, Officers

Recent Activities: Consultation with Rob Weekes re Sport Science role in Sponsor benefits

LIAISON TO PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Contact as appropriate with professional organization

Recent activities: Recruiting of members for Sport Science Network; Contact with "Professionals Against Doping in Sport" organization.

*Contact: Dr. John Heil, Psychological Health * Roanoke*

2727 Electric Rd., Suite 100, Roanoke, VA 24018

Phone-Direct: 540-772-5147

jheil@PsychHealthRoanoke.com

Appendix E Hall of Fame Committee

The Hall of Fame Committee is currently in the preliminary stages of creating the July, 2010 ballot for induction in the summer of 2011. We are reconsidering those previously nominated individuals who did not succeed in achieving election to the Hall as well as considering a new group of fencers who have been suggested for nomination by members of the USFA and members of the HOF Committee.

Appendix F
PARALYMPIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
aka WHEELCHAIR TASK FORCE
January 2010

Funding for Wheelchair Fencing programs and the back and forth budgeting has (temporarily) limited our activity. Now that our W'Chair program is under the official umbrella of US Fencing as our NGB, we began the task of searching for monies to support both domestic and international programs. Originally, funding was issued to this committee. With our stated goal being domestic development, that did not allow us to figure in the needs of our international and elite athlete programs. Per the decisions of the USFA Board, that money was in turn transferred to the budget of National Coach Les Stawicki., who was developing a budget along with the HPG. The committee is now linked to the Membership Committee and its funding.

We continue to have good response from our sources of communication, the *Sit and Fight* Newsletter and the website, WheelchairFencer.org

We are pleased to see continued development of programs across the US. Phoenix has developed a strong new program, and New Jersey is showing promise. We have been encouraging new programs to seek assistance through our offering of developmental camps and encouraging the partnership of US Paralympic's Sport Club program. The Phoenix club seems to be effectively using this program, as is San Antonio. We still are hoping to target a program in Miami, if they can handle co-ordination on their end.

Schedule conflicts seem to be our biggest problem. Different entities looking to host a competition/camp expect participation from w'chair athletes around the US. Athletes must choose where to spend their funds; regional events, national events and camps, world cups, etc.

This spring, there are camps w/events scheduled in Louisville and Phoenix, along with the Dallas NAC, all within a few weeks of each other. All should be well run events, the question remains as to where people will choose to participate. It has been stated by National Coach Stawicki, that ALL NACs will include a mini-camp on the day prior to the first event.

We do expect a good turnout for the Dallas NAC. The location should prove to be good for the larger pockets of fencers from Arizona, Texas and Mississippi. Pittsburgh was not well attended, most likely due to the location. Note: Winter events in northern cities are not attractive to people with mobility impairments.

The lack of organization and communication from the International Wheelchair Fencing Comm. has had a trickle down effect. We have little idea of the schedule of international events, rules being implemented or information on November's World Championships, including qualification paths. It is imperative we have better communication with the international community. Currently, this committee has no information on how our elite program events are budgeted and have not been able to forward any information to athletes. We hope that stabilization in the HP Director position will help.

Submitted,

Gary M. van der Wege
Chair

Appendix G
USFA RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE REPORT
BOD MEETING 2/14/10

Following the BOD meeting in Minneapolis, the **Resource Development Committee** has been serving in an advisory capacity to the national office as they develop phase one of the marketing, image and process development.

Our group has provided advice, planning, insight and review for ongoing process that will be presented to the Board as follows:

1. Development of the Fencing ‘Product’

Proposed by the national office, and approved by the board at the last meeting, a nationally acclaimed firm Cronan Design, was hired to develop the necessary Fencing “product” and to provide the architecture for how this “product” will be integrated throughout the organization. The completion of this phase will position the USFA to deliver a consistent product approach to both members of the fencing community as well as non-endemic sponsors. In addition the USFA will be able to develop ongoing partnerships outside of current settings.

Starting with a process of input through intensive meetings, phone interviews and attendance at tournaments, Cronan Design developed a series of concepts as well as the comprehensive process on how to apply the concepts during the execution of the strategic plan and marketing implementation.

The next phase, implementation, is on schedule to deliver final results at nationals; at the BOD and annual membership meetings in July.

In addition, the **RDC** continues to offer support to other committees and their projects:

2. ROC Marketing Assistance

The **ROC** has requested assistance from the **RDC** in developing a marketing and promotional plan for the upcoming season; this plan will be evolved in conjunction with the ongoing program development: bid packet, regions, staffing, and organizational structure.

Appendix H
Tournament Committee Report
Tanya Brown, Chair

	08.09 Entered	08.09 CheckedIn	09.10 Entered	09.10 CheckedIn	Entered Difference	Entered %Change	CheckedIn Difference	Checked In % Change
NAC A	1945	1845	1621	1519	-324	-17%	-326	-18%
NAC B	2168	2061	2066	1920	-102	-5%	-141	-7%
NAC C	1190	1093	1565	1398	375	32%	305	28%
NAC D	1730	1648	1868	1782	138	8%	134	8%
Total	7033	6647	7120	6619	87	1%	-28	0%
NAC D Jr Teams	--	--	62	67	--	--	--	--

In the past few months the Tournament Committee’s main focus has been on tournament software testing and improving our tournament technology in the venue. The after action reports from the software testing at NAC A through NAC D follow. The Tournament Committee would like to thank Marc Courtney and Joe Salisbury for their dedication to the testing phase, as well as Sheryl Eberhardt for maintaining the integrity of our tournament data that kept both the tournaments and testing running.

The modeling of the various proposed classification systems has been put on hold as the implementation of the medium to model these systems has been delayed. The Tournament Committee hopes to begin this process before the end of the season.

NAC A 2009 After-Action Software Testing Review

Purpose:

To provide feedback to Tournament Committee Chair on the tournament software testing results being performed by the Bout Committee for the purpose of replacing our existing tournament software.

Goal:

To determine if existing Fencing Tournament software meets the needs/requirements anticipated for the running of a National Fencing Tournament. The current software (XSeed) used by the National Bout Committee will be used to establish the MINIMUM baseline requirements for any new software considered. All considered software must meet or exceed the current software performance in all areas of the running of National Tournaments.

Software Tested:

The software tested at NAC A in Des Moines was Fencing Time 3.0

Summary Conclusions:

Fencing Time 3.0 provides many of the features currently available in XSeed and contains many of the forward looking features desired by the Bout Committee, Executive Committee and Membership. While being considered as a possible replacement for the current tournament software, several features/issues need to be addressed.

Future Testing Goals:

It is the Bout Committee's goal to test Fencing Time 3.0 at NAC B for general suitability on several events using multiple computers. Regression testing of any elements updated based on feedback from NAC A events will also occur.

The suitability of Fencing Time 3.0 for running team events will be evaluated at NAC D.

The testing of NeoRegistration/NeoMain and Engarde, if available for testing, will also be attempted at NAC B.

Testing Details for Fencing Time 3.0

The latest version of Fencing Time 3.0 for National use was provided in a special password protected download area for the Bout Committee. Setup of Tournament for NAC A was performed using instructions provided to the Bout Committee.

This version of Fencing Time requires any old version of fencing time be removed and a hidden file deleted before Fencing Time can be started. In addition there is an expiration date for its use. This will be a problem moving forward since we want to test and fix on a software version of Fencing Time prior to March of 2010 and Dan has a timeline for releasing the finished 3.0 in Q3 or Q4 of 2010.

The first challenge beyond basic tournament running functionality occurred during the upload of the tournament data. The data structure used by Fencing Time separates division and country into separate fields and uses a table lookup to match valid divisions and country data. We found that the table lookup for divisions did not contain the country names we currently use to identify foreign fencers and defaults to inserting National as the division to be used. In addition the country code is then changed to USA.

We were able to manually correct this on the individual fencer record but needed to use the registration from XSeed to identify which fencers were affected since there does not appear to be a means of printing out the conflict records generated during the upload.

We also decided we needed was to determine and evaluate possible non-programming ways to allow multiple computers to enter data into a tournament and have the tournament stored and backed-up from a separate computer acting as a server. This was determined to be an absolute requirement for any tournament software running a National Tournament by the Tournament Committee Chair.

We were able to develop a procedurally oriented solution to achieve this very limited networking functionality: By making multiple copies of the tournament .ftx file, saving the copies in different directories grouped by weapons and removing the non-relevant events for that weapon; it is possible to divide the tournament onto multiple data entry computers and have the tournament files stored on a central server (via a networked drive) to allow concise data backup.

We were not able to test this on live data during NAC A but plan to do so at NAC B.

We also tested the live web posting feature, auto assign referee, and results with projected classifications awarded.

Bugs, Issues and Feature Requests for Fencing Time:

Bugs:

*** Bug: Upload changes country in division field to National and country to USA**

Behavior:

On all Clients: When an unrecognized division is found in the upload csv file the division is set to National and the country to USA.

Request:

Provide countries in the division lookup. Make sure country information does not change.

*** Bug: Age restriction does not consider points qualification**

Behavior:

On all Clients: When a fencer does not meet the age requirement for a Cadet event, they are removed even though they qualify based on other qualification paths.

Request:

Make removal of the fencer optional

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Bug: Web display shows club information

Behavior:

When publishing live web results club, division, earned classifications etc. are displayed and cannot be edited out.

Request:

Make what is displayed editable

Issues:

***Issue: Fencer Registration information**

The current printed registration does not display a notes field that contains the information uploaded from the national office.

Request: provide a field to display the registration notes and if not already uploading that information include it in the upload process.

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Issue: Web Updates

Display of fencers who medically withdraw shows DNC

Request: Change display to show DNF (did not finish)

***Issue: Add/Edit Countries**

Cannot Add/Edit Country Database/List when foreign fencers arrive, if country is not already on list. Defaults to National/USA.

Request: Ability to Add/Edit Countries

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

***Issue: Printed Pool Summary not labeled**

Printed summary for pools does not show seeded/random status.

Request: Label printed pages as Random or Seeded based on pool status displayed.

Issue: DE table only prints in landscape mode

DE Table only prints landscape mode using twice as many pages to post

Request: Print option to allow portrait mode and reduce pages required to post the tables.

Issue: Auto assign of referees has no filter/priority feature

When using the auto assign feature all referees are used if available

Request: Recommend providing some method to filter or prioritize how referees are auto assigned.

NAC B 2009 After-Action Software Testing Review

Purpose:

To provide feedback to Tournament Committee Chair on the tournament software testing results being performed by the Bout Committee for the purpose of replacing our existing tournament software.

Goal:

To determine the current suitability of existing Fencing Tournament software for the needs and requirements of running National Fencing Tournaments. The current software (XSeed) used by the National Bout Committee will be used to establish the MINIMUM baseline requirements for any new software considered. All considered software must meet or exceed the current software performance in all areas of the running of National Tournaments.

Software Tested:

The software tested at NAC B 09 was Fencing Time 3.0 and NeoRegistration/NeoMain (Neoregistration 0.97.0.9/Neoregistration 0.97.0.9 advance copy 8 and Neomain 0.97.0.20 advance copy 10)

Summary Conclusions:

NeoRegistration/NeoMain was removed from current and future considerations at the direction of the Tournament Committee Chair after approximately 4 hours of program setup/testing by the Bout Committee. This was based on software stability issues and lack of forward looking features desired by the Bout Committee, Executive Committee and Membership.

Fencing Time 3.0 provides many of the features currently available in XSeed and contains many of the forward looking features desired by the Bout Committee, Executive Committee and Membership. It is still being considered as a possible replacement for the current tournament software, but only if several features/issues can be addressed within a 30 day timeframe.

Future Testing Goals:

It is the Bout Committee's goal to test Fencing Time 3.0 at NAC C as the primary tournament software for a few small Veteran Events (shadowed by XSeed). As well as continued general suitability testing on larger events.

The suitability of Fencing Time 3.0 for running team events will be evaluated at NAC D.

With the removal of NeoRegistration/NeoMain for future consideration, the Bout Committee strongly feels that an additional software package (Engarde) be made available for testing.

Testing Details for NeoRegistration/NeoMain

Right before NAC B it was determined that the Bout Committee did not have a uniform current version of the Neo Software Suite and a quick request was made to the developer to email the current version to us. It was found that communicating with the developer was difficult and that they were unwilling or unable to respond to our requests in a quick and concise manner.

After repeatedly rewording our requests for a current copy of the software, the developer provided a series of emails with links to over a dozen different versions of the software(s) and convoluted instructions on which version(s) to test. It took almost 24 hours and about 4 hours of the testing members' time to actually get to the point where Neo could be installed on a test computer.

Upon attempting to run a tournament at NAC B using the Neo software, Neo Registration repeatedly fatally crashed either upon loading the tournament data, changing some fencers seeding data or editing some fencers clubs.

After spending an hour of repeatedly restarting NeoRegistration, the Tournament Committee Chair made the decision to halt all further testing and documentation of issues with the Neo Software Suite, and remove it from future consideration.

An additional concern was with the lack of a Neo Setup program, thus requiring a complete install of XSeed alongside the installation of the Neo programs. This did not meet the requirement of testing standalone tournament programs.

No further notes or testing results are available for the NeoRegistration/NeoMain programs.

Testing Details for Fencing Time 3.0

The latest version of Fencing Time 3.0 for National use was provided in a special password protected download area for the Bout Committee. Setup of Tournament for NAC B was performed without major incident, using instructions provided to the Bout Committee.

The first challenge beyond basic tournament running functionality was to determine and evaluate possible non-programming ways to allow multiple computers to enter data into a tournament and have the tournament stored and backed-up from a separate computer acting as a server. This was determined to be an absolute requirement for any tournament software running a National Tournament by the Tournament Committee Chair.

We were able to develop a procedurally oriented solution to achieve this very limited networking functionality: By making multiple copies of the tournament .ftx file, saving the copies in different directories grouped by weapons and removing the non-relevant events for that weapon; it is possible to divide the tournament onto multiple data entry computers and have the tournament files stored on a central server (via a networked drive) to allow concise data backup.

Throughout the testing process, this split weapon method was used as the baseline for the tournament. It was determined that while this method allowed us to use multiple data entry computers, it seriously limited our flexibility, redundancy and increased our vulnerability to tournament data loss. It also would require an increase of computer hardware (laptops) and manpower on the computer side of the Bout Committee for large, complex events.

Short of a version of Fencing Time that supports full networking and a shared relational database; several possible “stopgaps” were determined by the Bout Committee to be required to enable the operation of Fencing Time at a Summer National Tournament without major manpower and hardware increases.

First, Fencing Time must be able to have multiple instances of it running on a single computer. As it stands, any attempts to launch a second instance of Fencing Time results in “Another instance of Fencing Time is already running” error. This would reduce the required number of computers and operators needed.

Second, Fencing Time must be able to save the existing tournament .ftx file, as many smaller files grouped by sex, event and weapon (i.e. Men’s Youth 14 Epee – TournamentName_MY14E.ftx). This would reduce our vulnerability to tournament data loss, due to another operator opening and saving data to an ongoing event and is required to do live web posting of multiple simultaneous events.

Third, Fencing Time must be able to export results in .csv format. This is the current method of reporting tournament event results to the National Office and is used to maintain National Points and Classifications.

Even with these two “stopgaps”, Fencing Time would not meet the multiple user functionality and reliability to that of XSeed, but it would be able to at least run a Summer National Event with near normal hardware and manpower requirements.

Bugs, Issues and Feature Requests for Fencing Time:

Bugs:

***Non-Recoverable Error: Add Club**

When trying to Add a Club, received a non-recoverable error: DataGridView: System.ArgumentException DataGridViewComboBoxCell value is not valid.

Behavior:

On XP Client: Error becomes unrecoverable if too many fields in the add club feature are left blank. Error also becomes unrecoverable on XP in tested cases when the window focus leaves the FT3 application.

Error was recoverable on XP if window focus was not changed.

Error still occurred even if all fields were filled out.

Changes to database did not take if error was unrecoverable.

On Vista Client: Vista Client gave same error in all tested cases, but was recoverable each time. Changes to database did take.

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Bug: Layout Pools

When inputting referees in Layout Pools and using the cursor keys to move through the ref list, Fencing Time will improperly list available referees as unavailable (color them red) or unavailable referees as available (color them black). Possibly linked to an array error.

Bug: Printing Pools

When printing pools, if pools are printed in landscape mode, you lose the "Warnings" section and "Signature" areas of the pools.

Issues:

***Issue: Web Updates**

The current method of creating and uploading the live results to the web will need to be addressed. The default behavior is to create one large html file per event and one index page listing all the active event pages. If the tournament is separated into weapon groups and each weapon group computer is uploading its events, the index file gets overwritten by the last weapon computer which updated and only shows the html links to the event files for that weapon.

Request: Some other way of driving the creation of the index.html file is needed. Possibly a separate .xml file that can be updated with the current tournament's events would be adequate.

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Issue: Web Updates

The single large .html file created for each event could be problematic bandwidth wise in venues where we must use cellular modems for Internet access. The office is now capped on monthly bandwidth for its cellular modems, and a NAC could use more bandwidth than available without extra (unexpected) charges – Summer Nationals definitely would.

Request: That each single large event file be broken up into rounds, so that the same HTML code doesn't have to be needlessly uploaded over and over as the event progresses. This would also make the Web Updates more accessible to more viewing devices, due to smaller files sizes.

***Issue: Add/Edit Countries**

Cannot Add/Edit Country Database/List when foreign fencers arrive, if country is not already on list. Defaults to National/USA.

Request: Ability to Add/Edit Countries

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

***Issue: Unable to Move Fencers in Pools**

Initial seeding screen display for pools does not show seeded/random. When swapping fencers there is no way to recreate the seeded order and fencers can only be swapped from pool to pool at this point.

Request: Ability to move fencers from pool to pool from display pools screen.

Issue: Estimated Start Time Not on Bout Slips

DE Bout slips have the option to set start time and strip assignment but slips do not display that start time.

Request: Print Estimated Start Time on DE Bout slips.

Issue: Save Button on Event Competitor's Screen

On the Event Competitors Screen of an Event there is a "Save" button. The assumed behavior is that the "Save" button would save changes to tournament file. Actual behavior is to "Export" the Competitors list to HTML.

Request: Recommend re-labeling "Save" Button to "Export" or "Save as HTML" and adding a true "Save" button to save changes to database (even if the changes are auto saved upon closing of Event Competitors Screen).

Issue: Event Competitors List

On the Event Competitors list, when sorting by last name and last names match, it does not use first name as a secondary sort. This puts competitors with the same last name in a random order (between themselves).

Request: When sorting by last name, do a secondary sort of first name.

Issue: Referee Printing

Auto assignment of referee's to pools occurs in the setup portion of FT prior to randomization. When the random pools assignments are printed in view by pool format the strip and referee is printed.

Request: Make referee print an option an option or suppress it from printing here.

Issue: Printing of Bout Slips

Set up screen for printing bout slips accepts changes instantly and does not revert to previous setting when input is canceled subsequent individual print of bout slips allows for setting strip and start time but does not allow changing the other options set up on the group printing screen. Old style bout slips does not print multiple strip data (17-20) correctly but new format does.

Request: Fix print of old style bout slips

Issue: Printing of Bout Slips

Bout slip format is too busy and needs to be adjusted.

Request:

1. Remove bar code from bout slip
2. On new format make score boxes the size the V/D box is now
3. Make referee signature box longer (talk to Marc about this)
4. Split the referee signature box in half horizontally and add score keeper signature block
5. Change round # to table letter designation and increment table by tableaux level in addition to id by table size

Feature Suggestions:

Feature Suggestion: Strip Numbers Equal Pool Numbers

On pool layout, add a "Strip #s are Pool #s" check box or button.

Feature Suggestion: Select/Deselect All

On Print Pools, add an option (checkbox) to select/deselect all pools to print. So if you want to print/reprint pool sheet #7 out of 26 pools, you don't have to manually deselect 25 pools - you deselect all and then select #7. Other selected print screens could use this feature.

Feature Suggestion: Add Column to Strip Assignments

On the Strip Assignments page, add a column for the tableau page number and include it as a printable report for posting the report to the fencers. Allows fencers to find themselves easier in the tableau in large events.

NAC C 2009 After-Action Software Testing Review

Purpose:

To provide feedback to Tournament Committee Chair on the tournament software testing results being performed by the Bout Committee for the purpose of replacing our existing tournament software.

Goal:

Determine the suitability of various Fencing Tournament software packages for running a National Fencing Tournament based on the needs/requirements established by the Tournament Committee. The current software (XSeed) used by the National Bout Committee will be used to establish the MINIMUM baseline requirements for any new software considered. All considered software must meet or exceed the current software packages performance in all areas of running of National Tournaments.

Software Tested:

The software tested at NAC C 09 was Fencing Time 3.0 with database version 3.0

Summary Conclusions:

Fencing Time 3.0 provides many of the features currently available in XSeed and contains many of the forward looking features desired by the Bout Committee, Executive Committee and Membership. It is still being considered as a possible replacement for the current tournament software, but only if several features/issues can be addressed within an acceptable timeframe.

Future Testing Goals:

It is the Bout Committee's goal to continue to test Fencing Time 3.0 at NAC D. The suitability of Fencing Time 3.0 for running team events will be evaluated at NAC D where Fencing Time 3.0 will shadow Engarde the current team event software.

The Bout Committee strongly feels that additional software packages such as Engarde be made available for testing due to continuing issues with Fencing Time 3.0.

Testing Details for Fencing Time 3.0

The latest version of Fencing Time 3.0 for National use was provided in a special password protected download area for the Bout Committee. Setup of the Tournament for NAC C was performed without major incident, using instructions provided to the Bout Committee. The additional functionality requested after NAC B that allows the printing of the import conflicts was tested and some issues were found.

The first challenge beyond basic tournament running functionality was to determine and evaluate possible non-programming ways to allow multiple computers to enter data into a tournament and have the tournament stored and backed-up from a separate computer acting as a server. This was determined to be an absolute requirement for any tournament software running a National Tournament by the Tournament Committee Chair. (See attached analysis by Joe Salisbury)

We were able to develop a procedurally oriented solution to achieve this very limited networking functionality: By making multiple copies of the tournament .ftx file, saving the copies in different directories grouped by weapons and removing the non-relevant events for that weapon; it is possible to divide the tournament onto multiple data entry computers and have the tournament files stored on a central server (via a networked drive) to allow concise data backup.

Throughout the testing process, this split weapon method was used as the baseline for the tournament. It was determined that while this method allowed us to use multiple data entry computers, it seriously limited our flexibility, redundancy and increased our vulnerability to tournament data loss. It also would require an increase of computer hardware (laptops) and manpower on the computer side of the Bout Committee for large, complex events.

Short of a version of Fencing Time that supports full networking and a shared relational database; several possible “stopgaps” were determined by the Bout Committee to be required to enable the operation of Fencing Time at a Summer National Tournament without major manpower and hardware increases.

First, Fencing Time must be able to have multiple instances running on a single computer. As it stands, any attempts to launch a second instance of Fencing Time results in an “Another instance of Fencing Time is already running” error. This would reduce the required number of computers and operators needed.

At NAC C Joe Salisbury tested software (Sandboxie) that allows several virtual machines to run on one laptop so that multiple instances of Fencing Time could be started and run on a single laptop. This software would need to be purchased if we choose to use it as an alternative to fixing the Fencing Time issue. . (See attached analysis by Joe Salisbury)

Second, Fencing Time must be able to save the existing tournament .ftx file, as many smaller files grouped by sex, event and weapon (i.e. Men’s Youth 14 Epee – TournamentName_MY14E.ftx). This would reduce our vulnerability to tournament data loss, due to another operator opening and saving data to an ongoing event and is required to do live web posting of multiple simultaneous events.

At NAC C we tested a work around that requires a web server set up and manual parsing of the output; again as an alternative to fixing the Fencing Time program issue. . (See attached analysis by Joe Salisbury)

Third, Fencing Time must be able to export results in .csv format. This is the current method of reporting tournament event results to the National Office and is used to maintain National Points and Classifications.

AT NAC C we were able to test that this functionality was working and provided the needed fields required by the National office.

Even with these “stopgaps”, Fencing Time would not meet the multiple user functionality and reliability to that of XSeed, but it would be able to at least run a Summer National Event with near normal hardware and operational manpower requirements. Considerable additional time would be required for Tournament setup. (See attached analysis by Joe Salisbury)

Bugs, Issues and Feature Requests for Fencing Time:

* **Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Bugs:

***Non-Recoverable Error: Add Club**

When trying to Add a Club, received a non-recoverable error: DataGridView: System.ArgumentException DataViewComboBoxCell value is not valid.

Status: Fixed

Bug: Layout Pools

When inputting referees in Layout Pools and using the cursor keys to move through the ref list, Fencing Time will improperly list available referees as unavailable (color them red) or unavailable referees as available (color them black). Possibly linked to an array error.

Status: Fixed

Bug: Printing Pools

When printing pools, if pools are printed in landscape mode, you lose the "Warnings" section and "Signature" areas of the pools.

Status: Dan says this is not needed and to use the Portrait layout if this is required.

Issues:

***Issue: Web Updates**

The current method of creating and uploading the live results to the web will need to be addressed. The default behavior is to create one large html file per event and one index page listing all the active event pages. If the tournament is separated into weapon groups and each weapon group computer is uploading its events, the index file gets overwritten by the last weapon computer which updated and only shows the html links to the event files for that weapon.

Request: Some other way of driving the creation of the index.html file is needed. Possibly a separate .xml file that can be updated with the current tournament's events would be adequate.

* **Must be fixed for proper operation.**

Status: Not Fixed. A work around has been developed by Joe Salisbury – see attached workaround document.

Issue: Web Updates

The single large .html file created for each event could be problematic bandwidth wise in venues where we must use cellular modems for Internet access. The office is now capped on monthly bandwidth for its cellular modems, and a NAC could use more bandwidth than available without extra (unexpected) charges – Summer Nationals definitely would.

Request: That each single large event file be broken up into rounds, so that the same HTML code doesn't have to be needlessly uploaded over and over as the event progresses. This would also make the Web Updates more accessible to more viewing devices, due to smaller files sizes.

Status: Not Fixed. In addition a method of updating old data that has changed needs to be created. This would be a procedural/training issue for post event/tournament support.

***Issue: Add/Edit Countries**

Cannot Add/Edit Country Database/List when foreign fencers arrive, if country is not already on list. Defaults to National/USA.

Request: Ability to Add/Edit Countries

Status: Dan will not allow this since he claims there is a potential to corrupt these databases which are taken from the official FIE and USFA sources.

Follow Up Request: Barring full edit ability, need the ability to override individual upload errors so that updates can be fixed in the fencer database once the upload is completed instead of a global yes or no.

*** Must be fixed for proper operation.**

***Issue: Unable to Move Fencers in Pools**

Initial seeding screen display for pools does not allow a seeded/random view option. When swapping multiple fencers there is no way to recreate the seeded order view once the pools have been constituted, and fencers can only be swapped from pool to pool at this point.

Request: Ability to move fencers from pool to pool from display pools screen.

Status: Fixed by displaying the pool type on the printed form and adding a select view option on the pool assignments view pools tab.

Issue: Estimated Start Time Not on Bout Slips

DE Bout slips have the option to set start time and strip assignment but slips do not display that start time.

Request: Print Estimated Start Time on DE Bout slips.

Status: Fixed

Issue: Save Button on Event Competitor's Screen

On the Event Competitors Screen of an Event there is a "Save" button. The assumed behavior is that the "Save" button would save changes to tournament file. Actual behavior is to "Export" the Competitors list to HTML.

Request: Recommend re-labeling "Save" Button to "Export" or "Save as HTML" and adding a true "Save" button to save changes to database (even if the changes are auto saved upon closing of Event Competitors Screen).

Status: Fixed button has now been relabeled export

Issue: Event Competitors List

On the Event Competitors list, when sorting by last name and last names match, it does not use first name as a secondary sort. This puts competitors with the same last name in a random order (between themselves).

Request: When sorting by last name, do a secondary sort of first name.

Status: Still a problem

Issue: Referee Printing

Auto assignment of referee's to pools occurs in the setup portion of FT prior to randomization. When the random pools assignments are printed in view by pool format the strip and referee is printed.

Request: Make referee print an option an option or suppress it from printing here.

Status: Fixed, this is now an option

Issue: Printing of Bout Slips

Set up screen for printing bout slips accepts changes instantly and does not revert to previous setting when input is canceled subsequent individual print of bout slips allows for setting strip and start time but does not allow changing the other options set up on the group printing screen. Old style bout slips does not print multiple strip data (17-20) correctly but new format does.

Request: Fix print of old style bout slips

Status: Fixed but after using at NAC C some additional changes have been requested.

Issue: Printing of Bout Slips

Bout slip format is too busy and needs to be adjusted.

Request:

6. Remove bar code from bout slip - **fixed**
7. On new format make score boxes the size the V/D box is now. – **size has adjusted**
8. Make referee signature box longer (talk to Marc about this) - **Still a problem on the new format version old format option allows full signature box**

9. Split the referee signature box in half horizontally and add score keeper signature block – **old format option fixes this**
10. Change round # to table letter designation and increment table by tableaux level in addition to id by table size – **fixed by adding tag to round box**

Status: Fixed bar code now an option other changes implemented

New for NAC C

Issue:

Upload/Import of tournament files

1. On Import Warning Report the Division error message does not indicate which fencer was affected
2. The import from the national office that indicated which referees will be used does not put the division information in the referee record and does not contain the valid/any ratings data. If the Fencing time .csv file is imported after this the active referee's do not update properly which makes the auto assign feature unusable
3. The Import Warning report shows club errors for all of the support staff i.e.: referees, medical, bout committee, and armourers. Since club information is not a part of these record and is not used it causes the report to have a large number on irrelevant entries that obscure the actual fencer issues.

Request:

1. Add fencer name to error message
2. Correct the import so that when the Fencing Time .csv referee file is loaded it updates the referee records while leaving the active referees as active.
3. Suppress club error messages for support staff in report.

Operational (post import)

1. On all printed reports such as seeding list, pool summaries, tableaux, etc only the first page displays the event information.
2. On the Pool assignment alpha listing the default is to show pool / strip / fencer.
3. On printed portrait pool sheets the warnings are currently a paragraph format under the entry box. The referees request that it be placed as a column next to the order of bouts instead.
4. Printed Tableaux does not have an option to show bout start times
5. In the DE tableaux using the tool icon does not allow you to remove the strip assignment or start time for an individual bout. You must turn off the display feature for them for the whole tableaux.

Request:

1. Print the event name on the top of every page printed with information for that event.
2. Make the default to show and print the Name column as column one (1) instead of column three (3)

3. Make the order of bouts and the warnings boxed columns i.e. 1st pool bout – tab – 1st fencer name – tab – second fencer name – tab – lined space for warnings related to that bout
4. Provide an option to show bout start times on the printed tableaux
5. Provide a clear button for the bout tool icon entry screen that clears start time and strip information for that bout.

Results

1. When exporting the .csv file format ties are flagged with a T next to the placement. The T needs to be removed for this file to be usable as the national office expects this to be a numeric field.

Feature Suggestions:

Feature Suggestion: Strip Numbers Equal Pool Numbers

On pool layout, add a "Strip #s are Pool #s" check box or button.

Status: Not yet implemented

Feature Suggestion: Select/Deselect All

On Print Pools, add an option (checkbox) to select/deselect all pools to print. So if you want to print/reprint pool sheet #7 out of 26 pools, you don't have to manually deselect 25 pools - you deselect all and then select #7. Other selected print screens could use this feature.

Status: Not yet implemented

Feature Suggestion: Add Column to Strip Assignments

On the Strip Assignments page, add a column for the tableau page number and include it as a printable report for posting the report to the fencers. This will allow fencers to find themselves more easily in the tableaux in large events.

Status: Not yet implemented

Fencing Time 3.0 Workarounds for National Tournaments

Introduction:

The intention of this document is to describe in some detail, the major issues with Fencing Time 3.0 and the Workarounds that the Tournament Committee's Software Testing Group have discovered and/or developed to enable the current testing version of Fencing Time to be used at the National Level.

Each major issue is described below: description of issue, Tournament Committee's view of issue, existing tournament software's (XSeed) functionality in regard to issue, behavior of Fencing Time 3.0 in regard to issue, description of the currently developed workaround, limitations of using such workaround, the financial impact of the issue as it stands, the future software development required/requested of the developer on the issue, and finally the time spent by the Tournament Committee's Software Testing Group for evaluating the issue and developing a workaround.

Summary Conclusions:

The workarounds described below present a temporary and limited solution for implementation of Fencing Time for use at the National Level.

The Tournament Committee and Bout Committee is in complete agreement that the issue of a Networkable National Tournament Software is serious enough to be one of the primary factors in determining whether a version of Tournament Software is suitable for use at the National Level. If a firm commitment and timetable to the solution of this issue is unavailable from the developer of Fencing Time 3.0, as well as the financial commitment required from the Organization to ensure that solution, then Fencing Time 3.0 should be removed from consideration for use at the National Level.

List of Workarounds:

1. Enable tournament files to be stored in a central location.
2. Enable multiple data entry computers.
3. Enable updating of HTML results from multiple data entry computers.
4. Enable multiple instances of Fencing Time 3.0 on a data entry computer.

Enable Tournament Files to be Stored in a Central Location:

Issue:

Tournament files are set to be stored on a single local data entry computer. Before other issues could be addressed, it was necessary to demonstrate that the tournament file could be saved over a network using Windows peer-to-peer networking.

Tournament Committee's Views:

National Tournament Software needs to be able to save tournament data on a central location for the purpose of data backups. We utilize a live-sync backup procedure to an external drive to ensure that minimal data loss occurs in the event of hardware failure.

Existing Software's Functionality:

Current version of XSeed supports standard Windows peer-to-peer networking features, in particular, the ability to store tournament files on a Network Mapped Virtual Drive (Mapped

Drive).

Behavior of Fencing Time 3.0 in Regard to This Issue:

It was found that Fencing Time 3.0 seems to support Windows peer-to-peer networking features, much in the same way that XSeed does.

Current Developed Workaround:

No workaround is necessary. Existing network equipment and procedures are adequate for this issue.

Limitations of Using Workaround:

No limitations are observed or expected.

Financial Impact of Issue:

No financial impact is expected.

Future Development Requirements:

No additional development is expected to be required.

Time Spent Evaluating Issue and Developing Workaround:

2 hours spent.

Enable Multiple Data Entry Computers:

Issue:

Fencing Time 3.0 does not allow for a tournament's events to be run from multiple data entry computers. Its current programming only allows one computer to be used for a tournament's data entry.

Tournament Committee's Views:

It is unacceptable for any National Tournament Software not to support multiple data entry computers for the inputting of tournament data during a National Tournament. Current tournament practices utilize a minimum of 3 data entry computers for a NAC and 6 data entry computers for a Summer Nationals.

Existing Software's Functionality:

Current version of XSeed supports data entry from as many as 9 data entry computers (limitation of 9 data entry computers and one master computer is a function of Window's Peer-to-Peer networking, rather than a programming limit of XSeed).

Behavior of Fencing Time 3.0 in Regard to This Issue:

Fencing Time 3.0 writes all tournament data to a single tournament file in a designated file location. If more than one computer opens the tournament file and makes changes, all data entry from the first computer is overwritten and tournament data is lost. It is very easy to erase an entire tournament's worth of data.

Current Developed Workaround:

Once the tournament data file is created with all the events in the tournament, it is possible to make multiple copies of that tournament file, rename them, and then remove undesired events

from them. This allows for a tournament's events to be segregated into weapon groups or just about any event combinations the Bout Committee could use. Each data entry computer is given access to only one of the tournament files (with a sub-set of events) and with proper oversight, there is minimal danger of data loss.

Limitations of Using Workaround:

There are several major limitations to the running of National Tournaments using this workaround. First, since only one data entry computer is allowed to access a particular event, other members of the Bout Committee are prevented from using another computer to "look" at an event to retrieve information about that event. All requests for information about an event are required to go through the event operator, who may be running multiple events and be unavailable for lookup requests. This could potentially delay an event from starting or continuing.

Another limitation to using this workaround is that the Bout Committee loses flexibility of having more than one computer available to enter event data during an event. This is likely to lead to increased cost for personnel due to the need of "dedicated" assigned operators/computers for each event.

Also the required time to setup the tournament files at the beginning of the tournament is greatly increased.

Financial Impact of Issue:

Use of the workaround for this issue is expected to cause ongoing increased costs for personnel and equipment. Additional computers, printers and operators will be needed for every NAC and Summer National Tournaments until this issue is corrected by the developer. Estimated required increases in equipment and operators are approximately + 50% for the 2010 Summer Nationals over running the tournament with the existing tournament software (XSeed).

Future Development Requirements:

The Tournament Committee and Bout Committee are in complete agreement that this issue is serious enough to be one of the primary factors in determining whether a piece of Tournament Software is suitable for use at the National Level. If a firm commitment and timetable to the solution of this issue is unavailable from the developer, as well as the financial commitment from the Organization to ensure that solution, then Fencing Time 3.0 should be removed from consideration for use at the National Level.

Time Spent Evaluating Issue and Developing Workaround:

10 hours spent.

Enable Updating of HTML Results from Multiple Data Entry Computers.

Issue:

The index.html file listing the available events, only show the sub-events for each operator when uploaded and overwritten from each operator's computer. Furthermore, each and every data entry computer will require internet access to update their events.

Another concern is with the amount of data to be sent to the servers. In venues where we would have to rely on cellular connection cards, the amount of data posted from a single tournament could exceed monthly data caps and cause substantial, unexpected data usage fees.

Tournament Committee's Views:

While at the moment, offering live web updates for the public is not a requirement, it is very much along the lines with the near term goals of the Tournament Committee, Organization and the membership. The developer needs to develop ways to allow for more efficient HTML file uploading in a multi-upload environment, and not just recommend that we upload less often.

Existing Software's Functionality:

Current version of XSeed does not offer/support Live Web Results.

Behavior of Fencing Time 3.0 in Regard to This Issue:

The current file structure for the HTML Live Web Results is an Index file (index.htm), a Cascading Style Sheet File (FTStyles.css) and then a separate HTML file for each event in the tournament. Each time a web update is performed (say every 15 minutes) on a tournament (or sub-tournament) all these files (events are selected by checkboxes) are completely uploaded to the server, not just the sections of events that have changed in the last 15 minutes. This means that potentially 5-12 MB of data is transferred every hour from a tournament, assuming 4 updates an hour, 100k-400k event file size and 6 events running at a time.

Current Developed Workaround:

On Apache based web servers it is possible to redefine the name of the directory index file with the highest priority (it will load first). Our workaround is to create the index.htm file from the initial tournament load, before the tournament has been separated out, make a copy of it and rename it default.html. Then either by changing the configuration of the server or by adding the below to a .htaccess file in the directory where the tournament is uploaded so that default.htm loads as the directory's index file. Then we upload the default.htm file to the web server.

.htaccess file:

Options -Indexes

DirectoryIndex default.htm default.html index.htm index.html

This means that we set the directory's index file to default.htm and when a visitor goes to the Web Results page (example: <http://www.fencingtc.org/nacc/>) the browser will ignore the ever-changing index.htm and instead load default.htm and allows the visitor to see the entire tournament tree.

No other workarounds have been found to significantly reduce the amount of bandwidth the results uploads would require.

An inexpensive hardware upgrade has been identified that would allow us to easily provide internet access to all the data entry computers without major changes to the network.

Cradlepoint makes the CTR-500 Travel Router for less than \$200 that accepts the US Fencing's cellular USB card as an Internet input, allowing all the computers on the network to share the card's internet access.

Limitations of Using Workaround:

As long as the hosting of the Web results is on an Apache server (a similar solution may exist for other web servers, additional research would be required), there are no major limitations, with the minor exception that the "Last update" time and date on the default.htm never gets updated after the initial creation.

As far as using the Cradlepoint Router for Internet access, the limitations would be slow conductivity, and increased risk of going over account bandwidth limits. Other choices would be

multiple cellular access cards with multiple accounts (at about \$65 per month each) or ensuring we have internet access at the Bout Committee Table at each venue.

Future Development Requirements:

We would like to see the developer allow for a proper updating index.html file, even when the tournament is separated between multiple computers uploading just their sub-section of the tournament.

We would recommend that the developer remove the “last updated” time and date line from the index.htm file to avoid confusion by the membership visiting the page.

Furthermore, we believe it should be possible to break up each event html file into base sections (Pools Seeding, Pool Scores, DE Seeding, DE Scores and Final Results) and upload them as separate (smaller files) only when a change has occurred in that section’s data. This would drastically reduce the amount of bandwidth used for Web Updates.

Time Spent Evaluating Issue and Developing Workaround:

8 hours spent.

Enable Multiple Instances of Fencing Time 3.0 on Computer

Issue:

Fencing Time 3.0 does not allow for multiple instances (more than one copy at the same time) of Fencing Time to run on the same computer. This creates an unreasonable increase of cost due to the need for more equipment and operators, based on the limitations involved with the workaround for issue 2 (Enable multiple data entry computers).

Tournament Committee’s Views:

A method of running multiple instances of Fencing Time 3.0 on a computer is needed to reasonably continue testing for the possible use of Fencing Time 3.0 for Summer Nationals 2010.

Existing Software’s Functionality:

Current version of XSeed supports multiple instances without restriction.

Behavior of Fencing Time 3.0 in Regard to This Issue:

Fencing Time 3.0 does not allow more than one instance of itself to run on a computer.

Current Developed Workaround:

The only way that is currently known to reliably allow multiple instances of Fencing Time 3.0 to run on a computer was to use Application Sandboxing. A commercial product called Sandboxie is available that restricts the execution of a running application’s environment to its own “Box”, and allows for multiple “Boxes” to be created for each running application - or in our case, multiple “Boxes” of the same application. Each of these instances is completely isolated from each other.

Using Sandboxie on each of the data entry computers allows for a single operator/computer to access and use more than one tournament file at the same time, thus allowing similar (but not exact) flexibility for multiple event entry by a single operator.

Also a computer dedicated to the purpose of looking up tournament data for the currently running events can be setup with Sandboxie. This would be setup to only have read access to the tournament files, so that no accidental data loss can occur.

Limitations of Using Workaround:

Because of the real danger of loss of tournament data if two or more operators load the same tournament file, the best solution for tournament data protection while using this workaround is to separate each event into its own tournament file. This drastically increases setup time for a tournament, but has minimal impact on the data entry operators.

Future Development Requirements:

Until a truly networked version of Fencing Time is available, our current collection of workarounds enables the use of Fencing Time 3.0 for tournaments at the National level. As a temporary measure, we would like to see the development of a utility program that would allow the easy splitting and rejoining of the master tournament file into the separate tournament files for the events (one event per tournament file). This utility does not need to have a Windows GUI interface, but could be a command line program if that helps the developer speed development of it.

Time Spent Evaluating Issue and Developing Workaround:

14 hours spent.

NAC D 2010 – San Jose, CA

Fencing Time Issues:

As we transition from XSeed to Fencing Time for the running of USFA National Tournaments, we are faced with serious issues preventing the smooth running of national tournaments. One of the more important “concepts” for the developer to understand is that the USFA needs to have their own “National Fencing Time” version, one not available to any other party. It is **critical** that the developer implements **only** the improvements, bug fixes and changes that the Tournament Committee and Bout Committee request and **not** any of the requests by the general public or features that the developer “feels” that would be useful. Any features/fixes not directly requested by the Tournament/Bout Committee that the developer believes is necessary, must first be submitted in writing (email) to the Tournament Committee for consideration. It is our intention to run all national tournaments with the National version of Fencing Time from here on out and speed the retirement of XSeed. Because of this, we will require several of the issues to be addressed before the Junior Olympics and NAC E. For the purpose of this document, the issues will be divided into several categories: CRITICAL, SERIOUS and FEATURE. We expect the CRITICAL issues to be addressed before JOs and the SERIOUS issues to be addressed before NAC E.

CRITICAL Issues:

Bout Order

Problem: In a pool, if you change the bout order from “standard” to “teammate” on the “Pool Options” screen, it doesn’t hold the change and defaults back to “standard”. In addition even when the teammate checkbox on the “Layout Pools” screen is checked, the generated bout order does not place teammates in position to fence each other first when pools are randomized.
Expected Fix: Teammate conflicts must be correctly handled in the random pools and the setup options should correctly reflect teammate bout order.

Team Data Import

Problem: The current program routine for the Team Data Import needs vast improvements. As it stands, the current process of setting up the import, importing of data, fixing the reported errors, re-setting up the import, re-importing the data and repeating the process until all errors have been found is too time consuming for the person setting up the tournament. For example, to setup all the team events at NAC D took a total of 8 hours for 6 team events.
Expected Fix: The import function needs to complete the import process first and then generate a printable error report for data adjustment within Fencing Time.

Edit Team/Team Competitor

Problem: Currently unable to edit/add/delete a team or team competitors after a team event has started. We found this to make the running of teams on Fencing Time nearly impossible. One team event had to be canceled, re-edited and re-started 12 times before we could make the Fencing Time team event reflect what really happened in the team event.
Expected Fix: Need to be able to edit/add/delete both teams and team competitors without changing team seeding within a running team event.

International Fencers

Problem: When adding International fencers to National events, currently there is no method for

setting their ranking relative to the rest of the field. When placing these competitors in the event; if they do not have domestic points and/or their Federation and/or FIE results could alter their relative rank, we cannot fix their position. For example, if 3 Canadian fencers are all rated B09 – they are currently randomized for the seeding, despite notification from Canada that they are ranked 1, 2, 3.

Expected Fix: Provide a way to record foreign fencer ranking information as additional criteria for determining initial seeds.

XSeed Import

Problem: Does not display names of problem fencers on the error report when Division errors occur.

Expected Fix: The tournament load error report must include the affected fencers name when reporting a Division error.

SERIOUS Issues:

XSeed Import

Problem: When default is changed for Division from National to Foreign in the preferences area of Fencing Time it does not affect the .csv import actions, only new adds.

Expected Fix: Change import behavior to acknowledge defaults set in the preferences.

Team Setup

Problem: When printing and displaying the Team tracking and Team setup forms First names are not matching if there is a nickname.

Expected Fix: Match First names on both forms to avoid confusion

Pool Assignment Defaults

Problem: Default for the view by competitor screen shows pool then strip then name

Expected Fix: Change default to display name then pool then strip

Problem: When portrait pools sheets are printed the bottom half of the pools sheet has columns for the individual fencer scores this was not requested and makes the sheet too busy

Expected Fix: Remove the two score columns and make the Warnings column wider

Direct Elimination Table

Problem: When using the assign strips tab view assignment lists the strip number then the name.

Expected Fix: Default needs to be name first then strip.

Problem: Round options only display if start time is selected and has not passed computer time

Expected Fix: Display strip numbers when that is selected even if bout time is past and/or is not selected

Problem: Printing the DE table does not allow printing of only selected pages

Expected Fix: Allow printing of selected pages

Problem: Printing the DE table does not allow printing of only selected pages

Expected Fix: Allow printing of selected pages

FEATURE Issues:

Request – Add Date/Time stamp on bottom of all printed pages.

Request – Provide a means of assigning/adding referees to DE tableaux even when competitors have not been determined. (Procedure at NAC's often assigns all Finals referees at start of finals)

Request- Have a pool # = strip number macro key

General Issues:

Sandboxie licenses were purchased and installed on all of the USFA laptops and used to run Fencing Time with multiple events. Response time on large events seemed to be slow with lags to the display refresh. The event separation tool was tested and works but will only be a temporary solution since it still requires a lot of manual manipulation to configure tournament setups into useful groups.

Appendix I Veteran's Committee Report

A Veterans meeting was held at the David Lawrence Convention Center Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on December 5, 2009, which was attended by approximately 50 persons. Ms. Kalle Weeks, President, Mr. Kurt Aichele, Executive Director, Mr. Mark Stasinis, Vice President, USFA, and Judge Paul Levy and Delia Turner, members of the USFA Veterans Committee were also present to participate and respond to questions of interest to those present.

Mr. Rinaldo Campana, Chairperson, Veterans Committee, stated that The Veterans World Championships, held at the former 1980 Olympic fencing venue (CSRK Sports Palace) in Moscow from Sept 23-27th, was the first step in a continuous improvement process in order to achieve greater long term success for the veterans' movement. Thanks to the efforts of the U.S. Delegation, and support from the spirited cadre of diverse volunteer coaches and captains, who shared a destiny with the team providing just the right support, which resulted in an exceptional team victory: 10 US medals. The cadre was the strongest and largest ever: including Co-Captains Jude Offerle and Jim Adams, Armorer Dan DeChaine, Andrea Lagan, the USFA National Team Director, Dr. Gail Blakely, Team Physician and three hard working Russian-speaking coaches, Vladimir and Vitali Nazlymov, and Iryna Dolgikh, who paid their own way. He thanked all those who helped make the trip to Moscow a success: USFA leadership and Scott Harkey who underwrote the armorer's trip.

He also informed the group that the heads of delegation in Moscow unanimously adopted the implementation of the 70+ categories, not only for men, but also for women in the next Veterans World Championships in Porec, Croatia, September 29 – October 3, 2010. There was also consideration of a proposal to have possible team competitions; on a rotation basis in a different category each year.

Rinaldo highlighted that the USFA is making significant infrastructure changes in the by-laws. One of the changes will reduce the number of board members to make the USFA more responsive to its members. This will be a way to give the USFA stakeholders more immediate access to the USFA leadership for a more rapid and effective implementation of change within the USFA. Kalle Weeks indicated that the draft by-laws can be found on USFA website. Comments on the proposed by-laws are welcomed and should be sent to bylaws@usfa.org. To read the proposed by-law changes go to fencing.teamusa.org with the main features on the title screen for the site click on more features and scroll down to the article and posting of the by-laws.

Mark Stasinis explained that there has been a great deal of discussion about the tournament schedule for veterans. Mark and Kalle Weeks provided clarification on the anticipated changes.

A concern was expressed by those present that a proposal to have the first veteran's NAC in October rather than December, which would conflict with the scheduled September 29 – October 3, 2010 Veterans World Fencing Championships in Porec, Croatia. Mark explained that the NAC would be scheduled towards the end of October. The USFA is currently considering rescheduling the veterans NAC at a later time because of the numerous complaints voiced by veterans.

In addition, Mark noted that there will be four regional combined veteran tournaments with no point value towards the World Championship qualification at this time. One of three tournaments may take place aboard a three-day cruise ship. Points of origin under consideration could be Los Angeles or San Diego, on the west coast, New York or Baltimore on the east coast, or Fort Lauderdale, Florida or Galveston, Texas in the south. The cost was estimated at around \$220 per person for room and board; this cost was considered competitively with land-based events. The USFA has taken under consideration how these events might be used as alternate paths to qualify for the Worlds Veteran Championship meets in the future. The USFA is not going to take any action on this without further discussion and evaluation of the proposal with the Veteran's Committee and the Veterans Fencing community.

A concern was expressed about the 80% rule, especially when the number of fencers is small. Judge Levy noted that the 80% rule is only applied at the Summer NAC because it is the format used by FIE. Mark and Kalle stated that the USFA is considering alternate ways to provide more fencing time such as, a round of two pools, consolation rounds, etc. Additional ideas are solicited and should be sent to officers@usfa.org.

Rinaldo informed the veterans that the Veterans Designated Fund currently has \$4,105. The USFA has set up a separate account for veteran contributions. He thanked those who had donated and urged members to donate. There were several suggestions for increasing donations, such as a check off box for registration, a sub charge for vets at Summer Nationals, etc. None of the suggestions were adopted. Suggestions for how to use the funds included improving veterans training and coaching to benefit all veterans, not just the elite fencers. Additional expenditures should be considered for awards for the most improved fencer, and recognizing individuals who have contributed nationally to veteran fencing. One use of the funds was to subsidize expenses of the US Team Head of Delegation during international veteran competitions abroad.

Kurt Aichele assured the veterans that the Veterans Designated Fund would not be commingled with the General USFA Funds. He noted, however a need to examine the procedure for the authorization of expenditure of funds for veterans expenditure.

The veteran leadership is looking for volunteers to plan the dinner in Atlanta. In addition, the Veterans Committee needs volunteers to review nominees for awards for the outstanding female or male veteran fencer for the season and the outstanding female or male, who has significantly contributed to Veterans Fencing over an extended period of time. Anyone interested in participating in these sub committees should contact Rinaldo.

Rinaldo expressed his appreciation to Kalle Weeks, Kurt Aichele and Mark Stasinos for their continued support and interest in providing the Veteran Community with opportunity to explore possible changes to make veterans fencing an integral part of the future of the USFA. Their participation in the Veterans meeting is a testament to their commitment to veterans.

The Veterans Committee anticipates presenting a proposal to the USFA Board of Directors to adopt the permanent establishment of a 70+ men and women categories for qualification to the Veterans World Fencing Championships, since the FIE has already adopted these categories.

The Committee needs to examine the procedure for the authorization of expenditure of funds for veterans' expenditure.

Respectfully submitted,

Rinaldo A. Campana
Chair

January 22, 2010

Appendix J
Fencing Officials Commission Report
2/1/10

The FOC is in the process of reviewing the Rules Changes passed by the FIE at its November Congress and will provide recommendation regarding adoption of some or all of these provisions to the USFA Board for their action in July.

The FOC Development Committee has reviewed the Referee examination and made suggested changes to the questions. These will be reviewed by the FOC at its meeting to be held February 12, 2010 and finalized as soon as possible thereafter.

Mary Mahon has been leading a project to establish photo and video segments of the examination, which would be taken online. The target date for the new sections of the examination will be Fall 2010.

The Rules Committee has been responding to rules questions posited by the USFA membership.

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. It has also assigned Assigner Trainees for the National events in order to increase the pool of trained and capable assigners for regional and national events.

The FOC website has been reconfigured and is being updated on a regular basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Cheris, Chair

Appendix K
Proposed Amendments to Operations Manual from Second Hearing Motion 1

Chapter 2: USFA Membership¹

Section 1: Rights of Membership

The USFA Board of Directors has established specific categories of memberships to differentiate ~~age groups and~~ those who are eligible to compete, those who coach, and those who support the sport. The USFA Board of Directors determines the rights and regulations associated with each category of membership. ~~All individual members, except the Associate class of membership, may participate in competitions held under the auspices of the USFA.~~

This participation is subject to the limitations specified in the USFA Bylaws as well as regulations and limitations approved by the Board of Directors with respect to particular categories of members or types of competitions. These limitations are published in the *USFA Operations Manual* and the *USFA Athlete Handbook that describes, in detail, criteria for national tournaments*.

A member of a class which has voting rights is not entitled to vote in USFA elections or participate in competitions until USFA Membership Services has received and processed the member's dues and fees. Payment of dues to a Division Secretary or other duly appointed agent renders a fencer eligible only to fence in local competitions sanctioned by the Division where the dues were paid. Once the membership has been satisfactorily processed, the individual will receive a membership card.

A. Voting Privileges [Article Ix, Section 6, 2001 USFA Bylaws]

All Competitive, Life, Non-Competitive, Professional, and Benefactor individual members in good standing, including those Competitive members associated with those holding a Family membership, who have paid their dues (membership processed and fee collected), as specified by the Board of Directors, on or before February 1st of each membership year and who have attained their 18th birthday as of that date shall have the right to vote on all matters that may be voted on by the USFA and its member Divisions. In addition these members may hold any office to which they may be elected or appointed. A person is considered a member when the USFA National office satisfactorily processes the membership application and associated fees. Members whose applications are incomplete, e.g., missing required signatures, will not be considered in good standing until all information has been completed, signatures have been obtained and fees have been collected.

Members must inform the USFA Director of Membership Services of their date of birth, if not noted on their membership application, on or before February 1st of the current membership year or stated in writing that they have, or will attain their 18th birthday as of that date to be eligible to vote in any USFA election.

B. International License

Competitive members (including Life and Professional members) of the USFA can apply for an FIE License in order to compete in international competitions. See the *Athlete Handbook* for rules governing application for an FIE License and entry procedures for FIE World Cup

competitions. Members of the USFA may not compete in any international team competitions representing the United States without specific approval of the committee designated by the Board to select members of international teams or by the National coach who has been given the authority to field teams at international competitions.

C. New Members

A new member whose individual one-year dues are paid between April 1 and July 31 shall be entitled to membership through the next membership year without the payment of additional dues. A person who has not been a member of the USFA for the past five years will be treated as a new member in establishing the expiration date of membership.

Section 2: Categories of Membership

~~Except for Associate and Non-Competitive members, the membership year commences on August 1 and ends on the following July 31. All dues are payable in full on application for membership and thereafter when the next membership year begins, or when one's membership expires, whichever is later. See Appendix A for dues structure. For each individual membership category Competitive and Non-Competitive members, one can pay for one year or three years of membership. If one's status for a category changes, e.g., age change creates a different status during the three year period, the change will be recorded in the system and a new membership card issued. If one does not receive the new card, notify the Director of Membership Services.~~

A. Individual Memberships

1) Honorary Membership: Open to any person who shall have rendered distinguished service to the cause of fencing. A candidate shall be elected an Honorary Member of the Corporation by the Board of Directors of the Corporation upon a two-thirds vote of those present at any meeting. Honorary Members shall have all the rights and privileges of Life Members.

2) Competitive Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein.

3) Professional Membership: Open to all persons who wish to be credentialed as a coach at sanctioned tournaments. Professional members must successfully complete a background check at the member's own expense.

4) Non-Competitive Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein. Associate members shall have all the rights and privileges of Competitive membership, subject to the limitation that they shall not be eligible to fence in USFA or international competitions.

~~2) Senior Membership: Open to all persons who will attain 20 years of age as of January 1 following the beginning of the membership year upon payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein. There are three types of Senior Membership: Senior, Coach and Veteran. Persons over 20 years of age are Senior members unless they fall within the definition of coach or veteran.~~

~~3) Coach category: Those coaches who are competing and are coaching and notify the USFA that they are coaches who are competing.~~

~~4) Veteran category: Those competitors who are 40 years or will become at least 40 years of age as of January 1 of the current fencing season.~~

~~5) Junior Membership: Open to all persons who will be younger than 20 years of age as of January 1 following the beginning of the membership year upon payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein~~

- ~~6) The three-year Junior membership is valid for the period in which the member meets the age criteria, after which the membership is changed to Senior.~~
- ~~7) Associate Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein. Associate members shall have all the rights and privileges of Senior membership, subject to the limitation that they shall not be eligible to fence in USFA or international competitions.~~
- ~~8) Associate Coach: category for those coaching or teaching fencers and no longer competing in USFA or FIE competitions~~
- ~~9) Associate Parent: category for parents of any fencer who are interested in receiving regular communications—email newsletters, American Fencing magazine, special notices—about the activities of the organization and its affiliates. Associate Parent category also provides the parent the opportunity to vote on the affairs of the USFA and the Division in which the child or children are competing.~~
- ~~10) 5) Life Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of the Life membership fee specified herein. Life members shall have all the rights and privileges of Competitive Senior members, but shall be exempt from the obligation of paying dues subsequent to the payment or waiving of the Life membership fee. Life members seeking the benefits of Professional membership may do so upon payment for and completion of a background check and upon payment of a fee as set by the Board of Directors to cover insurance premium costs.~~
- ~~6) Non-Competitive Life Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of the Non-Competitive Life membership fee specified herein. Non-Competitive Life members shall have all the rights and privileges of Non-Competitive members, but shall be exempt from the obligation of paying dues subsequent to the payment of the Non-Competitive Life membership fee.~~
- ~~11) 6) Olympians/Paralympians: Any athlete member of an Olympic Fencing Team or Paralympic Fencing Team is granted Life membership from the USFA. [BOD, 2/05]~~
- ~~12) 7) Supporting Life Membership: Open to all persons upon payment of one-tenth the dues for Life membership at the time of enrollment. Upon payment of supporting membership dues for ten consecutive years at the same rate as at the time of enrollment, the membership will be automatically converted to Life membership. [BOD, 2/04] *The purpose of this category is to allow individuals to become Life members by spreading the cost of the Life membership fee over a period of ten years.*~~
- ~~8) Benefactor Membership: Open as a membership upgrade to all Life members upon payment of dues specified herein. Benefactor memberships are grouped into four tiers, with dues for each tier designated in Table 1. Dues paid towards one tier may be credited against the dues required for the next tier.~~
- ~~9) Associate Membership: Open to all persons on payment of specified dues, but having the limitations that Associate members may not compete, vote, nor hold office in the Association. Associate members receive *American Fencing* magazine and other periodicals and electronic communications from the Association.~~
- ~~A-10) Family Membership: Open to a ~~maximum of four~~ members of the same family all at the same address. For the basic dues specified herein, two family members may be designated as Competitive members and two family members may be designated as Associate members. Additional family members may be designated as Competitive members upon payment of additional dues as specified by the Board of Directors, and for which no more than two will be granted competitive membership status with the remaining two granted Associate membership status. For this category of membership only one member of the family will receive a copy of the *American Fencing* magazine.~~

~~B-11~~ B-11) Club Membership: Open to any organization which (i) actively promotes or offers instruction in or provides facilities for engaging in the sport of fencing, (ii) has met its obligation with respect to the payment of dues for the membership year as specified.

• To be eligible for Club membership in the USFA, a club must meet the following criteria:

- 1) The owners and/or principal officers of the club ~~or fencing Division of such club~~ must be members of the USFA.
- 2) All members of the coaching staff, be they paid, volunteer or other similar status, must be members of the USFA.
- 3) Each Member Club must have a minimum of ten members of the USFA, at the time of the submission of the application, who have declared that club as their club. [BOD September, 1999]
- 4) The name of the club must be distinctive from that of all then existing club members, as determined by the Executive Director.

a. **Motion:** that all member clubs have a unique name that has at least one distinctive word different from another club. Motion approved. [EC meeting, July 2006]

An organization whose application for club membership is accepted has the option to request liability insurance coverage available through the USFA for an additional fee. Refer to the USFA club membership application for current insurance rates.

~~C-12~~ C-12) Corporate (formerly Business) Membership: Open to any corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship or other business entity which has an interest in supporting the development and growth of fencing in the United States upon the payment of the dues for the membership year as specified herein. Vendors wishing to purchase booth space at National USFA tournaments must be Corporate members of the USFA.

~~D. The Subscription category allows individuals or organizations who do not seek membership in the USFA to receive the quarterly fencing magazine, American Fencing and regular releases of the E Newsletter.~~

TABLE 1: SCHEDULE OF MEMBERSHIP FEES [This table replaces the table currently in the Operations Manual]

CLASS OF MEMBERSHIP	DUES (Annual except for those marked *)	3 YEAR MEMBERSHIP
Competitive	\$60	\$140
Professional	\$100	N/A
Non-Competitive	\$40	\$100
Life	\$1,200*	N/A
Non-Competitive Life	\$800*	N/A
Benefactor		N/A
Bronze Tier	\$1,500*	
Silver Tier	\$5,000*	
Gold Tier	\$10,000*	
Platinum Tier	\$25,000*	
Associate	\$25 (domestic) \$37 (foreign)	N/A
Family	\$110	N/A
Additional Members	\$50	
Club	\$60	N/A
Corporate	\$500	N/A

The Board of Directors establishes the schedule of annual dues of the USFA. Table 1 specifies

the fees for each category of membership approved by the Board ~~February 2004~~ July 2009.

Section 3: Definition of Division Membership

A fencer must identify to which Division the member will belong. A fencer may be a member of the Division:

- In which the fencer resides; OR
- In which the fencer's club is located, OR
- In which the fencer is a resident student at a school (i.e., not a day student).

The Division for the member becomes the place from which the member can qualify for the Junior Olympic Fencing Championships and the associated qualifying competitions for the Summer National Championships. The Section in which the Division is located is the Section in which the member can compete to qualify for the relevant Summer National Championships competitions.

A fencer may change Division membership if the fencer moves to a place that is located in another Division. Such change will affect the Division and/or Section from which the fencer can then qualify for any National Championship tournament. A fencer, who resides at a school located in another Division, must decide when submitting the membership application whether to represent the Division where his/her home (residence) is located or the Division where his/her school is located. Once the choice is made it cannot be changed in that fencing season.

Persons who have paid for a three-year membership must notify the Director of Membership Services if the Division should be changed at the start of each season. Without such notification the Division will remain the same.

If a member reports a change of address, the member must notify the Director of Membership Services if the Division needs to be changed.

Section 4: Benefits of Membership

Membership in the USFA includes the following benefits:

- Subscription to *American Fencing* magazine, published four times a year.
- Athlete Accident Insurance, is a secondary insurance policy that covers individuals only when participating in authorized USFA activities. (Contact USFA Membership Services for policy specifics).
- Coaches Liability Insurance; contact USFA Membership Services for details.
"U. S. Fencing Association (USFA) offers general liability coverage for member coaches at no additional cost. This coverage is extended to all USFA sanctioned and non-sanctioned fencing events/activities. This coverage is provided as an added benefit of coach membership through USFA." [BOD Agenda, Sept. 2005]
- Voting privileges: Members 18 and over as of Feb. 1 of the membership year who have provided their date of birth, have the right to vote on USFA issues and in USFA elections.
- Competitive members may compete in USFA sanctioned competitions if they meet conditions of specific competition.
- Discounts on Travel and Fencing Equipment.
- USFA Membership Card: Recognition as a member of U.S. Fencing and gateway to worldwide fencing.
- Club Memberships:
 - Eligible to enroll in the liability insurance program offered through the USFA
 - Eligible to enter team qualifying competitions for National Team Championships
 - Subscription to *American Fencing*

- Free Link on USFA website
- Corporate membership:
 - Advertising discount in magazine
 - Free link on USFA website
 - Eligibility for vendor space at national tournaments
 - Magazine
 - Mailing labels at special rates
 - Advertising opportunities in tournament mailings

Section 5: Dues Sharing (*BOD, July 1997*)

The USFA shall each year allocate \$3 of each member's dues to the Division specified by the member and \$1 of each member's dues to the Section in which that Division is located. The USFA shall pay Divisions and Sections their share of dues on a quarterly basis as long as each is current in filing past and present financial reports with the USFA and in filing Officers' reports for all previous membership years. Until all those reports have been filed, the Division or Section's share of the dues will be held by the USFA. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the Life Membership fee and Supporting Life Membership fee shall be paid by the USFA to the Division to which the member belongs and five percent (5%) of the Life Membership fee shall be paid by the USFA to the Section to which the member belongs. That portion of dues not allocated for Divisions or Sections shall be deposited to the national account of the USFA for general USFA purposes.

Official Policy [*BOD, 9/95*]

- a) Checks will be issued only to those Divisions and Sections that have filed the required financial report (from the Division/Section Treasurer) *and* Division/Section reports indicating current officers. If the Divisions/Sections have not filed the required reports, the funds due will be held in escrow until such time as the reports are current.
- b) Checks will be issued every three months according to the following schedule:
 - 1) November, December, January will be issued approximately February 15
 - 2) February, March, April will be issued approximately May 15
 - 3) May, June, July will be issued approximately August 15
 - 4) August, September, October will be issued approximately November 15
- c) Escrowed funds will be paid upon receipt of delinquent reports. On August 15, all funds held in escrow will be released providing that the conditions in Item (a) above have been met.
- d) Checks are valid for 90 days. There will be a \$15 charge to reissue checks that are no longer valid.

Section 6: Arrears

A member is not entitled to vote in USFA elections or participate in competitions until the USFA has received and processed the member's dues and fees. Payment of dues to a Division Secretary or other duly appointed agent renders a fencer eligible to fence in local competitions. When the USFA National Office has processed the membership application and the accompanying payment of dues, the fencer will be recognized as a member. No person will be eligible to vote in USFA affairs unless the person's dues for the membership year in which the person seeks the right to vote are processed by the USFA Membership Services by February 1 of that membership year. [*Article IX, Section 6, 2001 USFA Bylaws*]

Appendix L
Proposed Amendments to Operations Manual from Second Hearing Motion 4

NEW WORDING [indicated by italics and underline]

Chapter 2: USFA Membership. Section 1: Rights of Membership. (Second Paragraph):

... Payment of dues to a Division Secretary or other duly appointed agent renders a fencer eligible only to fence in local sanctioned competitions ~~sanctioned by~~ in the Division where the dues were paid. Once the membership has been satisfactorily processed, the individual will receive a membership card.

Chapter 3: USFA Competitions.

B. *Authorized/Sanctioned Competitions*

A. Definition

Webster's Concise English Dictionary defines sanction as: "official permission or approval." A USFA sanctioned competition refers to competitions that have been authorized by ~~USFA designated representatives who are responsible for the operation and conduct of official competitions (e.g. the USFA or one of its Divisions or Sections),~~ as set forth below in Section 1C of this Chapter and are held in accordance with the *Rules of Competition* and related modifications as specified in the current USFA Operations Manual.

...

B. Competitor Status

- 1) Current competitive members of the USFA may participate in competitions ~~scheduled by or under the auspices of the USFA Board of Directors or its authorized representatives: e.g., Division officers, Section officers, Regional Youth Coordinators, etc.~~ as set forth below in Section 1C of this chapter. Foreign fencers may fence in USFA competitions (non-qualifying competitions) by showing proof of membership in another fencing federation or a current season FIE License. Foreign fencers whose entry has been sent by the fencer's fencing federation do not need to show any other proof of membership.

...

C. Competition Requirements

- 1) ~~Competitive members of the USFA can earn classifications at competitions that have 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. The specific categories of competitions at which classifications may be earned are described in Chapter 6.

- 1) Competitions may be held under the jurisdiction of any of the following:
 - a) A USFA member club in good standing at the time the tournament is held
 - b) The officers of a USFA Division
 - c) The officers of a USFA Section
 - d) The Regional Youth Coordinators
 - e) The USFA Youth Committee
 - f) The USFA Regional Open Circuit Advisory Group
 - g) The USFA Tournament Committee
- 2) Sanctioned competitions must be organized and conducted by persons appointed by the appropriate USFA governing group, e.g., Divisions, Sections, Tournament Committee, Youth Committee, etc. The competitions must be conducted in accordance with current USFA rules of competition as described in the *USFA Rules Book* and the *Operations Manual*. These competitions must be open to current USFA competitive members who meet the stated restrictions of the competitions, such as age category or the type of competition, e.g., Class “C” or Division II or similar restrictions, or as an Open with only minimum age restriction.
- 3) Sanctioned tournaments or competitions are those published by an acceptable USFA official (Division, Section, Regional Youth Circuit or National USFA) means of communication—in print, electronic media via email and/or official web site. Any deviation from published information about the sanctioned competitions – either in manner of operation or splitting or combining to increase the number of classifications to be earned can be the basis for withdrawal of the sanction and thus nullify award of classifications. The following are considered to be acceptable means of communication:
 - a. Communication in print must be sent at least to all members of the Division of the hosting organization (in the case that a club or the Division is the host) or to all members of the Section (in the case that a Section is the host).
 - b. Communications via website must be posted on a generally accepted forum for competitions defined to at least include the official website of the Division or Section of the hosting organization (except as outlined below). Other web locations widely accepted by the fencing community within the Division of the hosting organization are also acceptable. Disputes about what is considered to be “widely accepted” will follow the dispute procedure outlined below in Section 7 of this chapter.
 - c. Communication of Regional Youth Circuit, Super Youth Circuit, Regional Open Circuit or National tournaments will be published in the annual Athlete Handbook and/or on the USFA web site, www.usfencing.org.

- d. Communications must include the information outlined below in Section 3A of this chapter.
- e. Communications must be postmarked/posted at least 30 days prior to the close of registration of the first event listed for the tournament.

...

C. *Responsibilities*
Member Clubs

Member Clubs may conduct sanctioned tournaments or competitions at a location which must have proper insurance coverage for the event. The club must ensure that such competitions are conducted in accordance with the current USFA Rules of Competition and operating procedures.

The Member Club must hold Club Membership under Chapter 2, Section 2B of this Manual.

The Member Club must NOT have been restricted from holding sanctioned competitions by the US Fencing Board of Directors or by a body delegated the responsibility to administer these restrictions by the Board of Directors.

Division

~~Division competitions are the responsibility of the Division officers and its Executive Committee. Only those competitions published in the official Division schedule, whether by newsletter mailed to Division members or posted on the Division website, and which are conducted under the authority of the Division, are deemed to be sanctioned by the Division and may be considered for a rating whereby fencers may earn a classification, all other conditions specified in this Manual being satisfied.~~

Divisions are responsible for scheduling and conducting the Division qualifying tournaments at which fencers can qualify for specific individual competitions for the Junior Olympic Fencing Championships and for individual and team competitions at the Summer National Championships. The qualifying paths are described in Chapter 8.

~~The official published schedule is one that is printed and mailed to the members of the Division and/or posted on the official web site of the Division or its Section. At the beginning of each fencing season the Division should mail to its members of the current and prior season a postcard with its web site address and date when the schedule of competitions will be posted on its web site. In this way the Division keeps its members informed of the status of the schedule without extra mailings and in a way that all the competitors can access schedule details. It is recommended that the Division mail a printed version of the schedule to the clubs in its area with a note specifying that its web site will post changes to and details of the scheduled competitions. Members who can receive email messages should notify the Division of their current email address.~~

Divisions may, under their auspices, sanction competitions within their territorial boundaries that are organized by current USFA member clubs, individuals or other organizations who must have proper insurance coverage for the event, and for which the Division ensures that such competitions are conducted in accordance with the current USFA *Rules of Competition*

and operating procedures. ~~These competitions must be included in the official schedule of Division competitions to be considered “sanctioned” competitions.~~

~~It is a common practice that Divisions will list other competitions that are not “sanctioned” by the Division but rather are to inform its members of other competitive opportunities. The Division and/or Section should indicate which competitions or tournaments are not held under their authority, and therefore are not sanctioned.~~

(Renumber below as appropriate)...

D. Scheduling of Competitions

Member Clubs, Division and Section

The USFA fencing season officially begins on August 1 and ends July 31. Member Clubs, Divisions and Sections should adhere to the guidelines specified here.

~~The Division and Section~~ Schedules must include the information described in the following paragraphs.

- 1) ...

- 5) Any special regulations or conditions governing the competitions and/or the venue must be specified.
 - a. At the beginning of each season (and not later than October 1) each Section and Division must publish dates of team and individual competitions, including competitions from which fencers can qualify to enter competitions at the Junior Olympic Fencing Championships and/or competitions at the Summer National Championships. The official published schedule is one that is mailed to the members and/or posted on the official web site of the Division/Section.
 - b. In determining dates of competitions and/or tournaments, every effort should be made to avoid scheduling qualifying competitions on the same weekend as the national tournaments, i.e., the North American Circuit (NAC) tournaments.
 - c. Similarly, divisions should strive to avoid, to the extent possible, scheduling Youth14 qualifying competitions to the Summer Nationals on the same weekend as a Super Regional Youth Circuit tournament.
 - d. Division and Sections must give at least four weeks' notice of qualifying competitions to National Championships: Junior Olympics and Summer Nationals.

Each type of competition or tournament must be explicitly described in the schedule published by an authorized agent of the USFA: i.e., Member Club, Division, Section, Regional Youth Coordinator or the USFA. Some examples of competitions that might be held are given below. Competitions at a tournament are gender specific unless the schedule states that the competition will be mixed. The description given in the published schedule of any tournament must specify gender and the weapon which will be fenced.

All tournaments at which fencers can earn qualification to any USFA National Championship competition must be gender specific, i.e., mixed competitions are NOT permitted in any

qualifying competition¹. In all other cases, if a sanctioning entity ~~Division~~ has determined that a mixed competition will be held if less than a certain number of fencers enter a competition, then that must be so stated: what that minimum number is, below which the competition will combine both the men and women's events in that weapon. Classifications can be earned in a mixed competition – see paragraph D below.

The schedule must indicate the possibility that a single gender competition could become a mixed competition if numbers so dictate or if participants express a desire for it to become mixed. Under no circumstances can a qualifying competition be a mixed competition¹.

E. Types of Tournaments

Open

...

Closed

A closed competition is a USFA competition in which eligibility is limited on the basis of sectional or division membership. Only Divisions or Sections may host tournaments that are limited on this basis and then they may only be restricted to members of the hosting Division or Section as appropriate. In a closed competition athletes must meet the minimum age requirement of 13 years old as of January 1st of the season or be on the National Junior Point Standings.

...

Removal of Sanctioning Status for a Tournament/Competition and Loss of Ability to Sanction Future Events

Should a sanctioned tournament or competition be held that violates the procedures outlined in this Manual the tournament's sanctioned status may be removed after being held using the procedures outlined in this Section.

Standing to Dispute a Tournament/Competition's Sanctioned Status

The sanctioned status of a tournament or competition held under the authority of the President of the USFA and the Board of Directors which has delegated the responsibility to the Tournament Committee and the Executive Director may only be disputed by a member of the US Fencing Board of Directors.

The sanctioned status of a tournament or competition held under the authority of a Regional Youth Coordinator and/or the USFA Youth Committee may only be disputed by a member of the US Fencing Board of Directors.

The sanctioned status of a tournament or competition held under the authority of the USFA Regional Open Advisory Group may only be disputed by a member of the US Fencing Board of Directors.

¹ A specific exemption has been provided for the Regional Youth competitions in that for 6 or fewer entries in a competition, the competition can become a mixed competition for that age category.

The sanctioned status of a Qualifying Competition held under the authority of a Division or Section may only be disputed by (1) a member of the US Fencing Board of Directors or (2) a member of the Division (in the case of a Division Qualifying Competition) or Section (in the case of a Section Qualifying Competition) Executive committee from the Division or Section actually holding the event.

The sanctioned status of any other tournament or competition may be disputed by any of the following:

- 1) A member of the US Fencing Board of Directors;
- 2) A member of the Division Executive Committee from the Division in which the competition or tournament was held;
- 3) Any member of the USFA from the Section in which the competition or tournament was held.

Adjudicating Body

Disputes brought by a member of the USFA from the Section in which the competition or tournament was held will be heard by the relevant Division Executive Committee.

Disputes brought by members of the US Fencing Board of Directors, as members of a Section Executive Committee or as members of a Division Executive Committee will be heard by the US Fencing Board of Directors or by a body delegated by the Board to hear disputes.

Individuals who are members of the Division Executive Committee or the US Fencing Board of Directors may choose to act only as members of the relevant section in the cases where they have the choice to act in either capacity.

Timing and Method of Disputes

All disputes must be submitted in writing no more than 30 days following the end of the relevant event. The postmark or shipping date will determine if the time period was met.

Dispute Procedure

Interested parties adjudicating a dispute must recuse themselves from the discussion and any vote held. Interested parties are defined as any of the following:

- 1) A member of any entity which collected entry fees from the event in dispute.
 - 2) A member of any entity (generally a member club) of which the person making the dispute is also a member (not including the USFA as a whole or any of its Divisions or Sections).
1. Disputes involving tournaments or competitions from Member Clubs must be sent to the appropriate Division's Secretary or President at the address delineated on the most recent Division mailing or on the Division's website accompanied by a check or money order for \$25. If the dispute is upheld the monies will be reimbursed. If the dispute is not upheld the funds will be forfeit.

Upon receipt of the dispute, a copy shall be provided to the Member Club's representative by the Division's Secretary or President no later than 10 days after the postmark or shipping date of the dispute. This written notification will be sent to the address of record of the Member Club. The Division's representative may redact information from the written dispute if it is deemed appropriate to do so. Any response from the Member Club must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the postmark or shipping date on their written notification.

Divisions are responsible for convening a meeting of their executive committee within 30 days of the postmark or shipping date of the submitted dispute. The written submissions of the disputing party and any response from the Member Club should, along with any other information the Division Executive Committee deems relevant, be taken into account. The Division's executive committee may make any of the following rulings:

1. The dispute is not upheld. The tournament retains its sanctioned status. The dispute deposit is forfeit. Both the member club and the disputant must be sent the result in writing. This result must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the meeting.
2. The dispute is upheld. The dispute deposit must be refunded. If the dispute is upheld the following may be the result:
 - i. The problem was sufficiently minor to allow the results of the tournament to stand as a sanctioned event. A written warning must be issued to the Member Club's representative with the problems identified. This is a ONE TIME EXCEPTION. Any dispute of a similar nature submitted a second time may not be considered minor and must result in one of the following actions. Both the member club and the disputant must be sent the result in writing. This result must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the meeting.
 - ii. The problem was significant and invalidates the tournament's sanctioned status. Any ratings earned will be cancelled. No further action on the part of the Division need be taken. Both the member club and the disputant must be sent the result in writing. This result must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the meeting.
 - iii. The problem was extremely significant. The tournament's sanctioned status is invalidated. Any ratings earned will be cancelled. In addition, the Division recommends that further action be taken and that the Member Club's ability to conduct tournaments should be suspended for a period of time. In this case the Division must send both the dispute and any response from the Member Club to the US Fencing National Office along with the findings of the Division executive committee with a recommendation for further sanction and the reason for this recommendation. Both the member club and the disputant must be sent the result in writing along with the recommendation for further action. This result must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the meeting.
3. Either the Member Club or the Disputant may appeal the decision of the Division Executive Committee by following the procedure set forth below.

2. Disputes involving any other sanctioned tournament or competition or appeals of the decisions of Division Executive Committees must be sent to the US Fencing national office by mail at the US Fencing National Office accompanied by a check or money order for \$100. If the dispute is upheld the monies will be reimbursed. If the dispute is not upheld the funds will be forfeit.

Upon receipt of the dispute or appeal, copies shall be provided to all relevant parties including the Member Club's representative, the disputant, and the Division's/Section's Secretary or President as appropriate no later than 10 days after the postmark or shipping date of the dispute. This written notification will be sent to the address of record of the Member Club, disputant and/or Division/Section. The US Fencing National Office may redact information from the written dispute if it is deemed appropriate to do so. Any response from the Member Club, disputant and/or Division/Section must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the postmark or shipping date on their written notification.

US Fencing is responsible for convening a meeting of the body appointed (hereby known as the Tournament Dispute Group or TDG) by the US Fencing Board of Directors within 45 days of the postmark or shipping date of the submitted dispute/appeal. Any information deemed relevant may be taken into account. The TDG may make any of the following rulings:

- a. The dispute is not upheld. Either (a) the tournament retains its sanctioned status, if this is the body of first hearing, (b) no further sanction is deemed appropriate, in the case of a referral for additional sanction by a Division Executive Committee, or (c) the appeal is denied. The dispute deposit (if any) is forfeit. The member club, disputant, and/or Division/Section as appropriate must be sent the result in writing. This result must be postmarked or shipped no later than 10 days after the meeting.
- b. The dispute/appeal is upheld. The dispute deposit (if any) must be refunded. In the case where the TDG is the body of first hearing disputes upheld result in the following:
 - i. The problem was sufficiently minor to allow the results of the competition or tournament to stand including any ratings or points earned and any qualification to further events. The TDG may require the sanctioning authority to comply with specific procedures the next time a competition or tournament is held. Failure to adhere to these requirements at a subsequent competition or tournament will automatically result in the loss of sanctioning and will move to item ii of this section of the Operations Manual.
 - ii. The problem was significant and should invalidate the tournament's sanctioned status. The findings of the TDG must be referred to the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee for a determination of next steps and what will happen to any points/ratings/qualifications earned.
 - iii. The decision of the TDG may be appealed to the full Board of Directors by either the disputant or the respondent. In this case, there is a \$250 deposit and the procedures will be as outlined below in section D2c below.

In the case where the TDG rules that a decision of a Division Executive Committee must be overturned any of the repercussions listed above in this section of the

Operations Manual D1 may be applied. In addition, the TDG may refer the case to the Board of Directors as outlined in section D2c below.

- c. The Board of Directors has responsibility for the following:
- i. To determine next steps in the case of a significant problem where the TDG was the body of first hearing. In this case the TDG should provide a recommendation as to how to solve the problem and must vote on any dispute that was received by the TDG more than 30 days prior to the meeting of the Board.
 - ii. To act as a final appellant body in the case where a dispute by the TDG is appealed. Any remedy listed above or below. The Board may overturn any decision made by the TDG or apply additional remedy it deems appropriate.
 - iii. In the case where the TDG recommends that a Member Club be denied the ability to sanction tournaments for a period of time the Board may determine whether or not to remove this privilege and for what period of time, may issue a warning that repeat offenses will be so decided or may decline to penalize the member club further.

Chapter 4: Tournament Management

...

Jury of Appeal

...

Composition

1. Member Club or Division

The Jury of Appeal at a *member club* or divisional competition shall be composed of all current members of the Board of Directors...

Section 5: Crisis Management Group (formerly "Act of God" Committee)

B. Sections, ~~and~~ Divisions, and Member Club

Sectional, ~~and~~ Divisional, and *member club* competitions and/or tournaments may be cancelled, delayed, rescheduled or reformatted by the decision of a group composed of the BC chair, the organizing committee and all members of the Sectional or Divisional Executive Committee who are present at the competition...

Chapter 6: Classification System

...

Types of Competitions for Ratings

...

Restricted

...

MIXED: A Division or club may schedule competitions open to both men and women...

The ~~Division's~~ *Schedules* shall specify the conditions under which competitions will change from gender specific to mixed competition.

Administration of Classification

1. ... To avoid questions with respect to individual fencers, each ~~Division, through its Executive Committee or other designated officer or committee,~~ *Sanctioning body* should certify all classification changes (both major and minor) to the National Office...

...

6. Classifications can be earned only in regularly scheduled competitions run by the USFA, its Sections, its Divisions, *its member clubs*, or through official regional youth tournaments *or regional open circuits*. Classifications can only be awarded if adequate notice of the competition has been given to the members of the organizing body ~~via such means as a published schedule on the Division's web site, newsletter, or notices sent to all USFA clubs within the Division or Section as outlined in Chapter 3, Section 1, C, 3.~~ Classifications can be earned in competitions sanctioned by a body of the USFA but not run by that body (e.g., State Games) only after the sanctioning body has determined that the competition has been run in such a manner as to justify the awarding of classifications.

...

Notes to Table 2: USFA Classification Reference Chart

Changes in classifications are allowed at USFA sanctioned individual competition restricted to Veterans and to Junior fencers: *Member Club*, Division, Section and Regional Youth and Cadet competitions must meet or exceed criteria for C1 to award changes in classification. (BOD, July '02, July 03).

Chapter 7: Competition Procedures

Seeding

...

Division and Regional Competitions

... Since those rankings reflect performance of the fencers among themselves, those may be more meaningful in seeding Division *or member club* competitions if the participants in the competition are just members of the Division...

In *Member Club*, Division and Sectional competitions, seeding can use the national rolling point standings within each classification or it can use just the classification, letter and year, for seeding.

Formats

General

...

If the *Member Club* or Division sees a need for additional direct elimination bouts then it can

add repêchage to its format in the direct elimination round, whether at complete tableau of 32 or of 16...

Whatever format the *Member Club* Division or Region decides to use, it must be announced and posted before the start of the competition.

Appendix M
President's Report
Kalle Weeks

The work of the Bylaws Review Task Force is coming to a close—the deliberations have taken place over more than a year, including conference calls, face-to-face meetings, open meetings, individual conversations, email exchanges and countless drafts. Jane Carter, Greg Dilworth, Alan Kuver and Ivan Lee are to be commended for producing bylaws that reflect the needs of our diverse fencing community in a time of growth and change. Special thanks are due to Donald Alperstein, who crafted the multiple drafts that reflected the evolution of our thinking and input from our many constituencies.

As a member of the task force, I have been part of those activities, and want to share with you some of the concepts that shaped the thinking that you will see reflected in the bylaws.

Our current bylaws are now 12 years old, and while they have served us well, the organization has in many ways moved beyond them. Moreover, the USOC has put considerable pressure on the USFA to update our bylaws to better reflect modern governance practice and the current needs of the organization.

VII. Board accountability

- The new bylaws provide for members of the Board of Directors to be elected directly by the voting members of the association, not through intermediate governance units, such as Sections or the Congress, as is now true.
- Most Board members will be elected for two-year terms, which means that members' records are reviewable by the members at regular intervals.
- Elections will be contested—that is; at least two candidates will be put forward for each Board position by the nominating committee, and others can be nominated by petition.
- Increased member participation will be facilitated by moving the election process to electronic voting.

VIII. Diverse perspectives

- Members will bring specific expertise and experience to the Board of Directors:
 - Athletes
 - Coach
 - Parent
 - Veteran
 - Volunteer
 - Four “at large” members
 - Independent perspectives
 - Officers (President and Treasurer)
- BUT—all members must, as is explicit in the bylaws, serve in the interest of the association as a whole, not as representatives of any particular group.

IX. Board size

- A smaller board will permit in-person Board meetings at least quarterly; conference calls will be possible for frequent intervening meetings
- The Board will be able to make all major decisions without relying on an Executive Committee to act between meetings
- Travel and accommodation costs for a smaller board can be assumed by the Association at no additional cost to the organization.
- Members will take on greater responsibilities regarding committees, including possibly chairing them.
- Smaller boards are consistent with not-for-profit best practice and USOC guidelines.

X. Little or no change in many aspects of the organization

- The Athletes Council will be only slightly modified, as requested by the athletes.
- Committees will remain as currently constituted.
- There will be no change to the Fencing Officials Commission.
- Nomination procedures will be similar to those currently in place, with the addition of contested elections.
- Procedures for removal from office will be essentially the same as are currently in place.

XI. What about Divisions and Sections?

- Divisions and Sections remain in place, with the new Board charged with taking action to address this aspect of our governance no later than 2012. Such “sunsetting” is a common method of requiring legislatures, boards of trustees, boards of directors, etc., to address the operational organization and effectiveness of governments, corporations and other large entities.

As with all matters that come before the Board and our members, I anticipate that there will be lively discussions as we contemplate and plan for the future under these bylaws. In addition, I am confident that our association will be stronger and better able to meet the needs of our members as we go forward with a smaller, more nimble Board, elected by our members.

Respectfully submitted,
Kalle Weeks

Appendix M

Bylaws Review Task Force Report

The Bylaws Review Task Force has been very busy working to make bylaws revisions that will help the United States Fencing Association to grow and move forward over the next decade. The draft bylaws that are being submitted with this report are the culmination of over a year of research, discussion, debate and interaction with a broad spectrum of the membership, who provided great feedback and ideas. The Task Force's efforts have been undertaken with the best interests of the organization and its constituents in mind, while trying to comply with the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act and considering the input the USOC has provided with regard to Board composition.

Here are the next steps for the adoption of our revised bylaws. The Task Force will hold a working session with members of the Board on Saturday, February 13th at the close of fencing to discuss the process for adoption, to describe the thinking that led to the revisions, and to review the proposed bylaws. In addition, open meetings for members will be held on in Memphis, at times to be announced.

At the special meeting on Sunday, February 14th, a motion will be brought before the board to submit the revised bylaws to the members for adoption at the membership meeting of the USFA, to be held at Summer Nationals in Atlanta, as is provided in Article XXXVII of the current bylaws.

Board Members: Please review the Bylaws and be prepared to discuss your comments at the working session!

The key changes to the Bylaws are as follows:

- **Purposes of the USFA have been streamlined and updated**
- **USFA Officers**
 - President (4 year term)
 - Treasurer (4 year term)

This means that current Secretary and Vice Presidents' terms will terminate at the end of the Annual Meeting of the BOD. If Board determines VPs' terms shall continue, they will be appointed, but not as voting members.
- **Board of Directors (15 Directors)**
 - 2 Officer Directors (President and Treasurer)
 - 3 Athlete Directors (4 year terms)
 - 2 Independent Directors (2 year staggered terms)
 - 4 At-Large Directors - elected by membership (2 year staggered terms)
 - 1 Elite Coach Director (2 year terms, even years)
 - 1 Club Director (2 year terms, odd years)
 - 1 Age Group Parent Director (2 year terms, even years)
 - 1 Volunteer Staff Director (2 year terms, odd years)
- **Nomination of At Large, Elite Coach, Club, Age Group Parent and Volunteer Staff Directors**
 - Nominating Committee nominates twice the number of Candidates

- Nomination by Petition (\geq 25 voting members in good standing, distributed among at least 5 member clubs)
- **Election of All Directors**
 - Elected by ballot (either by mail or electronic means)
- **Election of At-Large Directors**
 - Voting members receive 2 votes to distribute among candidates, but no more than 1 vote per candidate
- **Delegation of Authority**
 - Board can delegate authority to an Executive Committee, but said Executive Committee is not mandated
- **Standing Committees**
 - Audit Committee
 - Budget Committee
 - Election Committee
 - Nominating Committee
- **Transition of Athletes Advisory Group to Athletes Council**
- **Division and Section Sunset**
 - Unless further action is taken by the Board, Divisions and Sections will cease to exist at 11:59 pm on July 31, 2012

I would like to thank the members of the Task Force for all their efforts over the past year – Kalle Weeks, Alan Kuver, Greg Dilworth, Ivan Lee, and special thanks to Donald Alperstein for crafting the wording around all of our ideas.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane Carter

Appendix O National Calendar Proposal Financial Projections

	2009/2010 Budgeted Revenue	2009/2010 Budgeted Expense	2009/2010 Budgeted Net	2010/2011 Proposed Revenue	2010/2011 Proposed Expense	2010/2011 Proposed Net	Variance from 09/10
Event Services							
National Events							
NAC A	\$189,025	\$142,418	\$46,607	200,025.00	144,818.00	55,207.00	\$8,600
NAC B	\$240,000	\$155,953	\$84,047	248,300.00	157,818.00	90,482.00	\$6,435
NAC C	\$150,600	\$159,594	(\$8,994)			0.00	\$8,994
NAC D	\$204,260	\$169,014	\$35,246	213,260.00	171,214.00	42,046.00	\$6,800
NAC E	\$191,400	\$160,386	\$31,014	191,400.00	160,386.00	31,014.00	\$0
NAC F	\$201,880	\$157,762	\$44,118	204,780.00	157,762.00	47,018.00	\$2,900
Junior Olympics	\$256,700	\$157,777	\$98,923	274,900.00	160,177.00	114,723.00	\$15,800
Summer Nationals	\$698,540	\$504,702	\$193,838	709,360.00	506,682.00	202,678.00	\$8,840
Total National Events	\$2,132,405	\$1,607,606	\$524,799	2,042,025.00	1,458,857.00	\$583,168	\$58,369