

TRU WINTER BOARD MEETING - AGENDA
SUNDAY, Apr 6, 2014 @ WOODLANDS/HOUSTON, TX

1. ROLL CALL @ 10am – McPhail
 - a. Voting Members: McPhail, Courtney, Watson, Roberson, Schmidtke, Corrigan, Camm, and Parker
 - b. Non Voting Members / [Club Roll Call](#)
 - c. Absent: Wolfinger
 - i. Proxy: Wolfinger, proxy McPhail
2. TRU Congress Seats
 - a. [Nominees](#) and process
 - i. Questions? None from the room
3. STATE OF THE UNION
 - a. USA Updates –
 - i. [RRRC vs GU](#)
 - ii. USA vs SCO
 1. 6,000+ tickets sold to date
 2. [Tickets](#), 15+ or more by calling 713-547-3055.
 3. VIP Tickets (post to website)
 - b. GU Updates –
 - i. [New Logos?](#)
 1. Would recommend choosing 2 so we have alternates for different events, etc.
 - a. Approved
 - ii. TRU D2/D3 Championships
 1. Bid Process (Watson): All Central D2 and D3 teams were contacted.
 - a. Anderson: Alamo City was not contacted.
 - b. Roberson: Agreed, I spoke with Ben Barton and he did not receive any correspondence either.
 - c. Watson: They were left several messages.
 - d. Anderson: The information should be sent to the Officers and put on the TRU website.
 - i. Young: Agreed, no information was submitted for posting to the website.
 - e. Courtney: Can you also clarify that teams were told they had to have 2 fields?
 - f. Watson: No. They were told if they had 2 fields it was one for playing and one for warmup.
 - g. McPhail: Why are all the teams not being notified by the same method? It all comes back to communication, the Bid Packets were requested from Watson and RRRC. They were not passed on until after the vote was done, this request was not fulfilled.
 2. [Event Hosting Checklist](#)
 - a. Pilot is Huns hosting TRU D2/D3 Championships, TRU Admin will assist with event hosting.
 - c. Collegiate Updates –
 - d. High School Updates –
 - e. Forfeits -
 - i. Diablos (M)
 1. 2 forfeits / 1 reschedules; Mar 15 withdrawn from League

- a. Parker: unplayed forfeit DARC and unplayed forfeit Midland.
 - i. Diablos: Yes, confirmed
 - ii. McPhail: unplayed forfeit is \$500 standard forfeit fine
 - iii. Camm: Second
 - iv. Opposed: None
 - v. DARC (online): 2 forfeits to DARC?
 - 1. Diablos: Last forfeit against DARC was after withdrawal from league
- ii. D1b/D3 Drops
 - 1. Woodlands (D1b)
 - 2. Ft. Worth (D1b)
 - 3. Austin Blacks (D3)
- iii. Denton/Diablos (W)
 - 1. 1 forfeit / no reschedule
 - a. Camm: I propose a \$150 fine (field costs/referee development).
 - b. Courtney: Second, but would add if they forfeit again, they should receive the standard fee and the field costs.
 - c. Young: Agreed.
 - d. Melius: So about the Diablos games being marked as forfeits, when will that be decided? Rutherford: Agreed, when we will we find out?
 - i. Young: Yes, we are already in discussion with RRRC and wanted to get precedence from the TRU. Proposal is to mark all Diablos matches as friendlies.
- iv. Bay Area (M)
 - 1. 1 forfeit / unplayed
- v. Katy (M)
 - 1. 1 forfeit / rescheduled
- vi. Woodlands (M)
 - 1. 3 forfeits / 1 rescheduled, 2 unplayed
 - a. Corrigan: Why can't we have a \$150 fine?
 - b. Camm: The over-reaching question is do the members want the Board to have some discretion? Is anyone opposed (feedback, not a formal vote), to the Board having discretion on this?
 - i. Jeff Heyse: No, and Ron Watson agrees.
 - ii. Room: Majority would like to vote for discretion.
 - iii. Anderson: I'm hoping that the Board, etc will make sure they are showing empathy and trying to help these struggling teams. The goal should be to grow rugby, a \$500 fine is not going to help that team.
 - 1. McPhail: Think about growing rugby this way, a host club has prepared for the match, brought in sponsors, planned a social, referee shows up...etc. If a team doesn't show up, all those game day expenses and planning is wasted. I think the fine should be enough of a warning that teams play the game, played forfeit is better than not a game.
 - 2. Roberson: I agree, prior when the fine was \$100 and teams didn't take it seriously. Raising the fine has made it better, except for this year.
 - iv. Kirk: I think the Board should have that discretion, there are always exceptions. Consider mitigating factors as needed.
 - v. Courtney: Going forward, I propose that the Board exercises

discretion as needed, expenses to the non-forfeiting team, up to \$500....including referee costs.

1. Camm: Second
2. Aye: 4
3. Opposed: 3
4. Motion carries.

4. REVIEW OF COMPETITIONS

- a. General summary –
- b. Results
- c. USA Playoffs @ Dallas
- d. Collegiate Results:
 - i. ARC
 1. Oklahoma
 - ii. LSC
 1. St. Edwards
 - iii. LSWC
 1. TX State
 - iv. SWC
 1. UT
 - v. SWWC
 1. UT
- e. High School:
- f. Discipline Matters: [Referee Abuse by Coaches / Players](#): Failure to adhere to [Sideline / Barrier Policy](#)
 - i. McPhail: We have to grow the referee pool, we have a small pool already and the referee abuse, sideline abuse has to stop. Also, the Team Coach reports are awesome, but when you are just checking the boxes and saying Great, or they SUCK with no comments is worthless.
 1. Law Tests - The referees are now taking law tests
 2. Fitness - They are now doing beep tests at the USA Rugby National Panel level.
 3. The referees are working hard to develop, the teams have to help us retain them as well.
 - ii. Roberson: The criticism on the assessments is not he missed two KOs, but rather overall his positioning was not optimal, his fitness is lacking, no secondary signals, etc.
 - iii. Parker: Also, its not just coaches and players coming on to the field, spectators and fans don't need to be in front of the ropes as well.
 - iv. Gundy: A couple of months ago, a player received a red card and then was allowed to take a referee course to lessen the sanction. We had a similar situation, why wasn't that offered to my player?
 1. Young: What was the Red Card for?
 2. Gundy: Not referee abuse.
 3. Young: This sanction and opportunity was given because it was due to referee dissent.
 - v. Courtney: We all have to take a part of this, show some leadership and stop the fans, players, etc. If it is a problem, report it and it will be dealt with.
 - vi. McPhail: Appeals, we've been seeing a few of them. Make sure to review the [appeals process](#) and the strict guidelines on time frame.
 - vii. Courtney: If you want to appeal or provide supporting information, do it BEFORE. Or during the appeals process, not after all is said and done.
- g. New for 2013 – 2014
 - i. D1 =

- ii. D2 =
- iii. D3 =
 - 1. Ft Hood
 - a. Parker: Spoke with Ft Hood, they are strong, have lots of support, may ask to be placed on competitive schedule next year.
 - 2. Lost Souls
 - a. Parker: Spoke with them last week, staying social next year but want to start scheduling friendlies.
- iv. Women D1 =
 - 1. Griffins
 - 2. Ft Hood
 - a. Social next year more than likely.

5. iRB

6. [TRU OPERATING PROCEDURES](#)

7. Review of website

- a. Feedburner - Every Club is required to have ONE rep signed up with this, but more is better. Only official source of ALL TRU Updates. Sign up on TRU Website under 'SUBSCRIBE TO ENEWS'.
- b. [Participation Agreement](#)
- c. CMS

8. FINANCIALS

a. [Review of YTD financials and budget](#)

- i. Corrigan: Vote to move on, approved
 - 1. Camm: Second

ii. [CIPP Summary](#)

b. [Conference financials](#)

- i. Tate: So do the Collegiate Conferences get a check at the end of the year?
 - 1. McPhail/Courtney: No, the money, if any is left over is left in the TRU account and held in "trust" or "earmarked" for that particular conference.
- ii. Pflieger: Need to double check numbers for the amounts of each conference and where it goes - into TRU account?
- iii. Ron: what happens when there is a positive in each account?
 - 1. Pflieger: SWWC - women just have a positive in the TRU account. They do not receive a check from TRU - its just saved for future.
- iv. Doug: Heard at previous AGM that college clubs are not part of TRU. Can you clarify please?
 - 1. Courtney: ARC and high schools are not part of TRU. SWC, SWWC, LSC, LSWC are TRU Affiliate members, but NOT full members. The TRU handles Disciplinary, Referees, Match Calendar, etc.
 - 2. Doug: If men want to use the money they have to get board approval, but when colleges want money they don't need board approval?
 - a. Courtney: Correct, we just hold their money and they don't pay TRU Dues, they pay Conference dues. However, they would need to get approval from their Conference Commissioner.
- v. Rutherford: Can we get a breakout of the TRU referee fees by division? So we know exactly how much of the \$86k is for the TRU senior clubs?

9. SENIOR WOMEN'S COMPETITION REVIEW

a. [Division One](#)

- i. Valkyries and HARC are at the top of the table, see notes under Diablos forfeit.

b. Sevens

- i. [Texas Bluebonnets](#) (All Texas Team)

10. SENIOR MEN'S COMPETITION REVIEW

- a. ACR4/RRRC Update
- b. DIVISION ONE
- c. DIVISION TWO
- d. DIVISION THREE
- e. SEVENS

11. USA Guidance / All Stars

12. Sevens

- a. RRRC 7s committee has been created
 - i. TRU has requested Budget, # of teams, etc.
 - ii. Tate: Should be ready within the next week and will be shared. We are using the same format as the West with a few tweaks and adjustments.
- b. Texas Sevens Series
 - i. RRRC is handling, TOLA is still around, but 3 qualifiers will be the pathway. M/W together.

13. TEXAS RUGBY REFEREE ASSOCIATION

- a. Notes under Disciplinary action

14. OLD BUSINESS

15. SELECTION OF SUMMER WINTER MEETING LOCATION & DATE – Central

- a. [Aug 2, 2014](#)
 - i. McPhail: Looking for volunteer to help coordinate the location.

16. NEW BUSINESS and INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. [Bylaw Proposals](#) from Senior Men's Clubs
 - i. Watson: A meeting was held in Waco, two weeks ago to review the TRU Bylaws, etc.
 - ii. Courtney: Who was at this meeting?
 1. Tate: Huns, Blacks, HARC M/W, Alamo City, Grand Praire, Quins M/W, Reds, Tulsa (proxy), Griffins, McAllen (proxy), OKC (proxy), Bay Area, Galveston, Grand Praire OU (proxy) and Valkyries (proxy).
 - iii. Tate: One change was that the President, rather than being a position appointed by the Elect Board would be chosen by the Clubs. Another change was to create a VP position that is part of the board and chosen by the Clubs. It was the consensus of the room that the Director of Disciplinary would not be a voting member. The Director of Competitions would be tweaked to be more of a Rugby Development Officer and would take on additional tasks beyond Competitions. There were other topics brought up, but not consensus by the room.
 1. The Board would appoint the Director of Disciplinary and the RDO.
 - iv. Taute: We came to the consensus that it was one vote per club except for the RRRC vote. This doesn't affect the TRU Bylaws at all.
 - v. Rutherford: So the consensus is that Horde wouldn't get a vote for another division.
 - vi. Tate: Correct. Also, the referees seat was discussed, some teams didn't mind the voting seat and other clubs did have an issue with it. No consensus was met on that topic.
 - vii. Courtney: Oddly enough, the USA Rugby GU Template Bylaws recommend having a Local Rugby Officer (LRO) on the board.
 - viii. Tate: At the time we didn't know that.
 - ix. McPhail: With the Bylaw changes, it was recommended that we follow the GU Bylaw Templates but we haven't done all of them since the changes from USA have been so frequent.
 - x. Tate: We discussed many, many points, but we came out of that meeting with a consensus or general mutual understanding of the the issues. We all agreed that the current bylaws are outdated, complicated, etc.
 - xi. Rutherford: The Affiliate (Independent Rep) was discussed and it would not have a

- voting seat.
- xii. Tate: Not true, we didn't have consensus at the meeting and so nothing was done. I feel that if they are NOT paying members of the TRU then they don't get a seat. If they are paying members, they do need a seat. As I understand it today, they are full dues member (not ARC/RT) and for me personally I have no issue with a voting board member representation. Obviously other people feel differently.
 - xiii. Rutherford: From the information we learned today, the Collegiates are still not full dues playing members. We either write them a check at the end of the year or we hold on to the money. I did vote last year that the Collegiate Conferences do receive a seat. At that time, I was for that, as facts come to light, I now better understand the relationship with the TRU and are only affiliate members, they should not have a seat as they are not full members.
 - xiv. Tate: My thought is that the general feeling in the room was that they were OK with Club voting of the President, new position of VP, tweak the Director of Competition's and Disciplinary to be appointed. Also DOC would be changed to be more encompassing position as competitions is now with RRRC.
 - xv. Courtney: Would you agree with me that as far as a bylaw amendment that there is a consensus by a block of teams that the Board be changed from an Electoral and Executive Board into a Board. At the very least it would keep the same electoral reps but that the President and VP are elected at large.
 - xvi. Tate: Yes, I would say that we have at least a dozen clubs that would agree.
 - xvii. Camm: There were clubs at the meeting that the President shouldn't be elected, but the majority did.
 - xviii. Watson: Any division that comes in as a full member would require another bylaw change so that they could receive an electoral member?
 - xix. Courtney: Speaking from the Colleges, if I said I want to be a full member, how do I do it? We would pay TRU dues, no rebates, no "trust" money...what do we get?
 - xx. Watson: You would get the same thing that full members get.
 - xxi. Tate: Where I was coming from is that this current arrangement is really confusing and if you want to be members, pay TRU dues and you get everything that everyone else gets.
 - xxii. Schmidtke: Can we just re-negotiate the Conference Agreements to become full members?
 - xxiii. LTU: If we do that and join the TRU, USAR will say no, you can't do that, you need to be NCAA, etc.
 - xxiv. Camm: The Conferences would be brought back in, but their Competitions would be a separate entity, just like the RRRC now with the Senior Clubs. RRRC and the Collegiate Conferences would run parallels and be full members.
 - xxv. Tate: With these proposals, we would just need to make sure that we aren't making a problem for the Collegiates.
 - xxvi. Courtney: Ok, so what if half of the SWC teams want to be full members but the rest don't? Then those three teams would have a seat on the board that only represents three teams of the whole SWC. I would propose that the Conferences get one vote for the Independent Rep...
 - xxvii. Taute: I would propose leaving the referee seat and the affiliate in place, then we can vote on it.
 - xxviii. McPhail: But what about the Option1 and 2 need to be filled out, we can't vote on options.
 - xxix. Rutherford: I propose that we go through the changes line by line now and then we can move forward with a proposal.
 - xxx. Camm: You could do one vote to tidy up the bylaws, then do another for this amendment and the next...otherwise it won't ever get done.

- xxxi. Courtney: Yes, lets break it up, lets do:
1. President and VP
 - a. Terms are concurrent but elections are staggered.
 2. M/W combined clubs would have a vote each, separate but equal
 - a. Not currently covered in the current bylaws, needs a clarification.
 - i. One vote per club based on CIPP, i.e. D1/D1b get one vote, D1 Men and D1 Women EACH get a vote.
 - ~~3. Referee not having a board on the seat.~~
 - a. Ron voted no, Tulsa voted no (proxy), and one other club voted no.
 - i. Majority did not want to remove it. NOT UP FOR A bylaw change right now as consensus can't be reached.
 - ~~4. Independent Rep, do they need a seat?~~
 - a. Tate: I didn't feel that we reached a consensus:
 - b. Watson: I feel that we did and that they wouldn't need a seat.
 - c. Courtney: Did you talk about the Colleges coming back under the TRU?
 - d. Rutherford/Tate: No.
 - e. Tate: We do feel that the bylaws don't explain what a full member or affiliate is, it is confusing.
 - f. Taute: I think we are opening another can of worms, it seems to be already be sorted out. Because we didn't understand the financial part of it and with the information we received today, I am find with the way it is.
 - g. Corrigan: I am fine as well, leave as it is.
 - h. Tate: Agreed, with the information we received today, I don't have an issue now.
 - i. Not up for a bylaw change as there is more understanding now.
- xxxii. McPhail: Was it also discussed that the Electoral Reps terms would change? To run parrallel to the CIPP cycle?
1. Rutherford: Correct, that was proposed but consensus was not reached.
- xxxiii. Courtney: So you would want it to say that the term would begin at the next fiscal year? Runs towards the end of a fiscal year of that term.
- xxxiv. Tate: Yes, this seems to make more sense.
- xxxv. Courtney: I will write them up, and post 30 days before and then follow the process.
- xxxvi. Corrigan: Move to close.
- xxxvii. Watson: Second.
- xxxviii. Motion passes.
- xxxix. McPhail: Any other business?
- xl. Anderson: The same thing I've been saying for years, we need a Mission Statement. How are we going to grow the game?
- xli. McPhail: Anderson did submit a Mission Statement last year, we can review it and look at it as a Board again.
- xl.ii. Courtney: What are you looking for? What can we help with?
- xl.iii. Anderson: We need help, administrative help with business plans, how to build rugby....etc.
- xl.ii. Courtney: Do you see the Board needing to be more interactive with your club?
- xl.v. Anderson: I would like to see the Board tell us how to grow rugby.
- xl.vi. McPhail: There has been discussion to try and help teams with administration, we don't have the manpower to teach every club, but we can do a administrative seminar in a central location.
- xl.vii. Yeoman: Ok, so who is doing it?
- xl.viii. McPhail: It is in discussion but please let us know what you are looking for, specific as possibe. Electoral Reps, work with your divisions to collect feedback on what teams

want. Not just how to recruit, but business plans, marketing, etc.

- xlix. Courtney: Let me ask you this, do you see the new RDO position as taking part of this?
 - i. Anderson: Yes, it is part of Rugby Development.
 - ii. Camm: I sent out a notice to all the D2 teams about this already and have had a limited response. No one wanted administrative help, they always want more coaching and player development. We can give it, but need to make sure the teams will participate.
 - iii. McPhail: Reps, contact your teams and lets get this going....anything else from the floor?

17. DATES TO CONSIDER:

- a. USA Rugby Collegiate Round of 32, April 12-13, 2014
- b. USA Rugby Collegiate Regional, April 25-27, 2014
- c. Rugby Texas Championships, April 26-27, 2014
- d. TRU D2 & D3 Championship, May 3-4, 2014
 - i. Huns hosting.
 - ii. McPhail: We need to decide on something, do we have consolation matches for D2 and D3? We've had different opinions, D2 should be held to a higher standard and have a consolation, D3 should not as they sometimes have issues with numbers/traveling. Or should we have no consolations? We will do whatever the clubs want to do, but we need to hear from the D2/D3 teams about Sunday morning matches.
 - iii. Parker: I did pose that questions to the teams, leave it up to the teams that would be playing.
 - iv. McPhail: We can't do that because both teams need to decide, referee assignments, the event host is working, better for everyone. BUT the teams have to commit to it.
 - v. Camm: We did propose that if teams want to do consolation matches, if there is a forfeit it includes a standard unplayed forfeit fee.
 - vi. Parker/Camm will email the clubs and ask for a decision. The Board wants to do what the teams want.
- e. USA Rugby Collegiate Finals, May 9-11, 2014
- f. USA Rugby Club Conference Playoffs, May 17-18, 2014
 - i. Irving, TX
- g. USA Rugby Club Conference Championships, June 7-8, 2014
- h. USA Rugby 7s Collegiates - Nov 23-25, 2014

18. EXECUTIVE BOARD SEATS / ELECTIONS

- a. President
- b. Director of Competitions
- c. Men's D2 Divisional Rep

19. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Motion to adjourn: Watson
- b. Second: Rutherford
- c. Adjourned