

# Agenda

## Annual Meeting of the USA Fencing Board of Directors

September 10-12, 2010 Denver, CO

This is the first agenda under a new format for Board meetings that is intended to allow for and lead to additional policy discussion, specifically including allowing for thoughtful exploration of topics without requiring an active motion.

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>
Hall of Fame Committee Report	A	8
Sports Science & Technology Report	B	9
Veteran's Committee Report	C	11
Fencing Officials Commission Report	D	13
FOC Report – International Usage	E	16
Requirement for Name on Uniform Proposal	F	17
ROC Advisory Group Report	G	18
Committee Responses to Old Business Motion C	H	20
Proposed Amendments to Operations Manual from Old Business Motion C	I	22
Proposed ROC-Based Changes to National Championships Qualification Paths	J	31
Process Improvement Task Force Description	K	37
Youth Development Committee Response to Old Business Motion B	L	38
Youth Development Committee Mission Statement	M	39
Regional Youth Circuit Selection Criteria	N	40
Super Youth Circuit Selection Criteria	O	41
Regional Youth Point System Proposal	P	43
2009-2010 Budget Report	(distributed separately)	
Proposed 2010-2011 Budget	(distributed separately)	
USA Fencing Rules – August 2010	(distributed separately)	
FOC Code of Ethics	(distributed separately)	
Draft Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting, July 2010	(distributed separately)	

\*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. General Information and Organizational Items**

General announcements

Moment of Silence

Barbara Lynch

Remarks – Kalle Weeks, President

Appointment of Parliamentarian

Appointment of Secretary

## **II. Minutes of the July 11, 2010 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors**

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To approve the minutes of the July 11, 2010 Special Meeting of the Board of Directors (the minutes are distributed separately)

## **III. Executive Committee Report of Action, February 22, 2010**

- In light of a statement from the PCS where they have agreed that there is no dispute as to the amount of a financial claim by the Golden Gate Fencing Foundation, USA Fencing acknowledges the obligation incurred on its behalf by the PCS and the Executive Committee resolves to pay it with all due speed.

This resolves a long-standing disagreement between the PCS and GGFF. USA Fencing has paid the money directly to GGFF and will continue to withhold dues rebates and other payments to PCS until the expense is cleared.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To approve EC Action Item.

## **IV. Appointment of Vice Presidents**

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** As set forth in Article VI, Section 5.d of the Bylaws, appoint Jerry Benson, Jane Carter and Mark Stasinos as Vice Presidents of the Association, to serve for the remainder of the quadrennium.

## V. Committee and Task Force Matters

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

**Motion (Mr. Baker on behalf of the FOC):** To adopt as official the August 2010 edition of the USA Fencing Rulebook (distributed separately).

**Motion (Mr. Baker on behalf of the FOC):** To adopt the policy modification regarding requirements for names on uniforms as described in Appendix F.

**Motion (Mr. Baker on behalf of the FOC):** To adopt all FIE rules regarding equipment including, but not limited to, homologated uniforms, maraging blades and conductive bibs.

This motion would not affect the additional USFA rules related to permitting the name of the fencer's uniform to be shown on the leg in lieu of on the back of the jacket. The FOC feels that the USFA should adopt the safety and other equipment rules of the FIE rather than picking and choosing those to adopt.

**Motion (Mr. Clements on behalf of the ROC Advisory Group):** To modify the qualifying paths for National Championship events (outlined in Section 2.11 of the Athlete's Handbook) as indicated in Appendix J.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To appoint members to the Audit Committee as indicated on the list distributed at the meeting.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To appoint members to the Budget Committee as indicated on the list distributed at the meeting.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To appoint members to the Election Committee as indicated on the list distributed at the meeting.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To appoint members to the Nominating Committee as indicated on the list distributed at the meeting.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To appoint the Committees of the Board as indicated on the list distributed at the meeting.

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To designate the Fencing Officials Commission, the Tournament Committee, the National Team Oversight Committee, the Youth Committee and the Veterans Committee as additional Principal Committees

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To establish the Process Improvement Task Force (see Appendix K)

#### **Next Steps Regarding Committees**

- Designation of Board liaison for each committee and task force, if no Board members currently serving
- Development of purpose/mission statements, guiding principals to permit Board oversight rather than management of details

## **VI. Old Business**

### **A. Motion (Mr. Baker; Seconded by Mr. Clements):**

The National Office is directed to send out a letter on a monthly basis to each tournament official specifying all outstanding reimbursements and owed honoraria entered in the Association's financial system. Such letters should also include an update specifying the most recent national event for which payments in each category (out-of-pocket reimbursement and honoraria/per diem payments) has been made.

These letters should be sent via either snail mail or email within the first five business days of each month, starting with the first month after this motion is adopted.

**Rationale:**

Letters of this type were sent in March 2009 and May 2009. They serve the purpose of updating tournament officials of the status of outstanding payments, as well as help ensure the accuracy of the Association's records. This process is complementary towards the current practice of acknowledging receipt of reimbursement requests, which has been very well received among tournament officials.

Resuming the practice of sending out update letters will increase the level of communication and accountability, as well as increase the accuracy of payments to volunteer officials. With some payments running over a year after service is completed, it is essential that US Fencing keep all tournament officials informed about progress that is being made and the current status of all payments.

**B. Motion (Mr. Kuver; Seconded by Mr. Blake):**

Direct the Youth Development Committee to reopen bidding for the Super Youth Cup calendar for the 2010-2011 season. Add at least three more SYC tournaments. Decision to be announced before the September Board meeting.

**See Youth Development Committee Response to motion in Appendix L**

**C. Motion (Mr. Dilworth; Seconded by Mr. Baker):**

The US Fencing Operations manual will be modified as listed in Appendix I of the Agenda effective on 8/1/2010.

**See Committee Responses to motion in Appendix H**

**VII. Association Status Update**

Sponsorships and Branding – Rob Weekes

**Motion (Mr. Baker):** To adopt and operate under the trade name “USA Fencing.”

Membership and Tournament Trends – Christine Strong Simmons

Fence for Life, Outreach – Christine Strong Simmons

Membership Giving – Christine Strong Simmons

High Performance Plan – Greg Dilworth and Jim Page

National Tournament Schedule – Greg Dilworth

## **VIII. Finance and Budget**

Financial Procedures

Financial Reports

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

Contract review/resolutions

Railstation – Contract to be distributed

**Motion (Mr. Sabharwal):** To approve the 2010-2011 Budget variances, as submitted to the Board.

## **IX. Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws**

The text of proposed bylaw amendments to address typographical errors and clarification regarding actions previously assigned to the Congress will be distributed at the meeting.

## **X. Executive Session**

## **XI. New Business**

**Motions from the Floor**

## **XII. Working Session**

Making the most of local governance

Decision-making processes

## **XIII. Good and Welfare**

1. Electronic Voting
2. Digitization of American Fencing
3. Schedule of Board calls and meetings

## **XIV. Adjournment**

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

**Appendix A**  
**Hall of Fame Committee Report**  
**Andy Shaw**

The Hall of Fame Committee had a very successful induction ceremony in Atlanta. For the second consecutive induction, Serge Timacheff video taped/ filmed the entire event. This video will be available to be viewed on the [www.usfencinghalloffame.com](http://www.usfencinghalloffame.com) site soon.

The election for next year's 2011 Hall of Fame inductees produced the following successes:

Arthur St. Clair Lyon  
Delmar Calvert  
Tanya Adamovich  
Ann Marsh  
Stacey Johnson

We look forward to having a full membership email election if possible for next year.

**Appendix B**  
**SPORTS SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY REPORT**  
USFA Board of Directors Meeting – Sept., 2010

**Dr. John Heil**

Three programs continue to be the primary focus of attention for sport science in 2010-2011: Sport Science Seminars at National Tournament Events, production of Sport Science videos & podcasts, and continuing development of eScout (for statistical aggregation & video playback).

The **Sport Science Seminars** held at National Tournament Events, initially sponsored by fencing.net, and subsequently co-sponsored by US Fencing and fencing.net are now in-house with the goal of making these seminars a profit center for US Fencing, along the model developed at US Cycling and USA Triathlon. Need to development work flow and timeline plans.

A series of brief **Sport Science Videos** have been in planning and development over the 2009-2010 year, with filming at Summer Nationals, and long version (rough cut) delivered. While the primary goal is educational, the videos are intended to serve a marketing function as well. The video production project will blend with development of a series of **Sport Science Podcasts** – initially planned for distribution by subscription. These programs provide a 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> vehicle for sport science delivery – in addition to American Fencing Magazine articles and the event based seminars referenced above.

**eScout**, provides stripside tactical information with statistical, descriptive and video capabilities. This project is near completion, but on continues on hold, pending consultation with new administration leadership. Funding has been promised but not delivered – now requiring about \$3,500 to completion

**PROGRAMS & SERVICES**  
Jul. 2010-Sept 2010  
**Project Status Reports**

**Sport Science Seminars at NAC events**

Seminars have been a collaboration between US Fencing and Fencing.net.

Seminar for coaches, and athletes offered at Summer Nationals, Atlanta

**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 Memphis NAC to help meet professional continuing education requirement.

Pending implementation for 2010-2011

**USFA EVENT CONSULTATION**

**2010 Summer Nationals, Atlanta**

Sport Psychology & Sport Science Consultation.

US Fencing Board of Directors 2010-2011 – September 10-12, 2010 Agenda

## **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

No new action

### **LIAISON TO PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Contact as appropriate with professional organization

Meeting with Victor Bergonzoli of Dartfish for (1) Review of current programs including Dartfish TV; and (2) Discussion and demo of eScout

Contact with Rob Brant re USOC Sport Science services with further action deferred pending consultation with USA Fencing leadership

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

**Appendix C**  
**Veteran's Committee Report**  
**Rinaldo Campana**

A Veterans meeting was held on Saturday, July 10, 2010 at the Georgia Convention Center, in Atlanta, Georgia, which was attended by approximately 60 people. The Veterans Committee members present were Delia Turner, Wang Yung, and Rinaldo A. Campana, Chairperson. Absent members were Gerrie Baumgart, Joe Elliot, and Paul Levy. Rinaldo A. Campana introduced the USFA leadership present, Gregory Dilworth, Acting Executive Director, Jane Carter, Vice President, Mark Stasinos, Vice President, Brad Baker, Secretary, and Carla-Mae Richards.

Discussions concerning "Procedures to Authorize the Use of Funds Donated to Veterans Designated Fund" determined that the Committee should solicit the input from the veteran fencing community as to the procedure that should be proposed to the USFA. The Committee submitted a motion for consideration by the USFA Board of Directors, which was withdrawn at the request of the Acting Executive Director Gregory Dilworth and agreed to by the Chairman of the Veterans Committee in favor of the adoption of the motion as an accounting procedure by the USFA, wherein the USFA Designated Veterans Fund (the DVF) which consists of contributions made by fencers and friends for the support of veterans fencing, the Veterans Committee would determine how to spend the funds in the DVF for specific items or services in support of the Veterans Fencing Community and the Executive Director of the USFA would authorized to expend funds from the DVF upon receipt of written notice/request from the Veterans Committee. Any disputes as to the propriety of such a request would be resolved by the Executive Director and the Chair of the Veterans Committee and a designee of the President of the USFA.

The Veterans Committee selected Jane Eyre as the Outstanding Female Veteran Fencer for 2010 and James H. Adams as the Outstanding Male Veteran Fencer for 2010. The Committee also selected Terry J. Abrahams, as the Female Veteran for Outstanding Service over a Lifetime to the Veteran Fencing Community and Dr. Larry M. Pinkus, as the Male Veteran for Outstanding Service over a Lifetime to the Veteran Fencing Community in 2010. These awards will be presented at the NAC in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Some veterans at Veterans Meeting expressed concern about the 80% promotion to the DEs at summer nationals. The current ruling is that if there are less than eight fencers, 100% are promoted. The Veteran Committee recommended to the Board that at summer nationals, and NACs, 100% of all veteran fencers be promoted to the DE. The groups had mixed views: (1) those for the ruling felt that veteran fencers should not be treated differently from other fencing groups and the 100% rule means that referees have longer hours (2) those against the rule felt that this is a disincentive to growing the ranks of veterans who may not want to spend a lot of money to just fence five or six bouts and that it has the potential to substitute financial capability for skill. The Board is currently considering the following format: (1) less than 24 fencers, 100% promoted to the DE; (2) more than 24 fencers, 80% promoted to the DE.

Mark Stasinos, Vice President USFA, informed the Veterans Meeting that ROCs are recent events that provide another possible qualifying path for summer nationals and additional fencing opportunities, but do not provide points for international competitions. Currently there are four ROCs that include veteran events:

Amarillo Open	Division IA / Veteran (40 and over)	Amarillo, TX	October 2-3, 2010
Michel Alaux Cup	Veteran (40 and over)	New York, NY	November 21, 2010
	Division IA / Veteran (40 and over)	Ft Mill, SC	March 19-20, 2011 Date Change 7/3/10



**Appendix D**  
**Fencing Officials Commission Report**  
**Sam Cheris**

The FOC met August 21-22 for its Annual Meeting. All members, except Jon Moss, Iana Dakova and Ariana Klinkov were in attendance. Their absences were excused. Greg Dilworth, Christine Simmons and Karen Kuhlman from the USFA office were guests for the morning of the first day of the meeting.

The FOC elected Sam Cheris as Chair, Charlie Washburn as Vice-Chair and Damon Scaggs as Secretary.

The FOC reviewed the International Usage report (See attached). Of particular concern was the lack of usage of US Referees at saber events during the last season where 19 of 27 international events were covered by paying fines rather than sending referees.

The FOC discussed with Greg Dilworth the budget for 2010-2011 and was pleased to see that the coaches and the USFA were planning on a greater usage of US referees to cover international assignments for the coming season. We also discussed with Greg, Christine and Karen the procedure for handling travel arrangements for this season and worked out a compromise plan from the one presented to the FOC at the beginning of the meeting which will permit a balance between cost control and the ability of referees to choose least stop itineraries which do not require the referee to take off additional days to work at events.

The FOC held an in camera discussion with Greg to review its relationships with staff members during the 2009-2010 season.

The FOC will continue to make its selection of referees based on quality and development issues and utilizing the input from our FIE Arbitrage Commission member. The FOC will continue to use a variety of means to keep within its budget: (i) designate fully-funded US referees or (ii) offer the fine amount as a subsidy to US referees, with the referee absorbing the remainder of the cost.

The FOC once again reviewed the rule change adopted by the FIE relating to the conductive bib as requested by Greg Dilworth and national coaches. It was determined that making this change to the equipment rules while ignoring the multitude of safety rules did not make sense. The FOC voted down a motion to solely adopt the FIE conductive bib rule for foil. The FOC then passed a motion recommending to the Board that the USFA (USA Fencing) adopt all of the FIE rules regarding equipment including, but not limited to, homologated uniforms, maraging blades and conductive bibs. This would not affect the additional USFA rules related to permitting the name of the fencer's uniform to be shown on the leg in lieu of on the back of the jacket. The FOC feels that the USFA should adopt the safety and other equipment rules of the FIE rather than picking and choosing those to adopt.

The FOC reviewed FIE rule t105.2, which requires that the space vacated by a black-carded fencer be filled by moving up all fencers in the final 64. The old FIE rule and the current USFA rule leave the spot blank. Carla Mae Richards and Tanya Brown argued in favor of retaining the USFA rule for our competitions since it could affect point standings in an random manner not having relationship to the performance of the fencer benefitted, especially when a fencer would jump brackets, e.g. 9th place to 8th place. The FOC recommend that the USFA retain its rule in this area.

The FOC has received a number of inquiries this year regarding which events required having the name of the fencer on his/her uniform. The FOC discussed a draft proposal of the Rules committee and after discussion and modification of the proposal hereby recommend the proposal attached to this report be adopted for the Requirement for Name on Uniform.

Omar Bhutta took on the task of reviewing the USFA Rule Book and comparing it to both the British version of the FIE Rule Book and the Official French version. He then prepared a draft with corrections to bring our Rule Book in line with the FIE Rule Book, except in places where the USFA has expressly decided to not adopt an FIE Rule. The members of the FOC reviewed this version and certain modifications were made to Omar's draft. The FOC hereby recommends to the Board that it adopt this new version as the official USFA Rule Book. Both redline and clean versions are supplied as attachments to this report. The FOC wishes to acknowledge the efforts made by Omar Bhutta in completing this task and providing us with a new Rule Book which more clearly represents the state of the rules and does so with more consistent verbiage.

The FOC wishes to thank its Rules Committee for timely and accurate responses to the questions posed by members during the year.

Mary Mahon presented her report on the state of the new online exam for the certification and re-certification of referees. The FOC thanks her for her work effort in spearheading this project that has been approved by the USFA Executive Committee and request that the USFA approves the reimbursement of Mary and her contractors who have produced this exam. Charlie Washburn is currently working with Mary's contractor to get the exam posted on the FOC website. The FOC approves the online examination and recommends to the Board that the online exam be effective for this season. All persons taking the exam must do so online at a cost of \$25 and all certified referees must re-take the exam every 2 years at the same cost. The exam fees will cover the cost of the development of the online test and will permit the FOC to continue to refine the exam in years to come.

Jon Moss had prior to the meeting provided the FOC with a revised Referees Code of Ethics, which had a section added noted the potential repercussions of a referee failing to adhere to the Code. The FOC discussed the jurisdiction of the FOC being limited to the acts of individuals who were acting as a referee during at least some portion of a competition. The FOC adopted the revised Referee Code of Ethics. A copy is attached to this report for Board's convenience.

The FOC reviewed a Refereeing Handbook draft prepared by Ian Serotkin and wish to thank him for his efforts in producing this handbook. The FOC will review this work and forward comments to Ian by **12 September** and will target **15 October** to receive a revised version back to the Commission. We will then approve by email vote or have a conference call meeting to discuss if there are any open questions.

The 2008-09 committees were selected:

Domestic Assignment – **Sharon Everson**, Iana Dakova, Mary Frye, Mary Mahon & Bill Oliver

International Assignment – **Sam Cheris**, Francisco Marin (saber), Derek Cotton (Foil) and Peter Burchard (epee)

Communications – **Peter Burchard & Charlie Washburn**, Derek Cotton & George Kolombatovich

Rules – **Bill Oliver**, Mary Frye, Ariana Klinkov & Damon Scaggs

Domestic Referee Development – Grassroots - **Gerrie Baumgart**, Mary Mahon & Jon Moss

- National Referees – **Bill Oliver**, Derek Cotton & Francisco Martin

International Referee Development – **Francisco Martin**, Derek Cotton & Atilio Tass

Tournament Committee Coordination – **Gerrie Baumgart**

Wheel Chair – **Jon Moss**, Gerrie Baumgart & Sharon Everson

Awards - **Damon Scaggs** & Jon Moss

Coaches Liaison – **Atilio Tass**

Ethics – **Jon Moss**, Peter Burchard & Mary Frye

Referee Certification and Re-Certification – **Mary Mahon**, Gerrie Baumgart & Mark Stasinov

Black Cards – It was determined that all black card reports from National, Regional and qualifying competitions should be sent to Damon Scaggs who will provide a report at each FOC meeting where it will be determined if additional FOC proceedings should be held with regard to any of the black cards issued. The FOC may also request the Board to take further proceedings if it feels that discipline, beyond that which the FOC can issue, needs to be forthcoming. The FOC will also review the instances that caused the black cards to be issued and make sure that the FOC educates its referees regarding the appropriate use of black cards.

NAC – the Domestic Assignment Committee made The FOC Representative assignments. The Committee discussed the percentages of referees at various ratings needed to efficiently (work & finances) run the various events. The Committee also noted the increased difficulty of securing referees for more than 3 days of a 4-day event. It was hoped that the USFA promise to pay all referees for work prior to the Summer Nationals by October would make the hiring easier, since this debt was one of the reasons given for an unwillingness to work as a referee at NACs.

The FOC proceeded to review the ratings of the referee corps. Changes will be communicated to referees and be posted on the internet.

The interim meeting of the FOC will be held on the Sunday evening of the JOs and the annual meeting will be held on **8/20-21**; site to be determined.

**Appendix E**  
**FOC Report – International Usage**  
**August 19, 2010**

Fines for Junior and Senior events were \$500 EUR per referee not supplied. Fines for Cadet events averaged \$250 per referee not supplied. The following is a summary of usage:

**Cadet Events**

Men's and Women's Epee – 11 referees were needed and 7 US referees sent and 4 contracted from Europe

Men's & Women's Foil – 8 referees were needed – 3 were covered by fines; 1 by a European Referee; 3 by US referees and 1 unknown

Men's & Women's Saber – 8 referees were needed and all were handled by fines.

**Junior Events**

Men's & Women's Epee – 12 referees were needed – 1 was covered by fines and 11 were covered by US referees.

Men's & Women's Foil – 20 referees were needed – all were covered by US Referees

Men's & Women's Saber – 10 referees were needed – 2 were covered by fine and 8 by US referees.

**Senior Events**

Men's & Women's Epee – 11 referees were needed – 3 were covered by paying fines; 1 was covered by a referee going for the fine amount; 1 is unknown and 6 were covered by US referees

Men's Foil – 3 referees were needed – 2 were covered US referees and 1 was covered by paying the fine

Men's & Women's Saber - 9 referees were needed – all were covered by paying the fine.

Women's Foil – None were needed.

## **Appendix F**

### **Requirement for Name on Uniform Proposal**

The Rules Committee of the Fencing Officials Commission recommends the following modification to the provision requiring names on uniforms at USFA sanctioned tournaments. This would be part of the USFA Note at the end of t.45.

Names on uniforms are required at the following classes of tournaments:

National Tournaments  
Nationally-Sponsored Regional Tournaments  
Sectional Championships  
Division Qualifiers to National Tournaments

Names on uniforms are not required if the tournament is below the national level, and not in one of the classes listed above.

Specific tournaments for each class, and any exceptions within each class, can be found on the FOC web-site, [www.fencingofficials.org](http://www.fencingofficials.org), under Rules.

Under the Rules drop-down on the web site, a new category should be added for tournament classifications, which would be as follows:

#### **National Tournaments**

NAC (all types)  
Junior Olympics  
Div 1 National Championships  
Summer Nationals  
Wheelchair National Championships

#### **Nationally-Sponsored Regional Tournaments**

ROC  
SYC

#### **Sectional Championships**

Senior Sectional Championships

#### **Division Qualifiers to National Tournaments**

JO Cadet Qualifiers  
JO Junior Qualifiers  
Y-14 Qualifiers  
Div 2 Qualifiers  
Div 3 Qualifiers  
Veteran Qualifiers  
RYC

#### **Exceptions to Classes; tournament types where name is not required**

Any non-National Tournament not listed under above classifications  
Non-Qualifier Division Level Tournaments (all types)  
Sectional Circuit Tournaments  
Regional Circuit Tournaments

Web page should note the addendum to t.45 in addition to the list of required tournaments.

**Appendix G**  
**ROC Advisory Group Report**  
**Aaron Clements**

The background of the Regional Open Circuit program was outlined in the July 2010 report of the ROC Advisory Group. In the interim, the ROC Advisory Group has finalized its proposals for modifying to national tournament qualifying pathways which will fully integrate the currently authorized ROC tournaments into the Association's scheme for qualification to various national championship tournaments. The ROC Advisory Group's proposals are presented separately as a motion for consideration at the first meeting of the newly-constituted Board of Directors.

In particular, the proposed pathways incorporate the following major ideas:

- Replacement of Sectional Championships with the ROC tournaments as the principal qualification pathway for Division I-A National Championships (including the elimination of the junior section champion as an automatic qualifier for Div I-A);
- Institution of qualification through standing on the ROC points list, with substantial modification to the existing points structure and wherein a competitor's top three points results may be used in determining qualification;
- Replacement of National Championship qualification based on placement at the previous season's National Championship at the next lower competition category with placement in the previous season's points standing (e.g., instead of the top 8 Div I-A National Championship finishers qualifying for the subsequent season's Div I National Championships, the top 8 ROC points list finishers would qualify for the subsequent season's Div I National Championships);
- Design of the ROC points system to integrate all authorized categories of competitions into the system (i.e., rather than separate Div I-A and Div II points lists, one integrated list would be maintained, although points awarded from Div II tournaments would be substantially less than those awarded for open tournaments).

Further commentary on these proposals are included with the motion submitted for the Board's consideration.

In addition to these activities, the ROC Advisory Group concluded its second season at Summer National Championships in July. Arrangements were made through National Office staff to provide prizes for each of the highest points finishers in each of the six gender-weapon categories; the Advisory Group would like to extend its thanks to Robert Weekes for his assistance in this matter on short notice.

The ROC Advisory Group is continuing to work on formulating a long-term plan for transfer of operational oversight of the ROC tournaments to semiprofessional regional coordinators, with a view towards providing a system which can be used not only for the ROC tournaments, but also the SYC/RVC tournaments. Ultimately, the ROC Advisory Group believes such a plan may provide operational oversight of not only these regional/super-regional tournaments, but may also provide a mechanism for effective oversight of all tournaments within given, defined regions.

Finally, the ROC Advisory Group has discussed the motion pending before the Board to modify the sanctioning process by devolving the authority to sanction tournaments from divisions to member clubs, pursuant to the Board's referral of this motion to various committees in February. The ROC Advisory Group has come to the unanimous conclusion that it opposes this motion. This Group understands that this proposal has been advanced for the purpose of eliminating problems and abuses associated with the current division-based sanctioning process by removing divisions from the equation and allowing market forces to play a large role in the ultimate success of tournaments. However, for the following reasons, this Group believes that the motion will create more problems while not solving any of the underlying issues.

Complaints associated with the current sanctioning process are myriad, but a majority of the problems occurring appear to occur in divisions where one large club controls the division administration and whereby the division officers, rather than acting in a fashion consistent with the fiduciary duties entrusted to them, act as puppets of their club and misuse the sanctioning process to prevent other clubs from hosting potentially lucrative tournaments, either through outright refusal to sanction or by selectively imposing burdensome requirements on competing clubs seeking to host tournaments.

Rather than solve these problems, this Group believes that the proposal before the Board is essentially runs up a white flag with respect to these current real problems, and that this proposal has the potential to in fact exacerbate these issues, with the sanctioning process and local calendars degrading into chaos as competing clubs attempt to attract fencers (and money) to tournaments. In particular, this Group believes this proposal will remove any impediment from larger clubs' competitive advantages in this regard, and that this proposal will allow larger clubs to suppress competition by allowing those clubs to host competitions on almost every weekend, with the base registration such clubs can provide (i.e., more fencers and fencers of higher rating) serving to attract "outside" fencers to the larger clubs' tournaments to the detriment of any efforts by smaller clubs to provide competing tournaments. In short, this Group believes that the proposal will simply give large clubs the ability to drive smaller clubs out of the market of hosting competitions. This Group also particularly believes that this result is unwarranted in view of the Group's impression that while there are "problem divisions" out there, a majority of divisions function effectively for their intended purpose.

This Group believes that a better short-term solution would be to better define the role and authority of the division in tournament sanctioning, i.e., to provide guidelines and a sanctioning structure which will, to the extent possible, minimize abuse and reduce the problems currently encountered with our division structure. Long-term solutions with this Group envisions with respect to this problem potentially includes matters it is currently working on, in particular, the institution of the semiprofessional regional coordinators, including not only a description of the responsibility and authority accompanying such a position, but also knowledge requirements and ethics guidelines which will go far in eliminating the lapses seen in a minority of the Association's local "volunteer" administrations.

Finally, the ROC Advisory Group is preparing its oversight of this season's Circuit events, and will be compiling lessons learned from past seasons and, in particular, this season in order to present a comprehensive proposal to the Board at a future date, with a goal of completing this handoff of operational oversight not later than the beginning of the next Olympic quadrennium.

For the ROC Advisory Group

Aaron R. Clements, Chair

**Appendix H**  
**Committee Responses to Old Business Motion C**

**ROC Advisory Group**

See report in Appendix G

**Tournament Formats Task Force**

The Tournament Formats Task Force does not feel that this motion falls within the scope of its mission. As a result, we have no opinion or recommendation to express on the matter.

**Tournament Committee**

No response received

**Club Development & Support Task Force**

No response received

**Divisions & Sections Resource Group**

August 6, 2010

To: Board of Directors, USFA  
From: Divisions & Sections Resource Group  
Subj: Club Sanctioning Authority

This Resource Group wishes to express in the strongest terms its opposition to allowing individual member clubs to sanction their own tournaments, and thus taking that authority away from the Division Executive Committees. We understand that, in support of this idea, much is being made of claims that many Divisions wield their sanctioning power in a capricious, unfair or vindictive manner. As many know, we have been dealing with problems from Divisions, and questions from the National Office about Division problems, for some 18 years. Based on that experience, we can assure the Board that out of, say, 10 allegations that a Division Executive Committee is mistreating a club, perhaps one turns out to have any merit, and that problem is usually the result of a misunderstanding of USFA policies and can be solved with a telephone call. On the other hand, when an allegation by an EC that a club is running unsafe or biased events, the one-in-ten ratio is almost reversed and we find that the club is usually doing very much what its Division EC says it is doing. Our experience therefore tells us that if clubs are given the authority to sanction their own tournaments, the National Office, and ultimately the Board, will be inundated with a surge of complaints about tournament misfeasance. Remember that the authority to offer, withhold, or retract sanction from a tournament gives the Division the ability to control the quality and safety of events inside its boundaries and permits local fencers to address local problems. Take away that sanctioning power, and you remove any local level of redress. Therefore any complaint from a fencer can only be acted upon at the national level.

The liability risk that this change would engender would be, we believe, enormous. The National Office and the National Officers cannot keep their eyes on the safety procedures of every club-hosted tournament in each of our 66 different Divisions, and local officers will have lost the authority and the incentive to do so. Would it not prove extremely difficult to explain to the USFA's insurer our rationale for making this major change? Moreover, if a club is recalcitrant about sending in classification changes, the proposed policy will also require the direct and ongoing intervention of someone at National level, since no local volunteer will have the power

US Fencing Board of Directors 2010-2011 – September 10-12, 2010 Agenda 20

to settle the issue.

We are fully aware that over the past few years there have been instances of Divisions that have at times been controlled and run in a manner benefiting some members and definitely not benefiting others. In a tiny few the situation became outrageous. In an even tinier sample there are issues that have risen to the level of legal action. It is these that get so much publicity that if one does not look at the bigger picture, one could reach erroneous conclusions about the overall state of relations within the Divisions of the USFA. Our own observation is that, while there is almost always a dynamic tension between the various clubs within a Division, fencers throughout the country continue to work together as adults to conduct local fencing affairs properly and safely.

If one assumes an average number of 8 members on a Division Executive Committee (many have less, some have hugely more), then the USFA currently has over 500 local volunteer officials carrying out the policies established by the Board, and policing the safety of competitions. Eliminating their authority to sanction anything more than their Qualifiers essentially eliminates an entire level of USFA administration and control (and the largest one at that), and is, in our opinion, a formula for sheer organizational chaos. We urge the USFA Board to reject the proposal to grant sanctioning authority to individual clubs.

Edwin K. Hurst, Chair  
Divisions & Sections  
Resource Group

## Appendix I

### Proposed Amendments to Operations Manual from Old Business Motion C

**Motion (Mr. Dilworth; Seconded by Mr. Baker):** The US Fencing Operations manual will be modified as follows, effective on 8/1/2010:

#### 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.**

##### A. *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](http://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.

...

**B. 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)...

#### C. *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 competition<sup>1</sup>. 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 competition<sup>1</sup>.

## D. *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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

### **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.

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 US Fencing Board of Directors 2010-2011 – September 10-12, 2010 Agenda

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 J**  
**Proposed ROC-Based Changes to National Championships Qualifying Paths**

**Motion (Mr. Clements):** To modify the qualifying paths for National Championship events (outlined in Section 2.11 of the Athlete's Handbook) as follows:

Division I

...

Championships

*Eligibility (age, classification, qualification path)*

Fencers must be 13 years old by January 1 (see Chapter 2.5 for exceptions) of the current season AND

- Be on the current National Senior NRPS at the regular fee entry deadline for these Championships OR
- Earn points at a Division I NAC in the current season OR
- Be in the top 8 of the adjusted\* Junior (Under 19) NRPS at the regular fee entry deadline for these Championships of the current season OR
- Be in the top 4 of the adjusted\* Cadet (Under 16) NRPS at the regular fee entry deadline for these Championships of the current season OR
- For the 2011 Division I Championships, placed in the top 8 in the previous season Division I-A National Championships OR
- For the 2012 or later Division I Championships, placed in the top 8 in the previous season's Regional Open Circuit (ROC) final point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*) OR
- For the 2011 Division I Championships, placed in the top 4 in the previous season Division II National Championships OR
- For the 2012 or later Division I Championships, placed in the top 4 Division II-eligible fencers in the previous season's Regional Open Circuit final point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*) OR
- In men's epee and women's epee, one of three fencers named by the U.S. Modern Pentathlon Association.

...

## Division IA – Summer National Championships

...

*Eligibility (age, classification, qualifying path)*

Fencers must be 13 years old before January 1 of the current season or on the Junior NRPS AND

- ~~Place in the top 25% (with a minimum of 8) at the current season Senior Section Championships (see Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) OR~~
- Placed in top 8 at any current season Division I-A Regional Open Circuit tournament OR
- Earn at least 1200 points in the current season's Division I-A Regional Open Circuit point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*) OR
- Placed in top 8 at the previous season Division I-A National Championships OR
- Placed in the top 8 in the previous season's Regional Open Circuit (ROC) final point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*) OR
- Placed in top 4 at the previous season Division II National Championships OR
- Placed in the top 4 Division II-eligible fencers in the previous season's Regional Open Circuit final point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*).
- ~~Placed in the top 10% (with a minimum of 4) at any current season Regional Open Circuit (ROC) event OR~~
- ~~Be the current season Under 19 Section Champion.~~

...

## **Division II & Division III**

...

*Eligibility (classification, qualifying path) – Summer National Championships*

### **DIVISION II**

Fencers must have a classification in the weapon of “C”, “D”, “E” or Unclassified at the time of the qualifying competition AND meet age requirements as above AND –

- Place in the top 25% of the current season’s Division Qualifying competition (see Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) [BOD, September 2006] OR
- Placed in top 8 at any current season Division II Regional Open Circuit tournament OR
- Finished as one of the top 8 classification-eligible fencers in the previous season’s Regional Open Circuit final point standings (as described in Appendix \*\*); OR
- Qualified for Division 1A, if classification eligible. [Board of Directors, September 2008]

### **DIVISION III**

Fencers must have a classification in the weapon of “D”, “E” or Unclassified at the time of the qualifying competition AND meet age requirements as above AND –

- Place in the top 25% (see Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) of the total number of “D”, “E” or “U” fencers competing in the current season Division’s Division II Qualifying competition (when Division II and Division III qualifying competition held together) OR
- If separate Division III qualifying competition held by Division, then top 25% of the field will qualify for Division III National Championships [BOD September 2006] OR
- Qualified for Division II. [BOD, September 2008].

...

## Junior/Cadet

...

*Eligibility (age, classification, qualifying path) – Summer National Championships*

Because the Junior and Cadet season ends with the Junior/Cadet World Championships in April, Junior and Cadet events held in conjunction with the Summer National Championships are the first events of the new season for the Juniors and Cadets. Therefore, they have different birth year eligibility requirements. Similarly, because Junior and Cadet events held in conjunction with the Summer National Championships are the first events of the new season which culminates with the Junior Olympic Championships, these events are treated as NAC's, with eligibility being determined only by age.

~~UNDER 19 (Junior) – Fencers must meet eligibility above **AND**~~

- ~~• Place in the top 25% (see Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) at the fencer's current season Under 19 Section Championships **OR**~~
- ~~• Be on the Junior (Under 19) point standings on May 1 **OR**~~
- ~~• Be on the Junior (Under 19) point standings at the Section's qualifying competition **OR**~~
- ~~• Be in the top 16 of the Cadet (Under 16) point standings on May 1 **OR**~~
- ~~• Be in the top 16 of the Cadet (Under 16) point standings at the time of the Section's qualifying competition.~~

~~UNDER 16 (Cadet) – Fencers must meet eligibility above **AND**~~

- ~~• Be on the Cadet (Under 16) point standings on May 1 **OR**~~
- ~~• Be on the Cadet (Under 16) point standings at the time of the Division's qualifying competition **OR**~~
- ~~• Place in the top 25% (see Chapter 2.7 for detailed chart) of the Division's Under 16 qualifying competition **OR**~~
- ~~• Qualify for U19 event **OR**~~
- ~~• Be in the Top 8 of the Youth 14 point standings after the April NAC.~~

...

## **Veteran Combined and V40, V50, V60, V70**

...

### *Qualifying Path – Summer National Championships*

Fencer must state on entry the competition at which he or she met qualification criteria. Failure to do so will be the basis for rejection of entry.

VETERAN – must meet age eligibility requirements above **AND** compete in

~~• Current season Section Championships~~ **OR**

• Current season Division qualifying competition for Division II and/or Division III Championships in which only those with a “C” classification or lower (D, E, or U) may compete **OR**

• Any Regional Open Circuit event (including Division IA, Division II, and Veteran Combined events) during the current season **OR**

• Any NAC during the current season.

...

## APPENDIX \*\*

### Regional Open Circuit Points Standings

Regional Open Circuit (ROC) points will be awarded to the top 32 fencers in each respective event at each of the following tournaments:

- Any sanctioned tournament<sup>2</sup> designated as a Division I-A and Division II Regional Open Circuit tournament; OR
- Any Division II North American Cup tournament; OR
- Division I-A Summer National Championships; OR
- Division II Summer National Championships.

ROC points will be awarded in the following manner: for the 2010-2011 season, Division I-A events shall utilize the same schedule of points awarded for placement in Division I events without repêchage, i.e., Appendix A, Table \*\*, column H (p. A-13). Similarly, Division II Regional Open Circuit and Division II North American Cup events shall utilize the same schedule, but the number of points awarded for placement shall be half the amount which would be earned from the same placement in a Division I-A event<sup>3</sup>.

For purposes of determining a fencer's ROC points list placement, up to three results may be added together. In order to determine a fencer's eligibility for Division I-A or Division II National Championships based upon current season results, only the fencer's best three results from current season Division I-A or Division II Regional Open Circuit tournaments or Division II North American Cup tournaments will be utilized. In determining a fencer's final ROC points standing for a season, the fencer's best three results during that entire season, including Division I-A and Division II National Championships, will be utilized. To determine whether a fencer is classification-eligible for National Championships based upon the previous season's final ROC points standings, that fencer's classification at the time those final ROC points standings are tabulated will be utilized<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that points will only be awarded for placement in *sanctioned* competitions. If a designated tournament fails to abide by conditions for sanctioning, in particular by failing to submit tournament results and the required ROC program support fee in a timely manner, that tournament's results will be excluded from the ROC points standings.

<sup>3</sup> For example, a fencer placing 3<sup>rd</sup> in a Division I-A event will earn 850 Regional Open Circuit points; a fencer placing 3<sup>rd</sup> in a Division II event will earn 425 Regional Open Circuit points.

<sup>4</sup> For example, at the conclusion of both the Division I-A and Division II National Championships in a particular event, the final points standings for that event will be tabulated, and the top 8 fencers who are classified "C" and below at that time will be eligible for the subsequent season's Division II National Championships *regardless as to any rating earned in the interim*.

# NAC Process Improvement Task Force Project Charter

## Project Mission

To improve the smooth running of USFA NAC events by optimizing the following processes:

- Fencer check-in
- Seeding
- Pool generation
- Strip allocation
- Information flow
- Round turnover
- Referee assignment
- Referee feedback/notes

## Objectives

- Reduce single event duration by 15%
- Reduce number of reseeds by 50%
- Reduce average fencer check-in time to 5 minutes
- Identify opportunities for improved
- Referee feedback/management.

## Scope

Any activity performed by USFA personnel or volunteer officials at a NAC.

## Out of scope

- Capital investments in new technology
- Summer Nationals

## Executive Champion

- Kalle Weeks, USFA President

## Team Members

- Omar Bhutta (Project owner)
- Ian Serotkin (Project owner)

## Schedule

**August/Sept:** Charter  
Creation/approval

**Sept/Oct:** Surveys to key stakeholders & interested parties

**Oct/Dec:** Data collection at NAC A/B

**Jan:** Data analysis, propose changes to key stakeholders, refine plan

**Feb/Apr:** Implement/monitor changes at NAC C/D, feedback from stakeholders

**May/June:** Year end report out

**Appendix L**  
**Youth Development Committee Response to Old Business Motion B**

To: the Board of Directors, US Fencing

From: Members of the Youth Development Committee

Regarding: Motion to reopen bidding for SYC events for the 2010-11 season

**The YDC recommends *against* adoption of the motion under consideration.**

Rationale:

1. Adoption of the motion would result in the addition of up to three additional SYCs, making a total of eight potential tournament opportunities that could result in points for the 2010-11 season for fencers in the youth-10, youth-12 and youth-14 age categories. In the same season, there are three tournament opportunities for Division I level fencers to earn points. The YDC feels that offering more than twice the number of points events to youth fencers than to Division I fencers is an inappropriate emphasis on competition for developing fencers.
2. The structure of developmental tournaments for our youngest fencers emphasizes regional competitions (RYCs) to help developing athletes learn competition skills in a relatively friendly environment with lower barriers (travel, disruption of schedule, cost, lost school days, etc.) to entry. The larger SYC events were developed to be transitional events for fencers preparing to enter national competition. Therefore, the original intent of the RYC/SYC structure emphasized a greater number of preparatory/RYC competitions and a much smaller number of transitional/SYC events. The number of SYCs on the schedule for the 2009-10 season was a result of an inaccurate understanding of this structure by the national office, the designating body last season. The number of SYCs currently designated for the 2010-11 season (five) brings the balance of RYC and SYC events back in line with the developmental structure successfully used for youth development for the last two quadrennials, since the structure's initial development and through its refinement.
3. In the event that the motion is adopted, a number of extremely important details are left unspecified and open to interpretation, including scope (review of current bids versus potential submission of new bids); an appropriate deadline for decisions, since planning for the season is well underway for many fencers; criteria for review, since the committee has already reviewed and made ranking decisions of the bids submitted under the original call for bids; and potential conflict with and impact on the organizations that have had bids accepted and have committed to holding events.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Appendix M**  
**Youth Development Committee Mission Statement**

While the oversight/organization/running of Youth Activities is the responsibility of the USFA, the Youth Development Committee creates policy that the USFA uses to provide and/or encourage developmentally appropriate activities for young fencers in the age categories Youth-14, Youth-12, and Youth 10 throughout the country, that youth-oriented activities are selected and run in an consistent and transparent way that encourages fencers to learn and grow, and that issues and questions related to youth fencing and youth-oriented activities are addressed in a timely and appropriate manner. Working with developmental coaches and youth programs, the committee seeks to provide a framework for youth fencing that allows our youngest athletes to develop their full potential as fencers in an environment that is safe and positive.

## **Appendix N**

### **Regional Youth Circuit Selection Criteria**

Regions are encouraged to provide as many RYC events as are appropriate for the region (based on distance, overall regional calendar, and availability of high-quality requests for designation). Designation should reflect the geography of the region as much as is reasonable based on the requests received.

The purpose of Regional Youth Circuit events is to provide an introduction to fencing tournaments in a relatively friendly, low-pressure environment, and to provide adequate numbers of age-appropriate competitive bouts for developing fencers. Competitors are encouraged to attend as many RYC events as make sense for the individual fencer and family.

Minimum requirements: There are some absolute requirements that any RYC request for designation must adhere to in order to be considered for an event. These include:

- Appropriate number of bathrooms/changing facilities for the projected number of competitor
- Adequate space for strips, bags, competitors, and spectators
- Adequate supply of freely available, fresh water for competitors
- Adequate number of referees and officials for smooth running of the tournament
- Demonstration of adherence to RYC guidelines, especially medical personnel guidelines
- Consistent adherence to all USFA competition rules

To evaluate tournament requests that satisfy the minimum requirements, the Regional Youth Coordinator will look at the following qualitative criteria:

- History of high quality events (past RYCs as well as local meets)
- Quality of space and equipment provided (grounded strips, adequate run-off, etc.)
- Quality of tournament staff, especially referees
- Ease of travel and accommodation for out-of-town fencers and families, and amenities of area
- Proposed schedule of events and conflicts with regional calendar, SYCs, and youth-oriented national events

### **Selection Process**

The Regional Coordinator for each region will evaluate and designate events, and will send tournament dates to the National Office for inclusion on the RYC calendar on the USFA website.

### **Process for voicing concerns/issues with RYC events**

**On site:** Participants who have questions regarding the running of an RYC are strongly encouraged to have a respectful discussion with the bout committee at the event to resolve any issue while the event is still underway.

**After the event:** If a question regarding an RYC is not resolved during the event, the appropriate process for escalating the question is:

- Contact the Regional Coordinator to discuss the concern (contact information for all Regional Coordinators is available on the USFA website)
- If the Regional Coordinator does not successfully resolve the issue, contact the YDC using the contact information available on the USFA website or from the National Office
- Regional Coordinators should consider any issues brought up after an RYC in the awarding of future RYC events

## **Appendix O**

### **Super Youth Circuit Selection Criteria**

Total number of tournaments: 3-5 per season, YDC looking into developing a formula to compute appropriate number of SYCs per season based on youth population for future seasons.

The purpose of Super Youth Circuit events is to provide a stepping stone between regional competition and national events. Fencers should rely on regional youth competition for development and the YDC encourages youth fencers to attend as many regional tournaments as reasonable for the individual fencer and family.

Geographic distribution: In order to ensure that young fencers will not excessive travel burdens, Super Youth Circuit tournaments should be distributed across geographic zones. Fencers may compete in any SYC competition they choose to attend, regardless of zone; however to ensure geographic distribution, bids will be evaluated in groups that correspond to geographic zones encompassing the contiguous United States.

Minimum requirements: There are some absolute requirements that any SYC bid must adhere to in order to be considered for an event. These include:

- Appropriate number of bathrooms/changing facilities for the projected number of competitor
- Adequate space for strips, bags, competitors, and spectators
- Adequate supply of freely available, fresh water for competitors
- Adequate access to a variety of competition-appropriate food
- Adequate number of referees and officials for smooth running of the tournament
- Absence of conflict with national youth-oriented competitions
- Demonstration of adherence to SYC guidelines, especially medical personnel guidelines
- Consistent adherence to all USFA competition rules

To evaluate bids that satisfy the minimum requirements, the YDC will rate all bids on the following qualitative criteria:

- History of high quality events (past RYCs and possibly SYCs as well as local and regional meets)
- Quality of space and equipment provided
- Quality of tournament staff, especially referees
- Planned tournament experience, including presentation of finalists, medals, etc.
- Ease of travel and accommodation for out-of-town fencers and families
- Neutrality of venue, not to preclude the use of a private club if that facility meets *all* minimum requirements
- Proposed schedule of events (weekends and school holidays preferred, along with a balanced calendar of tournament dates with regard to national events and other proposed SYCs)

### **Selection Process**

The process for evaluating and selecting bids will include:

- All bids must be submitted electronically for consideration
- Bid deadline will be May 1 of a competition season for events to be held the following season
- Organizations may petition for one two-week extension if they can demonstrate cause; no more than two weeks will be permitted unless circumstances are exceptional
- All bids will be distributed to YDC members electronically with evaluation forms (yet to be developed)
- Evaluation forms must be completed and returned by June 1
- The YDC Chair will group bids by region and tally evaluation forms to compare bid scores within each geographic region

- If more than one bid receives the same score, the YDC will meet by conference call to determine bid ranking based on qualitative criteria. The YDC as a group will also determine which if any regions will host more than one SYC
- The YDC Chair will forward the committee's ranking and selections to the National Office and sponsoring Vice President for review. Any concerns with the selections must be voiced to the committee immediately. The YDC Chair will also contact the High Performance Director with courtesy advance notice of the bid selection so that the National Coaches can be made aware of potential conflicts or opportunities with their pipeline development plans.
- Final selection of bids must be announced prior to the start of National Championships at the beginning of July.

### **Process for voicing concerns/issues with SYC events**

**On site:** Participants who have questions regarding the running of an SYC are strongly encouraged to have a respectful discussion with the bout committee at the event to resolve any issue while the event is still underway.

**After the event:** If a question regarding an SYC is not resolved during the event, the appropriate process for escalating the question is:

- Contact the club or organization that sponsored the event (contact information must be available at the bout committee during the event)
- If the sponsoring organization does not successfully resolve the issue, contact the YDC using the contact information available on the USFA website or from the National Office
- Records of any post-tournament interaction with the YDC will be kept and considered in the awarding of future SYC events

## Appendix P Regional Youth Point System Proposal

**Rationale:** The awarding of points at SYC events has caused clubs and families to prioritize participation in large events. The RYC/SYC structure was developed so that young fencers would have adequate opportunity for preparation and practice with competitive bouts before entering larger competitions. Therefore, the development of a regional point system may provide an incentive for developing fencers to include RYC events in their competitive calendar.

**Goal:** Track points within an individual region and for each age- and gender-specific weapon within that region.

- Each fencer receives a number of points for a given event based on his or her placement and the total number of fencers in that event (i.e. the first place finisher earns one point for each competitor in the event, second place earns [total competitors – 1], etc.)

So for example: 12-boys foil, total of eight competitors

Place	Name	Points
1	Bob	8
2	Joe	7
3T	Fred	5.5*
3T	Tony	5.5*
5	Bill	4
6	George	3
7	Alex	2
8	John	1

*\*Points for any tie, including the tie for 3<sup>rd</sup> place should be calculated as an average of the points for awarded place and the following (skipped) place.*

- In the event of mixed events, competitors earn points based on overall placement, NOT separated by gender; however, separate season point tables are kept for boys and girls
- At the conclusion of the season, the **top three results** are added for the final point totals

### Process

- At the conclusion of each RYC event, the organizer compiles the points and sends to the Regional Coordinator using a provided template
- The Coordinator compiles events and points throughout the season (Coordinators are encouraged to maintain public records of point totals using a website or routine email to member clubs, or some other method, if possible)
- The coordinator sends totals to each RYC event so that competitors can access and check the information, but maintains a separate master point total as a back-up
- For the final season event, the Coordinator either computes the final results at the event or deputizes the bout committee and makes sure they have adequate instruction. Final results should be announced at the event. If winners are not present, they should be contacted within a reasonable time following the event.
- Regions are encouraged to award certificates, ribbons or prizes, either soliciting member clubs for donations or designating a small (no more than \$2) surcharge to all RYC event fees

[NOTE: need to develop excel sheet/process to compile points with a minimum of manual work/rekeying results]