

# USA Field Hockey Club Task Force

## Meeting Minutes

June 7th, 2011

### I. Call to order

Laura Darling called to order the regular meeting of the USA Field Hockey Club Task Force at 8:30 PM EDT on June 7, 2011.

### II. Roll call

Laura Darling conducted a roll call. The following persons were present: Brian Bernatchez, Karen Collins, Lauren Cornthwaite, Laura Darling, Tony Gulotta, Simon Hoskins, Richard Kentwell, Karen Klassner, Kathi Liszewski, Steve Locke, Andy Muir, Tina Reinprecht, Nigel Traverso and Larry Zappone.

### III. Items Discussed

1. **National Club Championship** – We need to work through the workflow of the event and trying to cover all the logistics to ensure a high performance like event with all regions being represented and all teams having a fair opportunity to attend.

**A. Define the regions** – The group discussed the possibility of combining regions 1-3 and regions 4 and 6 so we could consolidate down to 8 regions. The group voted on this and the result was 6-1 in favor of combining. We did not have 2 member's votes. It was also suggested that upstate NY be added to regions 1-3.

Region	States	# Clubs	# Youth Clubs (approx)	# Athlete
1 - Northeast	VT, ME, NH	8	6	489
2 - Massachusetts	MA	9	9	834
3 - Atlantic	CT, RI	7	6	429
4 - New York	NY	17	11	1,283
5 - Pennsylvania	PA	50	38	2,956
6 - New Jersey	NJ	20	17	1,580
7 - Chesapeake	DE, MD, DC	38	30	2,329
8 - South	VA, NC, SC, GA, FL, AL, AR, MS, LA	28	22	1,780
9 - Great Lakes	MI, OH, IN, KY, WV, TN	10	6	1,390
10 - Central	WI, IL, MO, KS, IA, TX, OK, CO, ND, SD, MN, NE	11	6	991
11 - West	CA, OR, WA, AZ, ID, MT, NM, WY, UT, NV	32	25	1,079

# USA Field Hockey Club Task Force

## Meeting Minutes

June 7th, 2011

- B. Qualifiers** – The group decided unanimously that qualifiers should be regional.
- Qualifiers will be open to all “clubs” in good standing with USAFH.
  - **The group voted 7-2 in favor of one team per club per age group.**
  - Will regions be combined if there are not enough teams to hold a qualifier? The group discussed this and there were several different opinions on this topic. This question was added to the survey and the consensus was that if a region did not have enough interest to hold a qualifier they should be allowed to attend the qualifier at another region.
  - What is the minimum and maximum number of teams per qualifier? The group voted on the minimum and agreed by a vote of 6-1 that a region should be required to have at least 4 teams to hold a qualifier. No maximum has been applied to allow all clubs the opportunity to participate.
  - Will the number of teams advancing from a qualifier depend on the number of teams entered and if so what is the ratio? This was discussed and there were mixed feelings on this issue. We have decided that at a minimum each region should get one spot. The debate is what should happen with the additional spots. Any feedback on this topic is attached in the questionnaire results. There was a suggestion that we combine to 8 regions and each region would get 2 spots. Some members thought it would be unfair to give a region 2 spots at NCC if they only had 4 teams at a qualifier. It was recommended that every region get one spot and then the remaining spots would be divided amongst the regions with most teams. It was also recommended that the spots are allocated on a percentage basis by the total number of teams entered compared to the number entered per region. All comments are included in the survey.
  - When should qualifiers be held? Due to the many events in the spring it was hard to narrow down a date. In addition there was a concern that having all the qualifiers on one weekend would limit the umpire pool. The group voted on if every region should be required to have their qualifier on the same weekend to ease with Futures scheduling. The group voted against a set weekend 4-3. Any comments are included in the survey results. The group also voted on if the age groups should be the same weekend or spread over different weekends. The group voted 4-3 that whatever date is decided for qualifier should be used for all age groups.
  - What type of playing surface should be used? The group discussed this and although everyone would prefer true hockey turf for qualifiers we all realize that may not be possible. The group does feel qualifiers must be held on an artificial surface.
  - Will there be a requirement for top level umpires? The group feels top level umpires must be used for qualifiers and the NCC.
- C. National Club Championship**
- How many teams should qualify? The group voted on this and voted in favor of 16 teams per age group by a margin of 5-2.
  - How will the number of teams from each Region calculated? This was addressed above and the group is split on this topic. Comments are included.

# USA Field Hockey Club Task Force

## Meeting Minutes

June 7th, 2011

- What type of playing surface should be used? The group voted unanimously, 7-0, that this event must be played on a true hockey surface even if it lengthens the event and/or causes the age groups to be held at different sites.
- How will pools be assigned to ensure equality? The group voted 6-1 in favor of a geographical mix, wherever possible.
- Will the roster have to be the same as at qualifiers? The group voted unanimously that the roster must be the same from the team that qualified. They group also voted the maximum players that should be allowed on the roster for qualifiers and the NCC should be 20.

D. **Bid Process for Hosting Qualifiers** - how is this handled if using multiple sites in an area - ie Temple, Drexel, Ursinus, West Chester. There are not many sites with enough turf that can accommodate full field play for a 16 team qualifying tournament. The group discussed this and it was decided that this would have to be evaluated based on bids received each year.

E. **Age Groups** - U15, U17, U19 or U14, U16, U19

- The group discussed the possibility of adding an age group for the younger kids and which age format worked best. We voted on the issue and group was in favor of the standard U14, U16, U19 age group by a margin of 6-1. The group also voted unanimously, 7-0, to add a U14 division.

#### IV. Outstanding Business

1. Review Indoor Qualifiers and NIT process.

#### V. Next Meeting

Tuesday, June 14<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 PM EDT

#### VI. Adjournment

Laura Darling and Richard Kentwell adjourned the meeting at 9:40PM EDT.

Minutes submitted by: Kathi Liszewski

Minutes approved by: *Laura Darling and Richard Kentwell*