

USA Weightlifting Board of Directors - Minutes
July 17, 2014 8am local time, Salt Lake City, UT

In attendance:

Artie Drechsler, Jasha Faye, Mike Graber, Terry Grow, Ursula Papandrea, Les Simonton, Emmy Vargas,
Staff: Michael Massik, Carissa Gump

Old Business

1. Discussion of National meets
 - a. Continued discussion from last meeting on how to accommodate the growth of membership and increased attendance at meets coupled with the resource limitations of the organization.
 - i. Following significant discussion, the Board has condensed their views into the attached document (attachment 1). The full document will be distributed to members through the website and a summary of all changes will be prepared for quick reference.
 - b. The staff will develop a plan to create a regional qualifying system which will allow an alternate qualification pathway for the Junior National Championships, the Senior National Championships and the University National Championships.
2. Increasing the ranks of qualified national referees without compromising referee performance at national events continues to be an organizational priority. In previous meetings, the Board has discussed the need to create a program to recruit more new referees and broaden the pool of referees for National events. There was also discussion for the concept of creating an online test that would help fill the ranks of National Level Referees. In addition, the following items were proposed to increase the ranks of referees:
 - a. Discounts on referee hotel room rates
 - b. Food and beverage delivery to referees when possible (given personnel or venue constraints)
 - c. The staff will explore a system of patches and rocker bars for referees
 - d. The possibility of increased referee testing at regional and qualifying meets

Financial Report – Materials were distributed in advance of the meeting and will be discussed in detail at the next meeting of the Board.

Committee Reports and Organizational Updates

1. World Championships Update
 - a. Preparations continue for the 2015 World Championships to be held in Houston. A verbal summary of activities to date was presented to the Board in anticipation of the next organizational meeting which is scheduled for the first week of August. The final contract will be delivered by Houston during that meeting.
2. Review of existing Bylaws and proposed changes to that document. *(tabled until next meeting)*
3. Request from Connecticut for organizational consideration
The USA Weightlifting members located in Connecticut will be polled by the office to see if they are in concurrence with the attached request. If the Connecticut members are in favor of the request, then the Board has no objection to making the change.
4. Coaching Rating System: The Board discussed a modification of the existing coach rating system and has asked Artie Drechsler and Ursula Papandrea to work with the staff to construct language that recognizes:
 - a. The Head Coach of a top tier team (World Championships or Olympic Games) i.e., the coach that produced the top athlete, will advance to Senior International Coach.

- b. The Head Coach of a second tier team (Junior World Championships, Pan Am Games or Championships, Youth World Championship and World University Games) i.e., the coach that produced the top athlete, will advance to International Coach.

New Business

1. Discussion of Xtreme Perfect Weightlifting Club
 - a. Staff will compose a response to the Xtreme Perfect Weightlifting Club regarding their recent dispute. The Board will receive a copy of this response.
2. The Board has no current desire to purchase additional domain names related to weightlifting.
3. Discussion of the requirement for citizenship to compete in USA Weightlifting National Championship events. (*tabled until next meeting*)
4. Discussion of background check requirement
 - a. The current background check requirement stipulates that any coach must pass a background check in order to be listed as a coach member of USA Weightlifting. The Board reaffirmed this policy and reiterated that any exception to the policy would be highly unlikely.
5. The Board discussed the complicated relationship between Masters Weightlifting, the IWF and USA Weightlifting.
6. Athlete Performance Incentive Plan Proposal (Mike Graber). The plan author is revising some portions of the proposal for clarity. The proposal will be distributed by email.

Attachment 1: DRAFT 7/28/2014

Revised Qualification Procedures for the 2014 American Open and All 2015 National Events (updated 8/15/2014)

Over the past year, USA Weightlifting has experienced truly extraordinary increases in the number of athletes qualifying for its national events, to the point where we are in danger of exceeding our capacity to conduct a national event appropriately, within a three day event structure. Consequently, the numbers of participants at our national events needs to be brought under control. By doing that, we can assure the kind of high quality experience which befits those who earn the honor of competing at a national level. In order to accomplish this, we will be making some essential and important changes in our qualifying procedures going forward. Because of the proximity of our next major open national event - the American Open, the changes in the qualifying approach for that event will be relatively modest. However, the changes in our qualifying procedures for our 2015 national events will be much more significant and fundamental.

An “Embarrassment of Riches” Creates a National Event Crisis in the USAW

Over the past two years, USA Weightlifting has enjoyed an unprecedented growth in its membership, from under 8,000 in 2012 to more than 16,000 as of July 2014. Needless to say, we are thrilled with this development and hope that our growth will continue at a rapid rate, as more and more athletes discover the challenge and thrill of competing in Olympic-style weightlifting.

But with our unprecedented and welcomed growth, we have seen an unexpectedly precipitous increase in the number of athletes competing at our national level events. A gap between membership growth and national event qualification is the norm, since it generally takes time for new members to achieve the national level. But, we have experienced a rate of growth in athletes qualifying for national events that is almost exactly equal to our overall membership growth. For instance, we had approximately 200 athletes at a 2012 National Championships, but more than 400 athletes at our recent 2014 National Championships.

We have learned through this experience that we are unable to run a national event over a three day period with many more than 200 athletes, on one platform. We can handle roughly twice that many with two platforms, but two platform events preclude our being able to: staff a jury to oversee the performances of our officials, provide all the equipment needed to run the very highest quality event, broadcast our events over the Internet optimally, and assure that coaches can fully attend to their athletes during the competition (e.g., not being torn between the need to serve athletes competing on different platforms at the same time). But most importantly, only a one platform event assures athletes that they can lift without distraction from the events taking place on another platform, and with the full attention of the audience that they so fully deserve. Therefore, we will be establishing qualifying procedures for 2015 that will assure the use of a single platform (which is the international standard) at all of our national events (with the exception of the Youth Nationals, where two platforms have long been a tradition).

Revised Qualifying Procedures for the 2014 American Open (AO) Only

Since the 2014 AO is fast approaching, we will make a relatively modest change to our qualifying procedures for that event - limiting our entries to approximately 400 (the maximum we can reasonably handle in a three day event with two platforms, given our current resources. In order to accomplish this in the fairest way possible, we will take the following steps:

- 1) We will close entries to the AO on or about October 1, 2014,
- 2) We will accept applications from (but not guarantee participation to) all athletes who made the AO qualifying totals published earlier this year,
- 3) We will automatically declare as officially entered the athletes with the top 15 totals in each body weight category (if 15 or more athletes submitting applications make the qualifying total for that body weight category),

- 4) For the remaining spots in this event, up to a total of 365 (including those described in 3 above), athletes will be ranked and declared as entered on the basis of the percentage by which their qualifying totals exceed the already published AO qualifying totals in their respective bodyweight categories (see table below):

Women		Men	
Bodyweight Category	AO Qualifying Total	Bodyweight Category	AO Qualifying Total
48	101	56	153
53	123	62	184
58	135	69	219
63	149	77	250
69	152	85	269
75	158	94	277
75+	166	105	293
		105+	296

For example, if Sally Jones enters the 58 kg body weight category of the American Open with a total of 149 kg., her total is 111.11% of the qualifying total in her category. She would outrank Mary Powers, who has entered the 69 kg category of the total of 167 kg., since her total is 109.87% of the qualifying total in her category.

There will be a total of 365 spots awarded on this basis of criteria 3 and 4 above, 170 for the women and 195 for the men (the men having more slots because they have eight bodily categories versus seven for the women). In addition to the 365, there will be up to 30 slots available for athletes who cannot make the qualifying total for the AO, but who need to try out for an upcoming international event (e.g., athletes age 17 and under who might need to qualify for the Youth World Championship Team). Finally, 10 spots have been allocated for foreign athletes who are not USA Weightlifting members as of today, but who will be members of USA Weightlifting by the day entries close and who have made the CN totals in USA Weightlifting or international competitions during the qualifying period specified on the 2014 AO entry (AO has traditionally been open to USA Weightlifting member athletes who are not citizens and such athletes will continue to be eligible, but the aforementioned 10 spots are reserved for foreign athletes who are not presently USA Weightlifting members.). If either the number of trials athletes, or the foreign athletes who are not members as of the date this document is published, are not filled, those slots will be added to the pool for the athletes who are not ranked in the top 15 (if there are less than 15 entrants in a given bodyweight category, those spots will be added to the pool of available spots for that gender as well).

Athletes whose entries are accepted on the basis of the above procedures will be informed at least 6 weeks prior to the first day of the AO. As an event nears, the USA Weightlifting will regularly post on its website the total of the highest ranking athletes in each category, so that those who plan to apply for the event can get a sense of where they stand at that time.

We deeply regret having to make these changes to our qualifying procedures for the American Open on such short notice, but we simply do not have the resources to handle a three day/two platform event with more than approximately 400 athletes, so we must “cap” our entries (in the absence of these changes, we believe our entries could have reached 500 or more athletes – much more than we have the resources to handle in a three day event).

Controlling the Size of Our National Events Going Forward Into 2015 And Beyond

After receiving feedback from our athletes, coaches and officials regarding the “super-sized” events that emerged in late 2013 and continued through the 2014 Nationals, and after much deliberation, USA Weightlifting has decided to introduce a new qualifying method for all national events, with some special features for the 2015 Youth Nationals and American Open in 2015 (more about these events later).

The Nationals, the Junior Nationals and the University Nationals will all be run using one platform and will be limited to a total of approximately 225 athletes, up to 30 of which may be allocated to athletes who are

participating in special trials sessions for international teams, as needed. That will mean there will be approximately 104 spots for the men and 91 for the women at each of these events (excluding the aforementioned trials slots - if there are no such trials, the number of spots will grow to 120 for the men and 105 for the women).

There will be a minimum qualification standard (total) for each of these events, tied to the USAW Athlete Classification System. The level for the Nationals will be Local Level 2. Both the Junior Nationals and the University Nationals will use the Junior Local Level 2 totals. The totals used for the 2015 Junior Nationals will be the classification totals in place as of July of 2014, but the totals for the 2015 Nationals and University Nationals will be the Classification System totals as revised after the close of the 2014 World Championships (see totals below as of July of 2014):

Women			Men		
Bodyweight Category	Candidate National Total	Local Level 2 Total	Bodyweight Category	Candidate National Total	Local Level 2 Total
48	145	126	56	210	182
53	158	137	62	236	204
58	169	147	69	248	216
63	182	157	77	268	232
69	190	165	85	284	246
75	204	177	94	298	258
75+	219	190	105	305	264
			105+	327	283

Those who make the Level 2 Local totals by the deadlines set for each national event, on their respective entry forms, will be invited to make an entry application, and the applications actually accepted as entries will be determined as follows:

- 1) All athletes whose totals made in USA Weightlifting sanctioned competitions equal or exceed the Candidate National totals within the qualifying period designated for that event will be automatically accepted, with no limit per bodyweight category. We recognize these are challenging totals that only a limited number of athletes can achieve, but we want to assure that our very best athletes are guaranteed entry to our national events. We also want to assure that we have at least a minimum number of athletes in each bodyweight category, therefore,
- 2) The athletes with the seven highest totals in each bodyweight category will also be accepted as entered, regardless of whether or not they achieve that Candidate National total. Once entries from those who have achieved the Candidate National totals and/or are among the top seven highest totals submitted in a particular bodyweight category, in addition,
- 3) We will fill the balance of the available slots with the athletes who have submitted the highest entry totals relative to the Candidate National total, in all of the bodyweight categories for a given gender combined. So, for example, if John Jones totals 231 in the 62 kg. category, he will have achieved 97.88% of the Candidate National total. His entry will be accepted over Bill Strong, whose total of 273 kg. in the 85 kg. category was 96.13% of the Candidate National total in his category. In this way, we will assure that the athletes closest to the Candidate National level will have an opportunity to compete, regardless of their bodyweight categories.

For the Junior Nationals and University Nationals, the same approach that is described above for the Nationals will be used, except that the Junior Candidate National and Junior Local Level 2 totals would be used for the qualifying criteria (these are approximately 10% lower than the senior totals).

The Special Case of The Youth Nationals

We have historically used two platforms for Youth Nationals (YN) events to encourage participation by our youngest athletes, and because there are multiple age groups competing at the same event. For the YN, we will target approximately 400 athletes (there are generally no tryouts associated with these events, but if it were necessary to include such a separate event, we would target 370 Youth age athletes to permit up to 30 trials event athletes to participate).

Since there are three age groups at the YN (16&17, 14&15 and 13 and under) we would target 135 qualifying athletes for each age group. This breaks down to approximately 72 men and 63 women per age group. Totals for the Youth Candidate National and Youth Local Level 2 would be used in a way similar to that of other national events for the athletes in the 16&17 age category (these totals are approximately 20% lower than the totals for the senior athletes). However, because of the smaller number of competitors per age group than for other multiple age group national events; there would be relatively fewer non-Candidate National/top seven slots available. But, the available spots would be filled in the same way as for other national events (percentage Candidate National totals across all bodyweight categories for a specific gender).

For the 14 and 15-year-old and 13 and under groups, we would follow a similar process to what we'll do for the 16-/17 year old athletes, except we'll create proxy Candidate National totals using the results of the 2014 Youth Nationals by age category (no Candidate National totals exist for the younger age groups today). This process would consist of two steps. First, we would calculate the average total for the top five places in all men's categories and (separately) all women's categories for the 16&17 year olds (if some category had less than five totals, we assume a fifth total 1 kg. less than the 4th place total). Then, we would do the same for the 14-15 year old and, separately, for the 13 and under athletes. So if the average total among the 14-15 year olds was 20% lower than those for the 16-17 year olds, the totals for the 14-15 year olds would be 20% lower (in comparable bodyweight categories).

Second, we would extrapolate/interpolate (as appropriate) totals for bodyweight categories that didn't match those of the 16&17 year olds. For instance, for the 44 kg category in the 14-15 year old category (which doesn't exist among the 16-17 year olds), we would take the average total for the top five athletes at the 2014 YN and compare it to the total for the top five in the 48 kg. category for the 14-15 year old women. If the 44kg. category lifters had an average total of 90% of those in the 48kg. category, the proxy Candidate National total would be 90% of the total for the 48kg. category.

Tie Breakers

In any instance in which two or more athletes were tied in their totals to qualify for a spot in their body weight category, or had the same percentage total carried out to a hundredth of a percent (e.g., two athletes had percentages of 99.22%), the tie would be broken first in favor of the athletes who made the total at a national event. If both totals were made at a national event, or both totals were made at a local event, and the totals were made at the same event, the athlete making to total first would be given precedence. If the same totals were made at different days at local or national events, the total made on the earlier day would out rank the total made on a later day. If the totals were made on the same day but at different events (regardless of time of day) the totals would be considered tied and the athletes making those totals would be treated in the same way (e.g., if they were tied for 7th in their bodyweight category, both would be treated as being in the top 7).

2015 American Open

The AO for 2015 would use a similar qualifying procedure to the Nationals, except that after those athletes who made to Candidate National totals and/or ranked in the top seven in a bodyweight category were accepted as entered, the remaining spots would first be filled with the champions of any Regional Championship Event recognized by USA Weightlifting as such (it is expected that as many as five regions could be established by July 1 of 2015). This would comprise a total of as many as 75 additional athletes, but it is believed that the number would be lower because at least some of those who qualified by winning the regional championships would also be among

those who made Candidate National totals and/or ranked in the top seven their bodyweight categories. After the Candidate National, top seven and regional champion spots have been filled, any remaining spots will be filled on percentage rankings relative to the Candidate National totals, regardless of the bodyweight category, within a gender.

Conclusion

We recognize that these qualifying procedures represent a significant change from our past practice of setting fixed totals months in advance of our national events, based on estimates of entry numbers, but as we have learned, our ability to predict entry numbers in advance in an environment of growth is not sustainable. We think the new qualifying approach does an effective job of combining a total (admittedly challenging) that guarantees entry, a guaranteed number of athletes in each category, and the greatest number of our other highest ranked athletes regardless of category. We look forward to trying out this new system in 2015. The chart on the next page summarizes the qualifying approaches that will be used for the 2014 AO and national events held in 2015.

Step 1

Step 2

Step 3

Step 4

Minimum Standards

First Selected Group

Second Selected Group

Reserved Slots

2014 American Open						
Applications accepted from athletes who reach the qualifying total (QT)	→	Top 15 in each bodyweight category from prior step are entered	→	Balance of applications from athletes who exceed the QT for their categories are selected on the basis of highest percentage of the QT, (up to 195 men and 170 women) are entered	→	Up to an additional 10 foreign athletes and 30 trials athletes (any unused spots go pro-rata back to 195 men's, and 170 women's slots from prior step)
2015 Nationals (& JN & UN, age adjusted)						
Applications accepted from athletes who reach the minimum total (Local Level 2)	→	Those who make CN total and/or are in the top 7 in their bodyweight categories are entered	→	Balance of applications from athletes who come closest to the CN totals in their respective categories (up to 104 men & 91 women)	→	Up to an additional 30 trials athletes (any unused spots go pro-rata back to men's and women's slots from prior step)
2015 Youth Nationals						
Applications accepted from athletes who reach the minimum total (Local Level 2, age and unmatched category adjusted)	→	Those who make the age adjusted CN total and/or are in the top 7 in their bodyweight categories are entered	→	Balance of applications from athletes who come closest to the CN totals in their respective categories (up to 72 men & 63 women)	→	Up to an additional 30 trials athletes (any unused spots go pro-rata back to expand the men's and women's slots from prior step)
2015 American Open						
Applications accepted from athletes who reach the minimum total (Local Level 2)	→	Those who make the CN total and/or are in the top 7 in their bodyweight categories and/or win their regional championships (if any) are entered	→	Balance of applications from athletes who come closest to the CN totals in their respective categories (up to 104 men & 91 women)	→	Up to an additional 10 foreign athletes and up to an additional 30 trials athletes (any unused spots go pro-rata back to expand the men's and women's slots from prior step)

Request from Connecticut for organizational consideration

Connecticut LWC Proposal to USA Weightlifting Board of Directors

-----Forwarded Message-----

From: Gary Valentine

Sent: Jun 23, 2014 11:42 AM

To: Arthur Drechsler

Cc: COACH Robinson , dave@northshorecrossfit.com, Gregory Laxer , Denis Reno , Gary Valentine

Subject: CT LWC PROPOSAL TO USAW BOARD

USA Weightlifting Board of Directors,

As current New England President, I am proposing to establish Connecticut as its own Local Weightlifting Committee. All current New England Officers, cc'd here, are in agreement. I would continue as President in CT., and suggest that VP Ellyn Robinson assume NE Presidency.

Traveling 3-6+ hours for Board meetings – more are necessary now – and athletes distances to LWC championships has been less than ideal, to say the least. Within our 6 states, we now have 61 clubs and 752 members. New England membership has nearly doubled in the past 2 years. Connecticut currently has 9 clubs and 178 members – and growing. We had 7 contests last year in CT, and each is set on an annual basis. My goal for NE 2 years ago was to work up to a meet per month, and we've had 18 so far this year! Requests in the current LWC are coming in for meets on the same date.

The CT LWC will keep our governance local, and allow me to attend all meets and actively engage new members on our Board and Committees here in CT. I have selected a Board from the volunteers we've had in CT the last 10 years or more, ready to go. Meets are Open, so there will be no difference to the lifters in the surrounding areas as far as opportunities, only that we will have a State LWC championship, which I'm sure will be a positive.

I am asking for your approval and that we can announce this as soon as possible. We need to announce the LWC Championships for CT and NE held usually in the Fall.

Thank you for your consideration. Being involved in Weightlifting for 35 years now, I am proud to see the growth and popularity of our sport. I'm looking forward to governing and organizing this growth as efficiently as possible.

Sincerely,

Gary Valentine, M.A., USAW National Coach

President, New England Weightlifting

From: Deborah Carroll [mailto:deborah.millet@gmail.com]
Subject: Please forward to the BOD - Thank you from Utah

Mr. Michael Massik and USAW Board of Directors,

Thank you for the opportunity you allowed Utah to be involved in a superb event. Our small community of weightlifters has grown and will continue to grow because of this experience. Recently USAW has required a "legacy plan" with bids for national events. I want to applaud the inclusion of the legacy plan because of the vital role it plays in clearly outlining the intentions of the group requesting the event. Primarily FOR the group requesting the event. Developing Utah's legacy plan was critical in giving our community a short term and long term plan in supporting the sport. Our bid included an agreement (or partnership) with USAW in growing the high school programs in our state. I want to applaud USAW, and particularly Phil Andrews, for not only fulfilling that agreement, but keeping it as a high priority throughout this process. There is much to prepare when planning an event of the scope that Phil Andrews and I envisioned, and I assumed we would address Utah's high school growth after the event was over. However, Phil began addressing the growth of the sport in our community first, almost immediately following our confirmation of the bid. Although I was skeptical USAW's support would continue, without being solicited, Phil would readdress our legacy plan repeatedly and push and encourage us to take the necessary steps to grow the sport in our state.

We have included 8+ high schools in coaching certification courses, developed a strong relationship with the Utah high school football coaches association, and held our first annual Utah high school state championships all BEFORE we hosted the national championships last weekend. Because of how you organized this process, and because of the perseverance and integrity of Phil Andrews, Michael Conroy, and Scott Safe, you have left a "legacy" for the sport in our state. I am no longer skeptical of USAW's gestures of support.

Finally, I not only applaud, but give a standing ovation to you for your foresight in bringing Phil Andrews to USAW. This may be one of the most profitable decisions USAW has made. Phil has been professional, responsive and continually supportive both verbally and physically in every aspect of this event, USAW's membership, and the sport itself. Phil is bright, quick, positive, fair and firm in executing the vision of USAW. He has a better understanding of the sport than many of the old-timers I have met. He is genuine, involved and true to his word. Because of Phil's vision for what this national championship needed to be and because of how he handled this process, today USAW has regained the trust of its members. The 2014 National Championships is a feather in the cap of USAW. You provided an opportunity for your top athletes to enjoy competing. You treated your athletes like the elite athletes they train to be and allowed them to perform for an audience who appreciates what they have accomplished. You set a stage for 8 American records to be set. You gave the entire weightlifting community the respect they have worked for and in return they left motivated to train harder and they trust that USAW will support that training.

Thank you for allowing me the rare opportunity to participate in this amazing event. This is an experience I will always treasure. I thoroughly enjoyed the entire process, but the finest moment was standing near the platform watching our own Olympic athletes walk out into the spotlight in front of a roaring crowd in their own country, and while using the finest equipment in the world, with the support of efficient electronics and AV, as the crowd quieted to the point you could hear a pin drop, reach down to make their best lifts, set new records and wave to an again roaring crowd. That was when I knew USAW, Phil Andrews, a whole ton of volunteers and I had achieved what we set out to achieve. We didn't just reach our goals. We achieved our dreams this time around.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart,

Debbie Carroll

I can do 10 AM your time today. My suggestion on the minutes would be to extract the wording from my memo, unless someone says there is something technically wrong with what's there (Peter has already said it looks good to him). I agree with the WC issue but think you need to hammer home to Janis that the Board is VERY concerned about not having a contract and has been pushing you mercilessly, to the point where there are even radicals discussing withdrawal of support. I've talked to Ursula but it would probably be good if you do too. Glad to hear Cirque went well. If they ever want something done in this area I'd be interested in helping.

Thursday would be best for me so please pick a time. Good news on Cirque. I assume counsel has reviewed the letter on Xtreme?

With respect to your e-mail, I didn't find the Graber or budget attachments. Thanks for sending along the Debbie letter (she had distributed it as an e-mail and I responded – thought you were copied in).

On the minutes, I'm afraid the AO is not correct, at least as far as my memory and notes. We weren't applying the Candidate National approach until 2015. Instead we were using amount by which totals exceeded the qualifying totals already announce (see my memo draft on 2014 AO and 2015 national events). The 405 number included 10 foreigners not currently USAW members and 30 trials spots, so the available number was 365, distributed by gender as 170 for the women and 195 for the men.

I thought we were going to charge less for the Juniors and Youth than the rest of the meets.

The 75% of the third place average is of the "the past five years of World Championships/Olympic Games results" or "Merited International Elite" on our classification system.

Again, I'd look at the document I sent on 2015 events, but ties were first to be broken by giving precedence to national events. Foreign national were only to be permitted at the AO, not other national events (we didn't decide to let non-citizens become the national champions –see point 3 in new business later in your minutes). However, I would be in favor of loosening up there, especially at the YN, but think we should have some requirements – e.g., they are permanent residents for X mos – what started this all was foreign athletes getting off a plane the day before the nationals and beating our athletes for national titles).

On the WC section, I think we authorized you to tell Houston that the Board was very concerned about no contract, and to have you begin to see if some other cities might want the event (that shouldn't necessarily be in the minutes but we need to put some pressure on Houston to not put our deal on the back burner).

Under the coaching rating system, I think you have the intentions right but we should say that the Board authorized the coaching change in concept and authorized the staff and Ursula and I to work on the language outlined in the memo to the Board from Ursula and me.. We need to be careful about saying "automatically" since there were concerns about establishing the provenance of the coach and Ursula raised some questions about the coach having had reasonable experience. It seems to me that anyone who produced the highest level athlete would have demonstrated that, but I want to make sure she is comfortable before we publish anything that sounds conclusive, even in the minutes, or we'll soon hear from coaches asserting their rights