

**Atlantic Zonal meeting
Tuesday, May 21, 2019
Columbus, OH**

Called to order by Steve Bishop, 12:45 PM

Attendance: (RVAA, JA, Guest(s))

FL: Steve Bishop, Mary Andrew
Southern: Steve Kenyon, Keith Weller
IREVA: Hazel Goldstein, Tracy Manning
GEVA: Bob Baker
OVR: Bob Price, Bill Zehler
OD: Bob Kyle, Tammy Elliott
CH: Lisa DiGiacinto, Dado Singer
NERVA: Dave Peixotto, Roxann Link
WEVA: John Hughes, Cindy D'errico
Palmetto: Jimmy Peden
Carolina: Kevin Wendelboe, Fred Wendelboe
Keystone: Michele Carlton, Debbie Fajerski

Guests: George Mulry, AJ Joseph, Team Travel Source (Ainsley Harris, Beth Maltran, Erin Hobson), Chynna Tavares, Mike McNeil, Brenda McIntosh, Scott Cioffari, Stacie Kearns, Al Herbert, Stephen Boyle, Jasmine Sapp

Team Travel Source discussion

Housing general information – Adults (Columbus), Girls (Indianapolis), Boys (Dallas)

Steve: What are the sticking points / hot buttons?

1. Lack of hotels close to the Convention Center venues
2. 55,000 room nights for Girls; exceeded last year's attendance significantly
3. Lottery – some regions participate and others don't. There is no cost to participate in the lottery.
 - a. Lisa: What is the basis/formula for how many rooms are blocked? Last year's # (total picked up last year) plus 10%
4. Hard for teams that qualify late to find rooms nearby
5. Next year: Region qualifiers are at different times, so TTS is accommodating region-specific qualifiers and who the bid teams are. Two weeks to book rooms after region qualifiers are identified.
 - a. TTS desires a single rooming POC for each region
 - b. Also getting information on qualifying teams from USAV
6. Also working for some Qualifiers

RVVA Committee Motions to Zonal Representatives

Motion from Structure and Function

1. Motion: to add to Article III :7; c

- i. The RVA Administrative Council shall review agenda items.
- ii. The RVA Administrative Council shall review the budget.
- iii. The RVA Administrative Council shall determine the final course of action against alleged non-compliance by a region. [Article IV:5; d]

Rationale – In September 2018 Structure and Function was asked to define the role of the RVA Admin Council – This motion clarifies the responsibilities of the RVA Admin Council

Discussion: Straightforward detail.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from Structure and Function

2. Motion; to add to Article III; 7; b

The RVA Assembly shall have final authority by majority vote over matters that come before the Assembly.

Rationale – In September 2018 Structure and Function was asked to define the role of the RVA Admin Council – This motion clarifies who has the responsibilities for the actions of the RVA

Discussion: Is there a definition of “majority”? This is a simple majority of RVAA (21 of 40 regions)

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from the Insurance Committee

3. Put a small workgroup together to draft a joint position with USA Volleyball in regards to the potential background screen plan being presented by the USOC (Motion: Dave Peixoto, 2nd Michelle Carlton)

Discussion: Dave Peixotto briefly explained the motion. Bob Price: BG screens every year, but alternate year BG check is supplemental/not as stringent. Exact details are not known yet. Pricing (suggested) is \$30 per 2 year, although we have suggested \$15 / year. USOC is trying to standardize BG screening across all NGBs. Also adding Federal screen. Potential effectivity date

of 9/23, which is after our 9/1 start date.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from the Insurance Committee

4. Do not raise the member insurance costs for the 2019/2020 season and use the regional insurance fund to cover excess insurance costs above the current member assessment level of \$4.00 (Motion: Steve Bishop, 2nd Michelle Carlton)

Discussion: Expected 2019-2020 expected rate is \$4.92. 10-year loss history for USAV is 117% for Liability. \$1.1M is in our Regional Insurance Fund. With changes in MMS (Sports Engine replacing WebPoint) and changes in BG fees, this motion was intended to insulate regions from further short-term financial impact. Noted that continued membership growth will mitigate total cost impact.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from the Insurance Committee

5. The Insurance Committee recommends the multi-media cyber insurance proposal be submitted by Integro for all Regions (Motion: Nancy Funk, 2nd, Dave Peixoto)

Discussion: Steve Kenyon noted that the Southern region currently has Cyber insurance, and we could use his coverage and limits for comparison with Integro proposal. If all 40 regions obtain a single coverage, we might get a better rate, but impacts to specific regions would affect everyone.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from the Insurance Committee

6. The Insurance Committee recommends that we extend our current agreement with Integro one year to cover the 2019-2020 season (Motion: Steve Bishop, 2nd Glenn Sapp)

Discussion: Current coverage expires Sept 2019. Recommendation gives us more time to evaluate and get options. Stacey mentioned that the price will increase 1.5%.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from SafeSport Committee

7) A motion to add examples of misconduct, bullying and harassment. Glenn Sapp motions to amend to put a FAQ on their website that will define most parameters not accepted by the Center. (Michelle Carlton motioned, Angie Andrade-Morioka seconded)

Discussion: Michelle explained the motion and rationale. Bernie and Robin would work with the

Safesport committee to create this FAQ. A workgroup of 5 members was created to work on this FAQ.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Motion from SafeSport Committee

8) A Motion to ask USA Volleyball to develop an on-demand Safesport Webinar training that can be used by the regions, tailored to club directors, to address handling complaints and mandatory reporting requirements. (Motioned by Bob Baker, seconded by Glenn Sapp).

Discussion: Bob explained the motion and rationale. This would be a resource that could be used (or not) by regions and clubs, but not necessarily required. Discussion that some claims are being returned to the regions quickly by the Safesport Center for matters not rising to the level of seriousness handled by the Center, which makes having resources for handling issues at the region and club level more important. This is intended to be a resource that would be hosted by each region and/or Safesport/VRT, as desired, rather than on the Safesport website.

Atlantic Zone unanimously supports this motion.

Discussion Items

Competition Committee #1 - Limit number of teams allowed in a division at Qualifiers

1. Limit number of teams allowed in a division at Qualifiers – Mary Andrew (sending to ZONAL for further discussion)

The committee recommends a limit of 128 teams which would create playing days of – 3/4/4. With the new structure coming could solve itself. A recommendation should not move forward without QD input.

Is this an occasional complaint or is this a normal situation? The drawback is that a Q might turn teams away. The new growth proposal could solve some of that. New structure would add a 4th bid. Q directors like the new addition. They would like to limit divisions to less numbers (96 or less).

Problem is mostly in 14's/15's/16's American. Do you want teams to have the opportunity to play for a bid or do you want more teams involved?

There is currently a USAV limit in place. A Q that goes over the limit can apply for a waiver.

Discussion: Mary described the motion. The motivation is that some teams are playing potentially too many matches in one day with pool play plus challenge matches plus potential tie-breakers, and then playing again the next day at 8:00 AM. Is there a physical abuse concern? Bob Price expressed concern that we have a role in managing athlete's welfare. AJ mentioned scheduling options for the number of total teams versus # of matches per day. Lisa mentioned that perhaps the concern should be limiting the number of matches/playing time per day per team versus limiting the total number of entrants per division.

Competition Committee #2 - Division priority – USA vs National

2. Division priority – USA vs National (sending to ZONAL for further discussion)

There is a problem now that teams do not know how the priority works. Have an at-large process for USA or if a team has a USA bid do not allow them to now take a region national bid.

- a. It should be decided if a USA bid is higher than a national bid (ie, a qualifier bid is a 'better' bid than a region bid)
- b. If you have a USA bid, you are not allow to take a region bid
- c. Could offer USA at-large bids

Discussion: Steve discussed what is happening in Florida WRT bids and trickle-down. Lisa said that she has her qualifiers earlier, which causes a different set of issues. Al Herbert said that in OVR, many Open teams that don't get an Open bid move down.

Straw vote in favor of moving USA above National; 13 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention.

Strategic Planning Committee - Discussion Items 3-16

Discussion: Steve Kenyon said that there was a lot of brainstorming at yesterday's committee meeting, and this and other discussion topics came out.

3. Do we need RVA Mission statement?

Hazel said that we already have an RVA Mission statement.

4. How can we help our clubs and regions compete with JVA? (Marketing help from USAV why we are the best option).

Discussion: Multiple discussion points from AJ, Dave, Michele, Steve, Jimmy. Continue to need marketing support from USAV. Inter-region communication is still lacking. How effectively are we using Slack – not very much. There is overwhelming interest in region collaboration, but little adoption so far.

5. The MMS saves clubs money that is a member benefit that does not get promoted enough.
6. Gym development (construction/acquisition) and Coach training/recruitment how can we help.
7. Who is our customer? Clubs (What about a Club director mentoring program? To help provide more opportunities for kids to play,)

8. How do you get into local HS to use facilities? Hosting events as fundraisers for the school, (school rep must be USAV member). How to leverage the relationships that you develop with members of your community.

9. Multiple sites for Girls JN? Is event staff truly a constraint? How would multiple sites be an advantage?

Discussion: Steve noted that most regions have the skills to run large multi-court tournaments so that the USAV staff does not necessarily need to be enhanced.

10. What do you think about a rotation of playing sites (4 cities for one age bracket (12 – 14) another 4 cities for (15-17)) share the wealth help with cost as you can go to lower tier cities with great facilities that can't host the full JNQ.

11. Stay to play is still a challenge and has an image issue.

12. Have JVA/AAU affected regions been encouraged to network and share best practices to fend off competition?

13. Put regions together in groups separated by (those that run the majority of their events/ host some and sanction some / host regionals and sanction everything else.)

Discussion: In addition to geographic similarity on the Zones, should we have discussion groups based on other similarities (region size (Small, Medium, Large), JVA or AAU competition, etc.

14. Branding at every sanctioned event as part of the sanction requirements? Help with recognition.

15. Where are growth potentials? (Power league - like talent vs like talent). Small developmental leagues (single day competition 8-2 and 2-8) promotes grassroots and small clubs.

16. Would splitting up larger regions be good for volleyball? How would you facilitate this?

xx. Potential RVAA forum beyond our existing May and Oct meetings.

Discussion: Possibly related to Zonal trips by Jamie Davis. Need for additional networking opportunities. Financial and time commitment impact for regions. Formal versus informal meetings. Steve's previous proposal for an RVAA position in addition to RVAA Chair to advocate for region's interests. Steve mentioned potentially augmenting the current RVAA Chair position with part-time support, eventually leading to a more robust role. Need for an agenda and appropriate follow-up actions. John feels that this role needs to be separate from the RVAA Chair position.

17. General Assembly – Questions on CAP and BCAP business model

Discussion: Will this be more of the same or a new model? This is a work-in-progress, but we have no timeframe nor details to discuss yet.

xx2: Do we need a new developmental membership added? Current issue is upgradability. Perhaps the new SportsEngine MMS could solve this, but the membership categories must be ratified by the BoD. Discussion about whether regions have the flexibility to add this membership to rosters

Steve Bishop mentioned the option to help develop boys or beach programming at high schools.

Tryout membership: Proposed junior membership upgradable to full membership. Is it 5 consecutive days or 5 days spread across multiple timeframes.

Meeting adjourned 2:23 PM.