Actions Requiring Approval by the HOD:
1. None

Motions Passed:
1. Approval of R&T Committee Meeting Minutes from August 2, 2020

Minutes
The meeting was called to order at 8:00 PM EDT

1. MJ opened the meeting with a welcome to all attendees.
2. MJ extended a Thank You to all those serving on this committee and expressed how very proud she was for all that the committee has accomplished in 2019-2020.
3. MJ extended a special Thank You to Mary Beth Windrath and Mary Sweat for their work on the Top Ten lists, to Walt Reid for handling FINA records, to Mary Beth Windrath for tackling USMS records, to the documentation subcommittee of Mary Beth Windrath, Cheryl Gettelfinger and Jeanne Seidler for getting all our documentation up to date and to Stacey Eicks for putting out accurate and timely meeting minutes. MJ is incredibly grateful to all of you for all you do for USMS.
4. MBW moved to approve August 2nd meeting minutes, TP 2nd, no discussion, all in favor, none opposed.
5. MJ announced that all the Guide To Operations documentation has been updated and posted on the USMS website. MJ requested that the committee review the documentation and provide her with feedback or questions.
6. MJ advised the committee that rule change R-8 (change to Rule 103.18.2) proposed by the R&T Committee has been “Recommended as Amended” by the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee amended part D. D. The specified splits for all swimmers in the approved event(s) shall be included separately in the meet results for all meets other than national championship meets. The meet announcement shall specify the process for identifying splits at national championship meets for USMS record and top ten consideration.
   a. MJ requested if there were any concerns with the R-8 wording / language or the Rules Committee amendments
   b. There were no concerns expressed (no hands raised)
   c. MJ asked KC if the Rules Committee recommended the rule change. KC confirmed that the Rules Committee “Recommended as Amended” R-8 (see hyperlink above).
7. MJ asked if there were any rule changes proposed that may impact and/or raise concerns for Top Ten Recorders.
   a. There were no concerns expressed (no hands raised)

8. Discussion: How has the Top Ten Recorder role changed and what do we think it should be going forward?
   a. MBW question: Does the Top Ten Recorder still need to know what swims are valid for Top Ten or does the Top Ten Recorder just upload everything and someone else determines what swims are valid for Top Ten?
   b. BT: Top Ten Recorders really need to have specifics about the meet prior to uploading the swim results (pool certifications, timing system, etc.).
   c. CG: In addition to what MBW and BT said, she knows most swimmers that compete in her LMSC and can do a check of the swim results to determine if there is a potential bad piece of data or not. She has concerns about those types of reviews being missed if this Top Ten role is being performed at the National level.
   d. KC: In the Guide To Operations (GTO), does this committee update the Top Ten and Records section in the GTO each year? MJ says, yes, this committee does update that section. It is currently up to date, and MJ has committed that this committee will have the GTO updated shortly after the convention.
   e. BW: In response to CG comment, there is a way “algorithmically” to find those potential “bad actors” and kick those back to the LMSC.
   f. LC: Her responses were not auditable. Suggested that Linda put her questions in the Zoom Chat (see i. below).
   g. JM and AM: For MBW and MJ specifically: Is there a way for MBW to just get the files off of the web tools to generate the Top Ten submission files versus each LMSC Top Ten Recorder emailing in the files? Is there a possibility for automation?
      i. MJ agrees that there is a “charm” associated with that idea b/c that reduces the need to chase after 52+ people, but there might be certain meets that may be problematic or should not be included. MJ thinks that having the local people review the files prior to submission may be just as important.
      ii. AM: Says those meets could be “marked” as not to be included
      iii. MBW: Says, yes, she can pull that information off of the web tools, but there are a number of prerequisite steps that must be done at the LMSC level (splits not recorded yet, some data questions not resolved yet, some meets listed without results). MBW does chase after Top Ten Recorders more for the purposes of being proactive and inclusive.
      iv. AM: Maybe a “flag” could be added to the software where the Top Ten Recorder could check when season is complete.
   h. MJ: Committee is not getting a lot of software enhancements implemented (dying on the vine).
   i. LC: This committee educates Top Ten Recorders. It seems like Sanction Chair should be educated as well as the jobs & tasks are complementary. Who is educating the Sanction Chairs?
   j. KC: Sanctions fall under the Legislation Committee. Who updates the Sanction section in the GTO? KC will ask those questions and update the committee.
   k. MJ thinks these discussions are useful and on-going. She has requested that everyone think about ways we can support the Top Ten. The role has changed a lot in the last 20 years and will continue to change.

9. Open Questions
   a. MBW: What do people think about inclusion of USA Virtual Meets?
      i. MJ: Thinks the results should be included as long as those meets follow the rules and has been sanctioned.
      ii. BT: Until we see how a USA meet is going to be accepted by USA, he does not know if we will be able to use any of those times. The USA Virtual meets are all under one sanction, but the swims are held at various different pools. So, it goes back to the Top Ten Recorder ensuring the pools and officials are certified and the meet follows all rules to be valid swims. At least at this time, his recommendation is to wait to see how the results compare to previous swims etc.
      iii. AA: BT covered all the points she wanted to cover. Some of the USA Virtual Meets she has seen has only one timer or no timers and only touch pads. AA agrees with what BT has to say.
      iv. ST: He asked if this committee has anything to do with National Qualifying times. MJ says that the Championship Committee covers National Qualifying times.
v. MG: The Rules Committee does have a proposal in the delegate packet that deals with virtual meets.

vi. BW: If the pool is sanctioned and the swims follow all of the rules, that’s fine, but it’s a lot of confusion.

b. ET: Extended a commendation to MBW on everything she does. ET’s opinion is that MBW is “irreplaceable” in terms of the intellectual content in her head. Is the committee looking for ways to preserve and ensure the continuance of everything that MBW does?

i. MJ says that MBW and MS have documented some of her process and procedures; however, that documentation is not a replacement of how MBW does the job (“She can tell someone else how she does it, but she cannot make them be her”).

c. ET: Why no software updates or enhancements are being applied to the Records and Tabulations functions? ET thinks this functional area is very important and can greatly benefit from software improvements. What is the reason for no priority being given to software updates to this area?

i. EC: He does not have a good answer about how the backlog of IT projects are being managed – in particular as related to Top Ten. There have been other enterprise projects that have been going on and this year de-railed with COVID and having to crank out resources to the membership. He does not know where the requests from the R&T Committee are in the backlog.

ii. MJ: She has been told that what we work with is an older legacy system and not interested in working with it more. But she does not know if there is any planned to replace it, which is a big concern for MJ.

d. OP: National Office relies on previous Sanction Chairs to transfer knowledge to the new Sanction Chair. Also, whenever Volunteer Services receives notification of a new Sanction Chair, Volunteer Services sends that new person an email with resources and a link to GTO.

e. OP also replied to ET about the software backlog: Having a “Just in Case Scenario” document of her operations is a good step towards helping make her job easier and some upgrades to the system. MJ said she would get that document to OP.

f. JM: 2nd the comments from ET and MJ on all that MBW does – those are giant shoes to fill in the organization.

g. JM: Has there been a decision to have a Top Ten list for Long Course.

i. MJ: It was the committee’s decision to proceed with Top Ten for Long Course. The swimmer should get credit for the valid swims that they can accomplish. (See R&T Committee Meeting Minutes August 2, 2020)

h. BW: Has volunteered his time to write code. MJ said Thank You.

i. MBW: Wondering how many use the tutorial documents and if they need to be updated?

i. Do you use the tutorial documents? 12 responded Yes

ii. Do you think they need to be updated? Mostly Yes

j. BT: There are Rules that will force a change to the documents.

k. BT: This committee cannot decide to not publish Top Ten. That would be a rule change. KC concurs.

10. MJ: Committee members please fill out the meeting and committee evaluations.

11. SE Motioned to adjourn committee meeting. BW 2nd. MJ called the meeting adjourned at 8:49 PM EDT.

12. Tasks for the Upcoming Year – succession planning docs to Onshalee, GTO updated immediately after convention, more focus on IT priorities for top 10, further discussion about future role of Top 10s.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 PM EDT