



USAWE Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: March 15, 2021

Meeting Time: 5:00 p.m. Pacific, 6:00 p.m. Mountain, 7:00 p.m. Central, 8:00 p.m. Eastern

Meeting Modality: Zoom

Board Members Present		Board Members Absent at Roll Call	
President	Leslie Martien	Treasurer	Erin O'Shaughnessy
President Elect	Barbara Price	R2 Director	Robin Bond
Secretary	Julie Alonzo	R3 Director	Cindy Branham
At Large Director 1	Trisha Kiefer-Reed	R7 Director	Rebecca Algar
At Large Director 2	Doreen Atkinson		
R1 Director	Kristine Strasburger		
R4 Director	Kiki Pantaze		
R5 Director	Alex Tyson		
R6 Director	Kimberley Hillyer		

Current # of Board members = 13. BOD members required for Quorum = 7. # of BOD members in attendance = 9. Quorum was established.

Board Members in Attendance After Roll Call

Robin Bond, R2 Director

Cindy Branham, R3 Director

USAWE Adult Members in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Erin Long, Chair Awards Committee

Christy Reich, LOC Co-Chair

Jeanne Bond, Chair, Competitions & Rules Committees

Mindy Finelli, Chair Membership Committee

Kat Waters, R6 Member

Stephanie Hayes, R6 Member

Susan Watkins, R2 Member

President Martien called the meeting to order at 6:00, Mountain time.

PROPOSAL FROM THE AWARDS COMMITTEE

Awards Committee Chair Erin Long had brought a proposal related to the Lifetime Medal Program to the Board for discussion at the February 22 Board meeting. She has since provided additional information (pasted below) and is bringing the proposal before the Board tonight for vote.



Medal Program Proposal

Awards Committee | Updated 3/9/2021

The Awards Committee has performed an extensive review of the previous medal programs, our current one, and the riders who would qualify under each, in order to make recommendations regarding the grandfathering of medals into the USAWE program. At this time, our recommendation remains that USAWE grandfather in medals previously earned under WEU and CWE. Below we have laid out the reasons for this recommendation, as well as potential impacts of the board's decisions in either direction, and pricing of medal program options. We recognize this is potentially more information than is necessary to make the decision, but we have tried to cover all of the questions that came up at the last meeting, as well as some that came up in our own discussions. Please note that all data included here is through the end of the 2020 season, to avoid this document constantly shifting as new shows send in results.

Section 1: Grandfathering Medals

Previous Medal Programs vs. USAWE's Medal Program

WE United

WE United did not have a Pewter Medal Program

For Bronze and Silver:

- To earn a Bronze/Silver medal, a rider must accumulate a minimum of eight (8) total qualifying scores.
- Three (3) Dressage scores at the Novice/Intermediate level of 62% or higher from at least two (2) different WE United "r," "R," or "S" judges.
- Three (3) Ease of Handling scores at the Novice/Intermediate level of 62% or higher from at least two (2) different WE United "r," "R," or "S" judges.
- In addition to the above six scores, one (1) Dressage score and one (1) EOH score at the Novice/Intermediate level of 65% or higher.
- Beginning in the 2018 Competition Year, a minimum of 2 Dressage and 2 Ease of Handling Scores of 62% or higher must be earned while competing in Novice/Intermediate B. The remaining scores needed may be earned in either Novice/Intermediate A or Novice/Intermediate B.
- Scores for all of the above are only eligible if the rider successfully completed all trials in the competition in which the score was earned.

For Gold and Platinum:

- To earn a Gold/Platinum medal, a rider must accumulate a minimum of six (6) total qualifying scores.
- Two (2) Dressage scores at the Advanced/Master's level of 62% or higher from two (2) different WE United "R" or "S" judges or WAVE judges.
- Two (2) Ease of Handling scores at the Advanced/Master's level of 62% or higher from two (2) different WE United "R" or "S" judges or WAVE judges.
- In addition to the above four (4) scores, one (1) Dressage score and one (1) Ease of Handling score at the Advanced/Master's level of 65% or higher for a total of six (6) eligible scores.
- Scores for all of the above are only eligible if the rider successfully completed all trials in the competition in which the score was earned.

Confederation for WE

For All Levels:



- 3 Scores with an EOH/Dressage average of greater than or equal to 60%
- 3 Scores with an EOH/Dressage average of greater than or equal to 64%
- At least one score earned under an R or S judge
- If a split-level medal (Bronze and Silver), at least 3 scores must be obtained at the B level greater than or equal to 60%

USAWE

For All Levels:

- 4 scores 60% or higher (Dressage/EOH % averaged)
- 4 scores 65% or higher (Dressage/EOH % averaged)
- If a split-level medal (Bronze and Silver), at least 4 scores (minimum) must be earned in the B level
- Of the qualifying scores, at least four (4) must be earned when competing under an “R”, “S”, or WAVE judge

USAWE’s program is slightly more difficult than CWE’s program, with two more scores required, and a slightly higher score requirement. It is difficult to compare USAWE’s and WEU’s medal programs, as WEU did not operate on averages. However, from speaking with riders (and based on the data presented below), it seems that WEU’s was slightly more difficult, as it does not allow riders who are good at either Dressage or EOH to use that score to make up for a struggling score in the opposite phase.

Merger and Merger Board Considerations

To its membership, USAWE is a merged entity, not an entirely new organization. As a result, in many ways we are simply “continuing” what the merging organizations have already done, rather than starting from scratch. The Merger Board in its Awards Documentation, located [here](#), justifies the grandfathering of medals and their scores into the USAWE system.

Potential Impacts of Grandfathering Medals

Please note these numbers are rough, in an effort to get you data sooner rather than later for discussion purposes. We will also note a few issues regarding the data: if a score was earned at a show where levels were not split (largely in 2016/17), it is assumed to be at the A level; and, if it is unclear whether a show is a duplicate (common in 2016/17 due to vague dates and differences between the two organizations in record keeping), benefit is given to the rider and it is assumed to be two different shows/scores. If any major changes to this data occur, we will update you immediately.

Data on Medal Counts

If we were to include all previously earned medals into the USAWE Medal System, the numbers would be as follows:

- 78 Total Medals Awarded
 - 2 Platinum
 - 2 Gold
 - 13 Silver
 - 35 Bronze
 - 26 Pewter
- 29 from WEU
- 38 from CWE
- 11 new Medals (9 Pewter, 2 Bronze)



These medals were earned amongst 67 individuals. These numbers assume for discussion purposes that all previous medal earners are or will be members of USAWE. If we exclude the people who are not currently members, the numbers would be as follows:

- 53 Total Medals Awarded
 - 1 Platinum
 - 2 Gold
 - 8 Silver
 - 25 Bronze
 - 17 Pewter
- 22 from WEU
- 21 from CWE
- 9 new Medals (8 Pewter, 1 Bronze)

These medals were earned amongst 46 individuals.

Potential Impacts of Not Grandfathering Medals

Please note these numbers are rough, in an effort to get you data sooner rather than later for discussion purposes. We will also note a few issues regarding the data. Notably: if a score was earned at a show where levels were not split (largely in 2016/17), it is assumed to be at the A level. If it is unclear whether a show is a duplicate (common in 2016/17 due to vague dates and differences between the two organizations in record keeping), benefit is given to the rider and it is assumed to be two different shows/scores. If any major changes to this data occur, we will update you immediately.

Data on Medal Counts

If we were to include only those riders qualifying under the USAWE Medal System, the numbers would be as follows:

- 31 Total Medals Awarded (compared to 78 awarded if grandfathered)
 - 2 Platinum
 - 1 Gold
 - 5 Silver
 - 10 Bronze
 - 13 Pewter
- 9 from WEU
- 11 from CWE
- 11 new Medals (9 Pewter, 2 Bronze)

These medals were earned amongst 21 individuals. This means that 47 medals would not be awarded that had been previously, impacting 46 people. These numbers assume for discussion purposes that all previous medal earners are or will be members of USAWE.

If we exclude the people who are not currently members, the numbers would be as follows:

- 23 Total Medals Awarded (compared to 53 awarded if grandfathered)
 - 1 Platinum
 - 1 Gold
 - 4 Silver
 - 6 Bronze
 - 11 Pewter
- 8 from WEU
- 6 from CWE
- 9 new Medals (8 Pewter, 1 Bronze)



These medals were earned amongst 16 individuals. This means that 30 medals would not be awarded that had been previously, impacting 30 people.

Advancement Considerations

A further consideration to not grandfathering medals is the issue of voluntary and involuntary advancement. Of those medals that will not be awarded but were previously, the numbers of riders who would not be able to re-earn those medals without access to a second horse are as follows:

- Pewter: 6 Riders (3 currently members)
- Bronze: 10 Riders (8 currently members)

This means we have the possibility of excluding riders from this program based on actions they took believing they had already earned a medal. We believe it is not equitable to disqualify riders based on actions under a previous program, and not take those actions as qualification as well. A reminder that these scores ONLY include through the 2020 season, and so do not take into account any further earnings or disqualifications that may have taken place during this season.

Section 2: Pricing of Medal Programs

Option A: Including Medal Names on Medals

This option is what the Awards Committee recommends.

Medals:

This includes a medal very similar to what WEU did for its medals, with a 2.75” “challenge coin” that states “Lifetime Rider Medal” across the top, and the medal’s level (Pewter, Bronze, etc.) across the bottom, with our logo in the center (image to follow once ready). The following would be the metals and quantities we recommend for this program:

- Platinum: Matte Silver, 5
- Gold: Gold, 30
- Silver: Shiny Silver, 50
- Bronze: Copper, 60
- Pewter: Black Nickel, 55
- TOTAL: 200 medals

You can view examples of all of these types, aside from Matte Silver, in the gallery located [here](#). The Matte Silver is simply the shiny silver with a coating that makes it less reflective, but is not antiquing that darkens the grooves of the metal.

These quantities were selected based in part on what WEU elected to do, and also the number of medals presently earned. Medals can always be purchased in the future in batches as needed. If we choose not to grandfather we can lower these counts, however, we recommend ordering more rather than less, as it will save costs on shipping and save time in the future as these medals do not expire.

The medals themselves are \$5.68 each, and include a clear plastic envelope. Each type of medal has a one-time mold fee of \$112.50. *At these quantities, our total comes out to approximately \$1835 before tax/shipping.*

Pins:

Pins are considerably more affordable, at approximately \$2.10 each before tax and shipping. These would simply be our logo in color on a corresponding metal background (see image). We recommend ordering the following quantities:

- Platinum: 15
- Gold: 40
- Silver: 60
- Bronze: 70



- Pewter: 65
- TOTAL: 250 pins

This is slightly more pins than medals, however, there is a cost break at 250 that makes this jump worth it (\$510 for 200 pins vs. \$525 for 250 pins). It would also not hurt to have a few spare on hand in case riders lose theirs and wish to replace them. *At these quantities, our total comes out to approximately \$525 before tax/shipping.*



Example Pin

Total Cost:

With shipping to each rider, this brings the cost of each medal with pin in the first batch to approximately \$18.60, assuming a maximum cost of shipping of \$7.40 in a flat rate envelope (can likely obtain cheaper shipping ourselves, but this is a worst case scenario). After the first batch when mold fees fall off, the cost of each medal with pin would be approximately \$15.10 assuming no changes in shipping or medal costs.

Option B: Not Including Medal Names

Medals:

This option is the same as Option A, it just does not include the medal's level (Pewter, Bronze, etc.) across the bottom. This would save us considerably on mold costs, as the medals would then only require one mold. *At the same quantities, our total comes out to approximately \$1,385 before tax/shipping.*

Pins:

Pins are considerably more affordable, at approximately \$2.10 each before tax and shipping. These would simply be our logo on a corresponding metal background (see image). We recommend ordering the following quantities:

- Platinum: 15
- Gold: 40
- Silver: 60
- Bronze: 70
- Pewter: 65
- TOTAL: 250

This is slightly more pins than medals, however, there is a cost break at 250 that makes this jump worth it (\$510 for 200 pins vs \$525 for 250 pins). It would also not hurt to have a few spare on hand in case riders lose theirs and wish to replace them. *At these quantities, our total comes out to approximately \$525 before tax/shipping.*



Example Pin

Total Cost:

With shipping to each rider, this brings the cost of each medal with pin in the first batch to approximately \$16.60, assuming a maximum cost of shipping of \$7.40 in a flat rate envelope (can likely obtain cheaper shipping ourselves, but this is a worst case scenario). After the first batch when mold fees fall off, the cost of each medal with pin would be approximately \$15.10 assuming no changes in shipping or medal costs.

Medal Update Program

Allowing a medal update program has the benefit of helping to fund our medal program. Here is a number breakdown if USAWE charges \$20/medal to allow riders to have an updated medal. We are assuming entire batches here, but you are welcome to draw your own conclusions on numbers of riders you think will update their medals.

If all medals are grandfathered, and all current-member-earners want to update their medals:

- \$20 x 53 medals awarded = \$1060

If no medals are grandfathered, and all current-member-earners want to update their medals:

- \$20 x 23 medals awarded = \$460

No matter what the board decides regarding grandfathering medals, we do think a medal update program is an excellent way to help offset initial costs of the medal program, while allowing riders to have a complete set of medals.

Section 3: Recommendations & Conclusion

In conclusion, the Awards Committee recommends the following:

- The Board grandfather previously earned medals.
 - Given the potential impact on riders who would not only no longer have a medal, but also would not be able to re-earn that medal without access to a second horse, we believe it best reflects the spirit of the merger and the interest in celebrating our members to honor those medals previously earned under the merging organizations.
- The Board select Option A for medal design.
 - This provides greater clarity on which medal is of which rank, and gives greater significance to those higher level medals. While the up-front cost is high, its one time fees fall off after this first batch, and will allow us to order future batches at the same cost as those without the name.
- The Board allow a Medal Update Program
 - Whether medals are grandfathered or not, allowing medals to be updated for those that have earned them is a good way to not only help fund the medal program, but also to allow riders to have a complete set of medals for sentimental purposes.

Julie Alonzo, Secretary, made a motion to:



Motion: Approve the three recommendations made by the Awards Committee. Namely, that previously-earned medals be grandfathered into the USAWE Medal Program, that the Board authorize the inclusion of medal names on the medals, and that the Board allow a “Medal Update Program”.

Motion was seconded by Kiki Pantaze, R4 Director.

- **The motion passed unanimously by voice vote with no “nays” heard.**

APPROVAL FOR LOGO GUIDELINES

President Elect Barbara Price had shared the logo use guidelines with the Board in advance of the meeting. She asked the Board to adopt these guidelines as a starting point, with the understanding that modifications will likely need to be made in the future.

Those guidelines are as follows:

USA WORKING EQUITATION LOGO AND BRAND GUIDELINES

Creating and adhering to guidelines for USA Working Equitation’s (USAWE) logo usage and brand management is an important aspect of establishing how the organization will be represented. The benefit of a robust brand management strategy reaches far beyond simple logo usage, and will support clearer, stronger, and more effective external communications for the organization.

These guidelines are informational in nature and cannot cover all situations or circumstances. If there is any uncertainty regarding your intended usage, please contact USAWE for additional information and assistance.

USA Working Equitation Name:

The organization’s full name (USA Working Equitation) should be used in most written instances. The full name should appear in an initial reference in text documents or longer copy. If there are subsequent name references, USAWE may be used provided it was defined in parenthesis following the initial full name. Example: USA Working Equitation (USAWE). For print and graphic purposes (flyers, brochures, websites, etc.), the full name should appear at least once. In most cases, the logo also should be used. In some instances, such as smaller promotional items, it may not be feasible to display both the full name and logo. Consult with USAWE before ordering such items.

Official Logo Usage:

The official USAWE logo consists of the three-horse graphic, USAWE enclosed with stars, and the name USA Working Equitation. Sample below.





The logo always must be used in its entirety. Using pieces of the logo independently is not allowed. High resolution and quality imagery, as well as the proper proportions, are important and must be adhered to. To preserve the true logo colors and proportions, use an official image file whenever possible. This can be obtained from the USAWE Marketing Committee or Board of Director members. When recreating the logo for printing or other purposes, the specified color values are below and must be used. If there's an instance where these exact colors are not available, contact USAWE for alternate information before proceeding. The logo may be used in black and white form, with all elements of the logo in 100% black, or reversed with white on black. Grayscale treatment of the logo is discouraged, but may be used in some situations.

BLUE

Pantone: 2119C
RGB: 44 46 101
HEX/HTML: 2c2e65
CMYK: 100 96 0 32

RED

Pantone: 186C
RGB: 200 16 46
HEX/HTML: c8102e
CMYK: 0 92 77 22

[RGB & Hex/HTML values will differ between the PANTONE Color Finder and the PANTONE Color Bridge Guides due to different standards for print and digital use.]

Authorized Logo Users:

The following individuals and groups are authorized to use the USAWE logo within the parameters of these guidelines for official organization business, promotions and communications. All other uses (e.g. for personal promotion) and other individuals/entities need USAWE approval.

USAWE Executive Committee Members
USAWE Regional Directors
USAWE Committee Chairs
USAWE Licensed Shows and Sanctioned Events

USAWE Coaches Network: Instructors currently recognized by the Coaches Network may display the USAWE logo for training or promotion efforts, provided it is clearly specified they are a recognized network coach.

Affiliate Organizations: USAWE Affiliate Organizations with current status may use the USAWE logo to promote events and activities, provided it is clearly specified they are a USAWE Affiliate



Organization.

With prior approval, the USAWE name and logo may be used to help promote the sport of working equitation at trade shows, non-USAWE horse shows, and other such events.

When the use of the USAWE logo is not permitted:

The USAWE logo may not be used for promoting non-USAWE sanctioned events, including schooling shows, clinics, and personal web pages/materials regardless of membership in the organization. Doing so implies USAWE approves your event or activity and assumes liability.

Questions regarding usage of the USAWE official logo can be directed to: info@usawe.org

Barbara Price, President-Elect, made a motion to:

Motion: Approve the USA Working Equitation Logo and Brand Guidelines dated March of 2021.

Motion was seconded by Leslie Martien, President.

➤ **The motion passed unanimously by voice vote with no “nays” heard.**

BANNERS AND BROCHURES

Barbara Price had previously shared information about designing and printing a brochure for USAWE as well as creating banners for use at events in each region. That information is pasted below:

Kiki Pantaze and Barbara Price have been working on ideas for a USAWE brochure and banners (which will meet the specs below). The banners are a rougher estimate, as there is no design yet. This information is for pricing only. Brochure and banner mock-ups will need board review.

Brand Brochure

Vendor: VistaPrint (online)
8.5” x 11” / tri-fold / 4-color / premium gloss stock

1,000 quantity: \$345
1,500 quantity: \$405
Plus shipping & tax, will vary by order

Custom Banner

Vendor: Staples Office Supply
3’ x 6’ / Gloss vinyl / grommets

15-20 quantity: \$ 80-\$100 each, depending on design specs
Plus shipping & tax, will vary by order



Two possible scenarios:

- 1) Central order all at one location and drop ship 2 banners to each Region Director.
- 2) Have design available for Region Directors to order locally (USAWE to reimburse for up to 2 banners, additional banners can be ordered but not reimbursed.)

Additional input for possible vendors for banners include Vistaprint and Banner Buzz.

<https://www.bannerbuzz.com>

R1 Director Kristine Strasburger suggested having a file with a vendor that would enable people who want to order one the ability to order direct from the vendor. People could order at will.

Kiki Pantaze, R4 Director, shared that some show organizers might be willing to purchase a banner but that others (for smaller shows, etc.) might not be able to do this. She liked the idea of having two per region (which the Regional Director can keep track of).

There were questions about whether Affiliate Organizations might receive a banner as one of their member perks – Julie Alonzo, Secretary, cautioned that the cost of being an AO is about half the estimated cost of the banner.

Kim Hillyer, R6 Director, likes the idea of providing the file at a central vendor, 2 banners per region, and allow show organizers / AOs to have their own banners done.

Kristine Strasburger, R1 Director, said that as long as we have the right kind of files that can be printed, she thought it would be a good idea to allow show organizers, etc. to print more brochures and/or banners locally.

Barbara Price, President Elect, cautioned against having brochures printed locally because of the poor quality that sometimes happens. Barbara and Kiki will continue to work on this idea and will bring it back to the Board at a later date.

REGIONAL SHOWS AND POINTS EARNED

Kat Waters, R6 member, had previously shared a proposal that Regional Championships earn double points for year-end awards. That information is pasted here:

To the Board of USA Working Equitation:

New England Working Equitation, Inc, a non-profit Affiliate Organization of USAWE, is hosting the first Region 6 Championship Show in September. We are doing so to encourage B-Rated show attendance in our region and to attract upper-level riders by signaling the seriousness and professional-level viability of this sport in our region. Regional Championships should be premier events. As a result, they cost competitors and show management significantly more to attend and host than B-Rated shows.

As an organizer of a regional championship show, I ask that the USAWE Board consider the following proposal.



Proposal:

Award double points to competitors at regional championship shows as an incentive for increased participation at this level. The points awarded to each competitor would be twice the averaged score point value, regardless of how many judges are on a panel.

Rationale:

Regional championships bring an elevated awareness and validity to the sport of working equitation for competitors as well as the greater equestrian community. Regional championships motivate competitors to attend B-rated shows in order to qualify, which further encourages the growth of the sport.

There is considerable financial risk for show organizers to hold regional championship shows. These upper-level shows require a minimum of 2 judges, a licensed TD, a veterinarian and a farrier on site. Ideally, regional championships will also host the cattle trial which is an additional expense. In addition, shows at this level require a facility with overnight stabling, and ideally in many regions, a covered or indoor arena and warm-up areas. This translates to significant additional cost to host the show. Additional revenue must be obtained to offset these costs, some of which must be borne by competitors through increased show fees.

The prestige of competing at a championship show is a definite draw, but may not be sufficient to offset the significant increase in cost for the competitor (higher entry and stabling fees, additional days for hotel accommodations, longer distance travel, etc.) The opportunity to garner double points would provide an additional incentive for riders to compete in a regional championship.

Since there is only one regional championship show allowed per region per year, the advantage of additional points being available to this relatively small set of competitors is strictly limited.

Many national equestrian organizations use regional championships as qualifiers for their national show. This is a significant incentive for regional championship participation. Though USAWE may intend for regional championship shows to be qualifiers for their national show in the future, until each region has an established championship, this incentive is not available. Double points are a cost-effective competitor incentive USAWE can offer that, in addition, will support potential regional championship show management in taking on a championship's additional challenges and costs until regional championships are qualifiers for our national championships.

Respectfully and with gratitude for your consideration,
Kat Waters

USAWWE Member
Board Member of New England Working Equitation, Inc.
Region 6 Championship Show Co-Chair

Kiki Pantaze, R4 Director, suggested putting the discussion off for another week.

Doreen Atkinson, At-Large Director, asked where points were addressed in the rule book and indicated that she thought it could just be changed.



Julie Alonzo, Secretary, verbally summarized the idea that she had shared with the Board by email just prior to the meeting. The text of her email is pasted below:

When making decisions about programs, I like to keep in mind advice from non-profit gurus, who emphasize the importance of making all decisions with a clear focus on the organization's values/ mission. During the merger, the combined boards came up with the following statement to help guide our work (which is why it is listed on our website's homepage):

Fostering a Supportive Community of Riders and Building a Strong Future for the Sport

When I think about what is "right and good" about Working Equitation, and what has helped to set our sport apart from some of the other equine sports out there, one of the key features is how accessible / welcoming we have tried to make working equitation. People from all backgrounds, riding horses of all breeds, can compete on an even playing field. I love how inclusive our sport is, and how a person who doesn't have the money to work with a trainer but is determined to do their best and work hard at improving can see their hard work rewarded with regional and national recognition.

I think that Sue Watkins has made some good suggestions and would like to follow up on them.

I personally would rather see us remove the "A-Rated" option entirely. The only difference between B-Rated and A-Rated shows, really, is the number of staff required, which means that under the current rules, "A-Rated" competitions are always going to be significantly more expensive to run -- which means they will be more accessible to our members from higher income brackets, and less accessible to our members who might not have as much income. I would not support allocating more points for A-Rated shows because I think we would be promoting a system where members with more disposable income would be better able to afford their points. Although I, personally, am in an income bracket that means I didn't get any stimulus checks, I am always one to advocate for those on tighter incomes. In fact, I think it's essential that we, as a Board, keep the need to build a really strong and "broad" base of members in mind.

With this approach, Licensed Competitions would follow the regulations outlined currently for B-Rated shows. Both Regional and National Championships would be considered "A-Rated".

I like the idea of awarding double points for Regional Championships PROVIDED they are offered / accessible in each region. I think it would be supportive of our members as well as better support a strong future for the sport if members were able to compete in one Regional Championship each year, and if we were able to offer, say, three Regional Championships (one in the east, one in the center, and one in the west) each year, open to all members who earn qualifying scores at a USAWE licensed competition ANYWHERE (so that a member could qualify, say, in Florida, and compete in the Regional Championship being held in Virginia, or a member could qualify in Texas and compete in a Regional Championship being held in Michigan, or a member could qualify in Montana and compete in a Regional Championship being held in California or Michigan... you get the idea). Members with qualifying scores would select the Regional Championship they want to enter (their selection might vary from year to year based on a variety of factors... a desire to see a different part of the country, accessibility, wanting to "get together" with friends who live in other areas, etc.).



The way the rules currently read, a person must qualify for a Regional Championship by earning qualifying scores at a licensed competition held in their region (So a Texan - R4, could not compete in a Regional Championship being held in Michigan (R5), California (R2), or Virginia (R6). Given the low membership numbers (and hence, fewer opportunities to qualify) in some regions, this puts members in some regions at a disadvantage. It also spreads our resources pretty thin. If we were to have three Regional Championships each year, open to members who earn qualifying scores, regardless of which region they earn those scores in, the national organization would be in a better position to support the Regional Championships (for example, we might waive show licensing fees and allocate some \$ to help with some of the funding -- this would depend on the budget / income & expense projections for the year, of course).

Maybe we should go this route instead of trying to organize a National Championship (which, because of the size of our country, disadvantages people when it is located far from where they live).

Following up on Sue's suggestion, we might want to come up with some guidelines for making sure that a particular state / region / show organizer doesn't monopolize the Regional Championships. Perhaps we come up with an application process with guidelines:

"Starting with the 2021 competition season, USAWE will license three Regional Championships each year: one located in a state in either R6 or R7; one located in a state in R3, R4, or R5; and one located in a state in R1 or R2. Priority will be given to applicants with a history of successful USAWE licensed competitions. Regional Championships should not occur in the same state for more than one year in a row to ensure that members from different parts of the country have the opportunity to participate in a Regional Championship within two days' drive. For Year-End USAWE Awards Programs, points earned at Regional Championships will count double (4.5 points earned at a B-Rated show would be doubled to 9 points earned at a Regional Championship). "

I also want to encourage the Board to make any decisions about point allocation applicable to the 2022 season *not to the season we're already 25% of the way through*.

I think it would be far better for us to think this through (and solicit input from our members before actually voting on anything related to points) and come up with a proposal that we can roll out for the 2022 season.

Currently, two regions (R2 and R6) have applied for Regional Championship licenses for 2021. Both applied without the incentive of extra point earning to help drive people to their shows.

I would be in favor of **double points for Regional Championships starting in 2022, three Regional Championships** to be held each year (east, central, and west), and **re-designation of the title "A-Rated Show"** (along with the requirements that go along with it) to the Regional Championships.

Leslie Martien, President, expressed some concern about people coming in with different ideas at the Board meeting rather than sharing their thoughts in advance.



Kim Hillyer, R6 Director, indicated that she thought that Kat's proposal made a lot of sense and that she supported it. It makes sense to award double points for a regional show. She would like to see the proposal adopted for this year.

Robin Bond, R2 Director, shared that the information that she forwarded (which Sue Watkins had pulled together, was in support of what Kat had shared previously). She supports the idea of awarding double points to Regional Championships and triple points to National Championships. She isn't concerned about making this change in the middle of a competition season.

Kat Waters, R6 Member, added that she supports the idea at any point in time, whether it takes effect in 2021 or 2022.

Doreen Atkinson, At-Large Director, doesn't see any problem in accepting the proposal this year. She doesn't see that it's an issue to adopt this at this time, with the idea of doing a bigger change next year if the Board wants to.

Alex Tyson, R5 Director, likes the idea in theory, but not every region is going to have a Regional Championship, and since regional championships are not subsidized by the national organization, it makes it not as equitable / fair for people in regions without regional championships.

Doreen Atkinson, At-Large Director, says that she understood where Alex is coming from, but she doesn't think it's an issue.

Kim Hilyer, R6 Director, asked about whether the top 6 scores would really be influenced by making them double points.

Julie Alonzo, Secretary, indicated that she thought that the way to make the double points more of an incentive would be to actually double the points earned at that Regional Championship (rather than taking up two of the possible 6 "top score" slots).

Kat Waters indicated that her intention was not to double the points earned in one of the six slots, but instead to allow the points earned to be used for two "top score" slots.

Robin Bond, R2 Director, indicated that she thought it was a good incentive to have the double points earned at Regional Championships.

Leslie Martien, President, indicated that she was feeling as though more time was needed to share ideas because some of the ideas were shared so late (just prior to the meeting).

Julie Alonzo, Secretary, said that she thought that the proposal, as shared (where people attending a Regional Championship could use their points to count for two of their possible 'top 6' points for the year) didn't go far enough, but that she could support it for this year.



Julie Alonzo, Secretary, made a motion to:

Motion: For 2021, people attending a Regional Championship can use their points earned at the Regional Championships to count for two of their possible 'top 6' points for the year.

Motion was seconded by Doreen Atkinson, At-Large Director.

- **The motion passed by voice vote with seven in favor and two opposed.**

President Leslie Martien adjourned the meeting at 7:26, Mountain Time.

Minutes submitted by Julie Alonzo, USAWE Secretary