

Upper Valley Rowing Foundation
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
November 13, 2008
Oberlander Lounge

Board Members Present: Win Piper, Dick Grossman, Liz Marshall, Deb Dufty, Jen Friend, Buzz Congram, Brenda Sirovich, Peter Davenport, Peter Kermond, Kristen Laine, Bob Haynes

Board Members Absent: Elizabeth Glenshaw, Dartmouth Rep

The meeting was called to order at 5:55 pm.

The board approved the October 2008 minutes.

Win Piper provided an executive committee update. The executive committee approved a \$200 payment to Fred Cressman for repair work he performed on the Vespoli 4+ used by the men's team. Win Piper, Jen Friend and Deb Dufty met on November 11 to review items for the November board agenda, which included coaching compensation and board job descriptions. Deb took the action item of revising the board job descriptions and sending to the full board for review.

The board discussed the club's compensation structure for coaches. Jen Friend provided a comparison of different organizations within the region, which included club size, programs offered, program fees and coaching compensation. The clubs surveyed included: Community Rowing and Riverside (Boston), Great Bay Rowing (Dover, NH), Saratoga Rowing (Saratoga, NY), Northhampton (Northampton, MA), and Riverfront Recapture (Hartford, CT). All of the clubs used variable pay scales for their coaches. Rates ranged from \$10/hour to \$2500/year, with 3 of the 6 clubs reporting rates in the range from \$10/hour to \$35/session. One club did not provide specifics. Rates were based on experience and responsibilities. Club fees ranged from \$95/session to \$825/session. Sessions varied from two weeks to a full year; and from 2 to 5 days per week. Membership size ranged from 40 to 1500.

There were two questions related to coaching compensation. The first was whether the club's current structure, which pays the same rate to all coaches, was appropriate. One board member noted the club's "one rate for all" structure was clearly an outlier. Several members suggested that the pay for a "top coach" should be higher. Another board member noted that the club would have to have clearly defined criteria if it went to a variable pay scale, and asked what defined a "top" coach. Several board members cited experience and responsibilities as the appropriate factors to evaluate. One board member pointed out that the club tends to attract experienced coaches, therefore there might be very few instances in which a lower rate would be appropriate, however it would be good to have the flexibility to pay a lower rate to an inexperienced coach.

The second question the board discussed was the rate of compensation. One board member noted that each additional dollar of pay to a coach translates to an additional dollar the club has to charge to cover

its expenses and in the current economic climate the club needed to be mindful that its offerings are a discretionary expense. Another board member mentioned that several people had indicated to her they planned to do less rowing next year due to financial concerns. Another inquired as to whether individual programs might supplement the club's standard pay for their coach. Several board members felt this would be inappropriate as it would add an additional, unadvertised fee for the program, and one that all participants might not be willing or able to pay. A board member asked how many coaches had raised concerns about the club's pay rate. It was determined that one coach had expressed the opinion that the club's rate of \$60 per session was too low for a top coach. The board agreed that the financial impact needed to be evaluated before proceeding further, and that a survey should go out to the members about their plans for 2009. Jen Friend took the action item of working on the financial model and the survey. Kristen Laine offered to help with the latter.

The board reviewed the revised job descriptions that Deb provided. Brenda noted that the nominating committee had also looked at the job descriptions and had come up with similar suggestions. The nominating committee recommended that the VP position be framed as the personnel manager for the board. The nominating committee is proposing to expand the number of board seats by 2. Deb suggested that it might be advisable to have one board member specifically tasked with safety. The board discussed several potential candidates and agreed to provide Brenda with possible candidates and that each member would identify the roles/areas that they would be interested in. The board also discussed converting the Dartmouth board slot to non-voting status. The board greatly values the Dartmouth coaches' contributions and also recognizes that they have many other responsibilities. By converting the Dartmouth slot to a non-voting seat, the club can continue to benefit from their participation, while having more flexibility for achieving a quorum.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jen Friend
Club Secretary