



Safety Educations & Instruction Council (SEIC) Meeting

Date: Friday, March 1, 2019

Location: Courtyard Marriott Hotel, Fredericksburg, Virginia

In attendance:

Voting Members

Trey Knight	Steve Hutton	Molly Gurien*	Mike Aronoff
Josh Hall	Beth Wiegandt	John Browning	Jeff Atkins*
John Traendly	John MacDonald	Greg Wolfe	

*Via conference call

Non-voting Members

Don Goff	Rob Kolb	Paula Hubbard
Tom Dardis	Joe Moore	Kyle Thomas

ACA Staff

Kelsey Bracewell	Chris Stec
------------------	------------

Call to Order:

- The meeting was called to order at 8:05 am by Chair Trey Knight, followed by a welcome, introductions and declarations of conflicts of interest.
- A quorum was established with 11 of 19 filled voting positions. See Appendix A for details.
- No specific conflicts at this time, except for Mike who will abstain from an upcoming vote where there is a conflict. All voting members acknowledged that they will let it be known if a conflict does arise.

Secretary's Report – John Traendly

Secretary, John Traendly, presented the minutes for the meeting on November 9, 2018. A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Steve and seconded by Greg. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

SEIC Department Report – SEI Department Manager, Kelsey Bracewell

Kelsey's report was accompanied by a PowerPoint that can be found at [link](#). Kelsey covered:

- Members of the SEI Department staff and their responsibilities.
- Statistics on IT registrations, IT applications, ITE renewals, waiver requests and special situations for 2018 and for the period since 2016.
- List of new IT's and ITE's for 2018 and year to date for 2019.
- Instructor, IT and ITE statistics as of February 19, 2019 – with and without paid dues. Kelsey noted that not all new Instructors understand that SEIC dues are required when they pass their certification.
- Certification statistics, including 2018 certifications by level and discipline. It was noted that there was a significant increase in Rafting certifications from the prior year.
- Instructor audit statistics for the period 2012 – 2018
- Certification course pass/continued rates for 2018 by discipline and level
- Statistics for skills assessments, endorsements and PSF's for 2018

Kelsey was asked what can be done to help her process course reports. She indicated that course reporting continues to be a difficult process.

- Course reporting is often late, requiring fast processing when a report is submitted or follow up with the course leader to get the report.
- Chris – There are now multiple ways to report a course.
- Chris – Reporting is not well integrated into backend processing.
- Chris – Evaluations are submitted in different formats, Word, faxes, emails, pictures, pdfs, etc. Need one required channel for submitting reports.
- Trey – Could potentially charge a fee for processing handwritten reports.
- Mike – Need to be able to submit on a smartphone or tablet.
- Josh – How long does it take to process a course packet? Kelsey – A day to a month and a half.
- Chris – Reviews including the retyping of information and other validation steps.
- Kelsey – A lot of time is spent consolidating documents in different formats.
- Handwritten documents are often difficult to read.
- The preferred format is one pdf file with all documents (course report, candidate evaluations, course evaluations, continuation forms, liability waivers, etc.) consolidated in the file and the course report also submitted separately as a Word or Excel file. Do not submit more than once..
- Typed documents are preferred, but if documents are handwritten, print so that the content is easy to read.
- John B. – Need a solution for Chinese students.
- Trey – This is a huge priority. Need to look at modernizing.

- Kelsey – Some people use a desk top and some use a smartphone.
 - Chris – Need someone to solve.
 - Josh – Need an RFP from Chris.
 - John T. – Sent a proposal last night to the Exec channel to address these issues. Will follow up with a broader group.
 - Chris – Do not like third party services, but may need to go this route. Offered the Red Cross as an example of a process that is more automated and streamlined.
 - Trey – In the interim, Discipline Chairs should disseminate this information to their committees to help Kelsey.
 - Mike – Kelsey, document what you want so it can be sent to the Discipline Committees.
 - John B. – If someone is doing a particularly good job, let us know so we can share that knowledge.
 - Trey – Boil down into 5 or 6 bullet points.
-

Liaison Reports

Boy Scouts of America – Rob Kolb

- Starting February 1st, allowed girls into scout programs.
- Program name changes to BSA, corporate name unchanged.
- Girls can earn Eagle scout.
- Minimum time to Eagle scout is two years. Could have girls at Eagle scout in two years.
- Hosting the World Scout Jamboree for the second time in one hundred years. Anticipating 30,000 scouts from over 100 countries. In West Virginia.
- First World Jamboree with a full aquatics program – canoeing, kayaking, SUP, scuba diving.
- National Aquatics Subcommittee met last week. Chris is a member.
- Can probably come into compliance with the NOWS for all merit badge requirements.
- Chris – The National Aquatics Subcommittee meets every two years and has a workshop. One of the potential sites for 2020 could be James Island County Park. Suggest getting with Rob as follow up.
- New enhanced relationship between Sea Scouts and the USCG Auxiliary. As of August, all Sea Scouts are automatically members of the USCG Auxiliary. Through the work of people like Robin Pope and the ACA, the amount of paddlesports included in the Sea Scout curriculum has dramatically increased and participation has dramatically increased.

US Coast Guard – Tom Dardis

- Human powered deaths last year were 149, this year (2018) 137 – numbers not verified yet, all states have not yet reported. Covers federal navigable waters only.
- Encouraged us to stay involved in the American National Standards for boat knowledge and on-water training. Affects our world. Should have input into what they are doing.

- Grant program – Look at what is available from the USCG and other sources. Have targeted areas each year, but these targets do not prevent us from looking at other areas.
- Chris – We submitted six grant requests this year. Have not heard back yet.
- Tom - Has not seen yet.
- Chris – Someone in the USCG office has retrieved them.
- Tom – Reviewers have not been selected yet. Initial review looks at completeness, not merit.

US Coast Guard Auxiliary – Don Goff

- Paddle reflector kits – handed out one for each Board member. Four decals, one for each side of each blade.
- Initially printed 5,000. They were gone in a month.
- USCG provided additional funding. Now have half a million (500,000).
- Contact your local USCG Auxiliary affiliate, www.cgaux.org, to request.
- Passed out whistles as a reminder the carriage requirement for paddle craft is that you have to have a life jacket and a sound producing device. Many liveries do not provide whistles.
- Chris – Will request paddle reflector kits for instructor packets now that more are available.
- Don – Make sure paddle is dry before you apply reflectors.
- Tom – If the ACA needs a large quantity, can also contact Tom at the USCG.

National Safe Boating Council – Chris Stec for Peg Phillips

- NSBC is expanding some of their programming into the motorized space.
- Working with US Sailing and the ACA to develop a working relationship.
- Worked with MTI on a photo shoot. Some photos now hitting paddlesports media.
- Chris is currently Chair. Term ends next year in Alaska.

Board Committee Reports

Standards Committee Report – SEIC Chair, Trey Knight

- Hopefully everyone read the report. We had a good transition, starting before the new year.
- Set some goals for improvement including course reporting.
- Have worked through a handful of IT and ITE applications.
- Have a tracking list of open items and there is only one item on it.
- Have seen specific continuation expiration dates that do not align with SEIC policy. Recommendations are permitted, but not dates that do not align with policy. Can discuss if there is an interest in changing the policy.

- John B. – To clarify, cannot put in continuation forms that must be completed in 12 months, but can recommend completion as soon as possible?
- Trey – Yes, ok to motivate candidate to complete as soon as possible. Typically provides a range – not sooner than and not later than.
- Several – four years seems long.
- Josh – If we want to change, needs to come as a motion.
- Mike – Anyone can upgrade during the four period.
- Steve – In his experience, it is unlikely someone waits 3 years and 9 months to follow up on a continuation.

Nominations Committee Report – Past SEIC Chair, Steve Hutton

- Due to the recent transition, we do not need to deal with new SEIC officers immediately.
- Never too soon to be thinking about it.
- Mike – All discipline committee chairs turnover at the end of 2019, so the current chairs will not be voting on the new officers.

Instruction Committee Report – SEIC Vice Chair, Josh Hall

- Will be following up on the Instructor Candidate Evaluation revision started by Trey.
- Automating course reporting may jump to the front as a priority.
- May get started using the proposal that John sent.
- Question – What is the role of the Instruction Committee? Referred to bylaws.
- Trey – Something of a catch all.
- Mike – Overlap with the Curriculum Committee, like with the reporting project.

Curriculum Committee Report – SEIC Secretary, John Traendly

- No carry over projects from the previous committee.
- Will work with the Instruction Committee on course reporting improvements.
- Given the scope of the project. It could require significant effort for the next six months or more.

Discipline Committee Reports***Introduction to Paddling Committee*** – Beth Wiengandt

- Developed an information article on the new L1, highlighting the changes. Also, the article talks about NOWS.
- Hopefully, the article will go out to Instructors after final proofreading.
- Also developed a frequently asked questions document for Paddlesports Facilitators to help grow that program. Also, going through final proofreading.
- Two new projects they will be working on will focus on resource materials for the new L1. How to teach using a performance based approach. Goal is to have materials ready for the October IT/ITE conference.
- Will be working on aligning the Quick Start and Smart Start programs with the new L1 curriculum. Currently, they are not closely aligned.

Adaptive Paddling Committee – John MacDonald

- Adaptive Paddling Summit was a great event. Thanked Joe for his contributions.
- First ever rafting APW was great in addition to kayaking and canoeing.
- Talked about developing an Essential Eligibility Criteria (EEC) guide in the DC meeting.

Coastal Kayaking Committee – John Browning

- One voting member, Helen Wilson, has resigned from the committee. Was not able to keep up due to NOLS and backcountry commitments. Now have 12 voting members.
- John has elected to not fill the position. Helps in meeting quorum requirements. Also, leaving open for an athlete, if needed.
- In the DC meeting, had two friendly amendments to the motions that will be presented later in today's SEIC meeting.
- Projects that are in process include a navigation course and a skills assessment at L5.

Rafting Committee – Chris Stec for the Committee

- South America is becoming very interested in our rafting program.
- The World Rafting Federation (WRF), one of a couple organizations vying to become the recognized authority for rafting, has given the ACA a potential MOU to vouch for their programs.
- We have been sitting on the MOU, since we are trying to grow our program. We feel that there will be something with them, but we are not sure what that will be yet.
- The feedback we are getting from the Instructor certification courses held so far, is that more people want a guide certification.
- One of the largest rafting companies in the country has recently approached the ACA regarding developing a generic guide certification. Rafting companies would then provide training on their specific areas. They would help get other large rafting companies on board.

- It was mentioned that the rafting industry has a convention every December. Chris mentioned that we could not have a program in place by then and we would have to have the support of other rafting companies to begin working on a program and present at the conference.
- Mike – Currently a rafting guide. Need experience on a specific river to be a guide on that river. Not sure how a generic guide program would work unless it is primarily trip leading.
- Chris – Big rivers are a different beast. There are basics for smaller rivers, like NOC training.
- Chris – Did not do in the past, because there were many experienced guides in place that would push back on having to attend a guide certification course. But, with the support of large rafting companies, we could have a program.
- Trey – Does the current assessment not work for the large rafting companies?
- Chris – The focus is on the word “certification”. Also, need to focus on guiding, not just skills.
- Chris – Would be a big lift to get this done. Elisha would need help.

River Canoeing Committee – Greg Wolfe

- In DC meeting, discussed impact of new L1 curriculum on upper level courses. While there were differences of opinion, Greg suspects differences will appear in all disciplines.

River Kayaking Committee – Mike Aronoff

- In DC meeting, discussed getting a playboating course which has been discussed for several years, but now is getting some traction.
- Had additional discussion in the DC meeting on the upcoming proposal that will be discussed later in today’s SEIC meeting.
- Mentioned difficulty in getting committee input on issues due to turn over in membership as part of the last election.

Safety & Rescue Committee – Chris for the Committee

- Have a monthly conference call. Marcel is the staff liaison to the committee.
- Looking at the 2020 Swift Water Rescue conference. Fourth version of the conference.
- The ACA on the competition side of the house, is looking at athletic coaching conference in 2020. So, there might be some overlap.
- The ACA annual conference might be in conjunction with one of these conferences. If SWR chooses Canada, we will not likely have our annual conference there.
- John B. – Why would SWR choose Canada?
- Chris – Jim Coffey has a spectacular location there.
- Trey – Does the office have an opinion or input on setting a standard fee for the NFPA version of the course.
- Chris – Have been working on a NFPA version of the course for a while, but are not there yet. So, not there yet on setting prices.

- Chris – The ACA provided some seed funds to create a sprint coaching program on the competition side, with the idea that when the courses are given, some of the fees would come back to the ACA. Still working on how this process would work. Not sure how this process might relate to the NFPA question.

Canoe Touring Committee – Molly Gurien

- Have meeting coming up on March 31.
- Want to invite everyone to attend paddling courses this summer, not just freestyle.
- Includes updates, safety and rescue, and L1.

Standup Paddleboard Committee – Raff Kuner

- Difficulty with conference line limited Raff's participation.
- See committee report in pre-meeting package.

Committees Not Represented

- Prone Paddling Committee
- Surfski Committee
- Surf Kayaking Committee

Motion 2019-03-01-A

Proposal name: SEIC Policy Manual Update – Adding Endorsement Information

Submitted by: Standards Committee

Exact wording of motion:

Add a new section to the SEIC Policy Manual under CHAPTER 6 – ACA COURSES AND WORKSHOPS

F. INSTRUCTOR ENDORSEMENTS

Instructor Endorsements allow certified instructors who have completed the specific Endorsement to offer additional skills courses to the public and may use ACA insurance to do so. Examples include but are not limited to, Kayak or Canoe Rolling, Canoe Camping, Kayak Traditional Skills, Kayak Fishing, SUP Yoga, etc.

Instructor Endorsements are offered to certified instructors by appropriately credentialed ITs or ITEs who have met at least one of the following requirements:

- 1. Have successfully completed the relevant Endorsement program provided by another qualified IT or ITE who holds the endorsement being offered, or*
- 2. Are an IT or ITE in a Discipline and Level where the Endorsement material is a standard component of the ICW process (Example: Kayak Rolling is a standard requirement for all River Kayak and Coastal Kayak*

Instructors at L4 and L5, therefore all L4 and L5 Instructors automatically hold the Kayak Rolling Endorsement and can offer the Kayak Rolling (skills) course. Likewise, all River Kayak and Coastal Kayak L4 and L5 ITs and ITEs are automatically considered Endorsers for Kayak Rolling, and can endorse Instructors without further training.)

3. An IT or ITE pursuing an endorsement that is new or has a relatively small number of IT's or ITE's may apply to the SEIC Standards Committee to operate provisionally, with specified goals and timelines, to allow endorsement program development.

Endorsements must be reported to the SEI Department within 30 days of completion.

Endorsements generally do not have specific maintenance requirements and remain valid as long as the Instructor Certification to which they are attached remains valid. However the Adaptive Paddling Endorsement does have specific maintenance requirements, see Adaptive Paddling Workshop Instructor Endorsement Criteria for more information.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- Steve – Instructor endorsements were not addressed in our policy manual. Just an oversight. There is a section in our manual that explains all course types except endorsements.
- No questions are additional comments.
- Steve – Since motion is from committee, does not need a motion from the floor or second.

Amendments, if any:

None.

Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed without amendments.

Motion 2019-03-01-B

Proposal name: Venue Revisions for Coastal Kayak L2 – L5 Curriculum

Submitted by: Coastal Kayak Committee

Exact wording of motion:

The Coastal Kayak Committee moves to adopt a standardized venue description across the curriculum within each level.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- John B. – Have been working on standardizing venues whenever possible. This motion is intended to achieve that goal.

- John B. – Out of the DC meeting yesterday, had a friendly amendment at L2 to change “Calm, protected water near shore (within swimming distance to shore with safe extrication)” to “Calm protected water within 0.5 nautical miles with safe extrication”. Swimming distance was too subjective.
- John B. – As you go through different levels, there are differences due to requirements of specific skills courses.
- John B. – Passed committee by unanimous vote.
- Trey – Send exact wording to Kelsey.
- John B. – Will do.
- Chris – In case we are asked by Insurance, what is the rationale between 0.5, 1.5 and 2.0?
- John B. – The primary consideration was the paddling time to get to safe extrication. DC felt that something needed to be included.
- Chris – If someone gets hurt in one of our courses, we will be asked. Need to be aware that this question may be raised.
- Paula – Considered how far a L2 Instructor could tow a boat or carry a swimmer.
- Chris – Bullets with rationale do not need to be in the course document, but they should be on file with the SEIC. Should not prevent passing the motion, but should be a required follow up.
- Kelsey – At L2 use the term “safe extrication”. At higher levels use “safe landing”. Is there a reason for the differences?
- John B. – Can change “safe extrication” to “safe landing”.
- Chris – Can we change “students must demonstrate” to “Instructor candidates must demonstrate”. “Students” could be confused with a skills course or assessment.
- John B. – Ok with change.
- Chris – Use consistent wording on how many conditions must be present during a course.
- John B. – Ok with change. Will work with Kelsey on standardizing approach across courses.
- Trey – Some places “feet”, sometimes “foot”. Pick one consistent term.
- John B. – Agree. Will work with staff on change.
- Greg – Looking at how much detail Coastal goes into on venues. River Canoe just specifies river class. Does the SEIC encourage other disciplines to go into more detail on venues?
- Mike/Josh – The class ratings are somewhat industry standards. Something similar does not exist for coastal.
- Greg – Paddle Canada does include factors in addition to river class. Is there any interest in doing something similar in the ACA?
- Chris – Under a USCG grant, Dr. Robert Kauffman in 2007 developed an ACA Safety Code for Coastal Waters, which included an ACA Scale of Difficulty for Coastal Waters. Chris distributed several copies of the ACA pamphlet. The ACA still has boxes of these pamphlets. Mike Aronoff was part of

the committee that developed the pamphlet. The intent of the project was to develop industry standards for difficulty. Might be worth reviewing.

- John B. – Will review.
- Joe – No minimums at L1 and L2. In his history with Josh and others, they did not conduct L2 Instructor courses in totally flat water.
- John B. – Never had a minimum at L2, just a maximum.
- Josh/Chris – Different for SUP.
- Trey – Have made a push in recent years to be consistent. When developing L3 SUP Coastal, did not need to be the same as CK, but there needed to be a good reason for any differences.
- John B. – For the current L2, have not really changed anything. Have just changed the formatting so it looks consistent between courses.
- Josh – SUP did take some content and formatting from coastal.
- Josh – Surf Kayak, SUP and Surfski need to look at what Coastal has done for opportunities to be more consistent. Other disciplines need to be aware of need to be consistent. Can be different, just need to have reasons for differences.
- Trey – Should be more commonality at L2, less at higher levels.
- John T. – Will follow up in the Curriculum Committee.

Amendments, if any:

[See discussion above.](#)

Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with friendly amendments.

Motion 2019-03-01-C

Proposal name: Insurance Issue

Submitted by: Coastal Kayak Committee

Exact wording of motion:

Change the wording of the insurance section on the ACA website to provide the latitude for Instructors/Trainers/Educators to teach material/topics that may not be specifically listed in the curriculum for the course being taught, provided that such materials/topics are taught within the environmental range of their level of certification and within their scope of practice as defined by all the curriculum within their discipline at, or below, their level of certification.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- John B. – Affects all disciplines. Policy manual is not consistent with the latitude Instructors have in teaching courses. Question 3 on the ITC online exam, says courses must stay within the curricula.

CKC believes what is on the web site should be changed so that Instructors are free to teach any skills within their level or scope of practice.

- Mike – Has always assumed he can teach anything within his certified skill level.
- Trey – Would be helpful to get Chris' input.
- Chris – If the insurance company is insuring a L3 course, you can teach anything in that L3 course. Currently, if you are certified at L4, but your insurance is for a L3 course, you are not insured for L4 skills or venue.
- Kelsey – Is a worthwhile thing to look into. Did reach out to the ACA's insurance company. Provided copy of motion, wording on web site and several examples where there might be an issue and asked for their input. Initial response was that scope of practice was a little gray, vague. Might be open to a reference back to something more specific that they can evaluate.
- John B. – Proposed language includes reference back to certification levels and course outlines.
- Chris – Change would need written approval from the insurance company.
- John B. – Understand that. Important enough to bring before the SEIC.
- Chris – Great opportunity. Change motion to figure out how to make this happen.
- Joe – Have "sample" skills outlines. May need to clarify. Also, need to clarify that skills listed at one level by implication include skills listed at all lower levels.
- Kelsey – Referencing other documents helps the insurance company understand specifics.
- Mike – Years ago, the insurance company did not understand exactly what we did. If we start picking at this, the insurance company might raise other issues, like USCG regulations for small craft. Be careful how you approach this issue.
- Chris – In the education side of the house, we have zero claims. If we start having claims, the insurance company might have more concerns.
- Joe – The other issue is that course participants have an expectation that the course will be conducted within the curricula. They have not been told it might include higher level skills and/or conditions. The duty to warn has not been met. They cannot have consented.
- Chris – Encourage motion to be approved with friendly amendment to look into how it might be done.
- John B. – Covered in three places, SEIC Policy Manual, Instructors Manual and web site. Not all are in sync. Creates confusion.
- Kelsey – Other disciplines do not have venue specific courses like rock gardens and surfing. Needs more discussion.
- Steve – options: could table for additional investigation, approve as is and take it to the Board with recommendation from SEIC Chair and staff to follow up with insurance company.
- Chris – If tabled, will have less urgency than if passed in some form with a recommendation and goes to the Board. Can at least plant the seed with the Board.

- Paula – One of the concerns with insurance, what if weather changes? If certified within the new conditions, but the new conditions are not within the course remit. Chris – Probably not currently covered.
- Beth – Can we word the motion so it is clear that it is a work in progress?
- Mike – If you get past the waiver, up to insurance company lawyers to address.
- Joe – Our insurance should already cover the change in weather as long as we have checked the forecast before launching and it was within the remit and we took the appropriate action when the weather changed. The risk is inherent.
- Greg – Can we add wording in front of the current motion to investigate?
- John B. – Accepted friendly amendment.

Amendments, if any:

Friendly amendment: Add “Investigate opportunities with the ACA Insurance company to” – followed by wording of the original motion.

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with friendly amendment.

Motion 2019-03-01-D

Proposal name: L2: Essentials of Kayak Touring – Recreational Kayaks

Submitted by: Coastal Kayak Committee

Exact wording of motion:

The Coastal Kayak Committee moves to adopt the attached curriculum to establish an L2: Essentials of Kayak Touring—Recreational Kayaks course of instruction. The attach curriculum details a sample skills course, a skills assessment, and Instructor Criteria.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- John B. – CKC and RKC have similar motions to approve curriculum for recreational kayaks. There are 10.6 million recreational kayaks, 1.6 million sea kayaks and 1.2 million whitewater kayaks. Recreational kayaks are a significant market that we are not addressing appropriately. Defined criteria as a kayak without a spray skirt. L1 covers this well, but people are using rec kayaks in conditions greater than L1. River initiated the process last Fall, CKC joined.
- Trey – Not familiar with the BSA survey, the OIA 10.6 million statistic does include SOT kayaks. So, we are currently addressing part of this market. We do not know what portion of the 10.6 million is SOT.
- Josh – Is the group we are not addressing the lay person or the kayak instructor? Would argue that a lot of people are teaching this segment of the market. Want to clarify who we are not currently serving.

- Beth – Do not currently have a curriculum for Instructors who teach in open cockpit kayaks and whose students are in open cockpit kayaks. The ones Beth comes in contact with have no desire to deal with spray skirts.
- Mike – Large operations like the State of NY and the National Park Service only offer non-spray skirted kayaks. They want to have their instructors certified. Now, he has to provide the boats. Wants to be more inclusive. A Boy Scout program is coming along and they will not be using spray skirts. Want to make it easier. Offer a limited certification.
- Kelsey – Make sure the word is always “spray skirt”, not just “skirts”.
- Trey – Does the lay public understand what is a “rec” kayak vs. just a kayak? Would CKC and RKC be open to a more understandable name, for example “non-spray skirted” kayak?
- John B. and Mike – Agree. Want wording that avoids confusion with the existing L2 EKT courses.
- Mike – We are not saying you cannot teach with spray skirts.
- Steve – Could modify the SOT courses as an option.
- Mike – Offered this approach earlier, but was turned down – too cloudy.
- Paula – Giving an opportunity to L2 instructors who are not proficient with spray skirts.
- Trey – Opposed to making the SOT curricula more difficult for non-spray skirted boats. Craft looks a lot different.
- Mike – Can require floatation in all craft. Easy to insert.
- Beth – Not including non-spray skirted at L3.
- Mike – Willing to accept separate courses or exceptions to the existing courses as long as the problem gets solved.
- Kelsey – Consider offering the same way as tandem and solo canoe courses where both candidates can be in the same course. Easier to fill the course. Keep separate for record keeping. Would not need to create six new course curricula documents.
- Mike – Not opposed to the suggestion.
- Paula – CKC considered an option to include an introductory paragraph and *s highlighting skills not needed for non-spray skirted kayaks in the existing EKT courses.
- Kelsey – Option above would be easier.
- Beth – Agrees with the modified current curricula approach.
- Steve – Only need changes in the Instructor Criteria document. Skills courses do not need to change. The Assessment courses might need small changes.
- Trey – Is anyone significantly opposed to having a qualifying statement and *s in the current L2 documents?
- John B. – We should use something other than *s. *s are currently used in EEC.
- Josh – The above would be Option A. Option B would be to include the language in SOT curricula?
- Trey – One option would be to reduce content in a separate document. The other option would be to modify existing curricula.

- John B. – Prefer to leave SOT alone.
- Josh – Modifying SOT would have the least amount of changes.
- Beth – For a beginner, hard to determine how to classify a craft.
- John B. – Likes the clean approach of separate documents, but open to modified documents.
- Chris – Would prefer one course with skirted and non-skirted options.
- Mike – Ok with that option.
- Trey – Straw poll on a friendly amendment. Option 1: Separate new L2 documents. Option 2: Modifications to existing L2 EKT documents. Option 3: Modify SOT curricula. Equal support for last two options, not six new documents.
- Paula – Modifications closer to sit inside curricula.
- John B. – Prefers modifications to the existing EKT sit inside. Can combine both types of candidates in one class.
- Chris – If motion passes, we would have one certification with skirted and non-skirted options. IT would have to be both, similar to canoe tandem and solo.
- Trey – The friendly amendment would be to modify the existing L2 EKT curriculum so it would be inclusive of both options. Break for lunch. Work with Kelsey and Chris during lunch on specific wording of amendment.

Amendments, if any:

Option 1: Motion as presented by CKC

- Add new full sets of documents for River and Coastal L2 – new, unique Skills, Assessment and Instructor Certification courses for non-skirted kayaks.

Option 2: Motion to include “non-skirted” alternate outcome in the current version of L2 documents

- Combine skirted and non-skirted instructor criteria, with some * to indicate what applies to each, also make comparable changes to assessment courses, no changes to skills course.
- Track SOT, non-skirted and regular certifications separately

Motion from the floor made, seconded and approved on allowing discussion of Option 2.

Option 3: Include “non-skirted” alternate outcome in the current version of L2 SOT documents

- Change existing SOT documents to SOT/Rec (non-skirted) and add needed content for Instructor Criteria and Assessments
- Track SOT, non-skirted and regular certifications separately

Vote:

Option 1: 2 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Option 1 did not pass.

Option 2: 6 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Option 2 passed.

Option 3: Not voted on due to Option 2 passing.

John T. to follow up with John B. and Mike on finalizing L2 document updates.

Kelsey – Confirmed that we will only have one IT level that is qualified for both skirted and non-skirted boats.

Motion 2019-03-01-E

Proposal name: L2 Instructor Certification for Recreational Kayaks Not Using Spray Skirts

Submitted by: River Kayak Committee

Exact wording of motion:

To add recreational kayaks, not using spray skirts to the training, assessment and certification curricula for River Kayaking. Certifications would be limited when granted under the non-skirted option. The RKC is offering two options for implementing this program – new, standalone L2 curricula and modifications to existing L2 curricula. Either option would be acceptable to the RKC.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- Mike – Comfortable with taking the approach to non-skirted boats approved for CKC Motion 2019-03-01-D.
- Trey – Friendly amendment would be to adopt whatever exception notation is adopted by CKC.
- Beth – Friendly amendment to remove the new standalone L2 documents (Option 1 under Motion 2019-03-01-D above)
- Mike – Accepts the friendly amendments.
- Steve – Friendly amendment to adopt the approach taken by Motion 2019-03-01-D presented by CKC.
- Mike – Accepts Steve’s amendment as well.
- Josh – What was the vote on this motion in your committee?
- Mike – Had some negative feedback in the DC meeting.
- Trey – Based on the meeting yesterday there were contra positions not reflected in the motion form.
- Josh – Some in the DC meeting thought everyone should learn to use a skirt.
- Mike – That is not what he heard.
- Chris – Did RKC approve this motion?
- Mike – Yes
- Josh – Is there documentation it was approved?

- Trey – After voting in RKC, there were still multiple positions being discussed.
- Mike – The motion is not keeping anyone from teaching in just skirted kayaks.
- Chris (after vote) – Heard that there were contra views on the proposal. Need to be careful that a motion is actually approved in the DC.
- Mike – Clarification, should the names of each voter be noted.
- Trey – That would be prudent outside of Slack.
- Chris – Would be great if RKC could show vote. Next meeting we will care.
- Mike – In future, will keep record of votes. Often he does not get responses to votes.
- Trey – Would be helpful to know if some did not comment. If not getting responses, just present that.

Amendments, if any:

Friendly amendment: To adopt the approach taken by Motion 2019-03-01-D presented by CKC with the following outcome:

To add recreational kayaks, not using spray skirts to the training, assessment and certification curricula for River Kayaking. Certifications would be limited when granted under the non-skirted option. ~~The RKC is offering two options for implementing this program – new, standalone L2 curricula and modifications to existing L2 curricula. Either option would be acceptable to the RKC.~~

Vote: 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with amendments.

Motion 2019-03-01-F

Proposal name: Creation of an Advanced Communications Endorsement Committee

Submitted by: Joe Moore/Advanced Communications Endorsement Development Work Group

Exact wording of motion:

Pursuant to SEIC Bylaws, we move to create a new Discipline Committee to govern a new Advanced Communications Endorsement. Below, we have included documentation of SEIC Bylaws compliance. A motion to adopt the Advanced Communications Endorsement Criteria document has been submitted alongside this motion.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- Trey – Motion from the floor from a work group. Do we have a second?
- Steve – Seconded.
- Joe presented a history of where the motions came from using a PowerPoint (copy not available).
- Joe – New AC motions would govern impairments in vision, deafness and speech.

- Joe – Content is about communication. 2016 observed the opportunity. Wrote a grant for funding to Veterans Affairs. 2018 began a search for subject matter experts to develop content through several channels including a page on the ACA web site.
- Joe – Received over 100 applications. Selected 10.
- Joe – Researched best practices. Nothing in the English speaking world.
- Joe – Trial taught the material.
- Joe – Refined the written material and provided in the motions presented to the SEIC.
- Joe – Adaptive cannot be put with sensory disabilities. Have proposed separate committees.
- Joe – Put governance not at the header, but with subject matter experts.
- Joe – Program quality is improved if done by subject matter experts.
- Joe – Content overlap is almost zero between AP and AC.
- Joe – Motion has a sunset clause.
- Joe – If we put this new group at the heading level, we will be changing the rules mid-stream.
- Joe – Feels confident after talking to others that a separate discipline committee will not be approved. It is off the table. However, it does not mean that subject matter experts cannot oversee and teach the material. Joe handed out Plan B (see Appendix B) based on this realization.
- Joe – Plan B proposes separate subcommittees for AP and AC, with one vote overall on the SEIC.
- Joe – Plan B amends the original motion as a friendly amendment. Basically changes committee to subcommittee.
- Mike – Every Wednesday he holds an adaptive paddling workshop. Not clinical, just there to help. Will these motions change what they have been doing?
- Joe – No change.
- Mike – All of his guys would welcome more instruction if it is close to home and free.
- Chris – Would be an issue if Greg was teaching an AC course or AC content with ACA insurance and he did not have an AC endorsement, that would be an issue.
- Joe – A little different in the world of disabilities. ADA mandates integrating persons with disabilities. Insurance cannot then deny coverage.
- Chris – There are other clarifications in the law.
- Beth – If we can pick just one motion, that would get us back on track.
- Chris – Staff has some concern with Point 6, Implementation Plan.
- Beth – Talked to some special ed education experts. Tried to pigeon hole individuals into specific categories, but discovered that their population was many things. Wasted a lot of time and energy. Now try to address all issues. Likes Plan B, but feels it is still divisive. Should be more working together. Having a single UP Chair will hopefully take the advice of subject matter experts. Two co-chairs would be confusing.

- Joe – Understand poly disabilities. How we get there is the question. How we teach it is the question. Instructor skills is what we are parsing.
- Mike – Nearly everyone has some level of PTSD. Where do we get the guys to handle those situations.
- Joe – What we are teaching are the technical skills after someone begins the road to recovery.
- John M. – Are these revisions (Plan B) coming from you (Joe) or the workgroup?
- Joe – They are coming from the conversations with members of the AP committee, conversations with members of the work group, conversations with Josh, conversations with Mike, conversations with Chris, coming from the whole pile. Not specifically from the work group as a whole. The first motion did come from the work group as a whole. Need to have a starting point.
- Steve – Thanked the work group for their efforts. Generally, likes Plan B. In the past, worked hard to eliminate separate bylaws, governance documents for each committee. Standardized on one set of bylaws. Love the spirit. Do not think the SEIC wants to approve unique bylaws for the UPC that differs from the current bylaws.
- Joe – Agrees, but wants to divide by subject matter content. The problem can be solved by having two separate committees.
- Steve – Does not necessarily agree with Joe’s logic.
- Joe – Totally different content.
- Chris – Staff is not in favor of two discipline committees. Staff is much more in favor of Plan B, minus some issues with number 6. Closer to acceptance.
- Joe – Can Plan B be an internal governance document within the UPC? Tried to even out the process, so one group would not have a trump card over the other.
- Trey – The goal is to get rid of the internal governance documents. Only the IPC has separate governance.
- Chris – Cannot imagine a chair not supporting the recommendations of a work group or subcommittee.
- Joe – Can the chair speak to the specifics of a recommendation.
- Trey – As an example, Raff in SUP cannot speak to surf or SUP yoga.
- Chris – How can a chair defend a L5 course if the chair is only a L2? Similar issue. We have significant history of one individual representing a group when they are not the subject matter expert.
- John M. – In his academic experience, he has seen committee chairs provide appropriate leadership to represent all issues. Has represented a nursing program, although he is not a subject matter expert.
- Joe – One benefit of co-chairs is the committee is twice as likely to have a representative at the SEIC meeting.
- Paula – We already have ways to designate a committee representative if the chair is not able to attend a SEIC meeting. For example, she attended a meeting when John B. was in China.

- Steve – Would this group be comfortable, if we stopped at A in Plan B. Other points in Plan B would be guiding principles. That way, we would not be approving governance that does not agree with our bylaws.
- Joe – That is fine.
- Joe – Now have an imbalance of IT's. Without governance, could become more imbalanced.
- Trey – Could go the other way at the next election.
- Steve – Hears that Joe is building in protection against a worse case scenario. Many in the room do not feel that is a real concern.
- Josh – If an imbalance does occur, a member of the underrepresented group can still come before the SEIC. There is a method to overcome these kinds of problems.
- Joe – Trying to pre-empt this type of problem.
- Trey – Agree to disagree that SUP is not a good example of this problem. Whitewater and surfers had a significant debate that ultimately resulted in the implementation of Slack to track complex issues and multiple opinions, including minority opinions.
- Joe – Suggest building in structural protections for future problems.
- Beth – Most of the elements being proposed are already in the bylaws, except equal representation.
- Chris – Let's type up the friendly amendment so everyone can see what we are voting on.
- Trey – The terms "subcommittee" and "work group" appear in the current SEIC Bylaws and possibly SEIC Policy. Used somewhat interchangeably.
- Steve – Rather than say each committee will have equal representation, could we say that the committee will strive for equal representation.
- Chris – Showed current bylaw wording on screen. UPC is the new name of the APC. Under UPC creating AP and AC subcommittees.
- Josh – Subcommittees can include non-committee members. Only members would be on the UPC and be eligible to be Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary.
- Chris – The current eight APC members would become the members of the UPC.
- Trey – Adding members would need to happen during a committee vote.
- Chris – This motion does not put two new people on the UPC.
- Steve – Would be ok to have a committee vote. This would be a qualifying event.
- Joe – Three of the five on the AC work group are currently endorsed.
- Steve – Joe and he are saying different things. Joe is say it is a new committee. Steve is saying it is a retitling of the existing committee and adding a little more under the existing committee.
- Trey – Ok with creating two subcommittees.
- Joe – Disagrees with Steve's summary.
- Chris – What is in red (purple here) is what is being voted on. The other content in the motion document, like who gets to be an IT is not being approved and is not correct.

- Steve – Can we include the retitling of the existing committee? Easier than disbanding the existing committee. We are not today at just a UPP umbrella term.
- Chris – By changing the name, the current APC members become the UPC members.
- Joe – Does not have a problem with the existing APC officers becoming the UPC officers.
- Trey – The SEIC does not have to create the subcommittees. It can however provide guidance to the UPC. The UPC can create the subcommittees as outlined in the Bylaws.
- Chris/Josh/Steve – Subcommittee members do not vote on the DC unless they are DC members.
- Chris – Not voting on Plan B, just voting on what is in red (purple here). New motion, not a friendly amendment. Replaces the original motion.
- Joe – Does not say much.
- Trey – Because the new motion relies on the language in the Bylaws on how to govern a subcommittee.
- Trey – This motion does not guarantee equal distribution of experts, it just says strive for equal distribution. Membership determination is a democratic process.
- Molly – What is the discipline committee – the UPC? All – yes. Does the SEIC even have authority to specify membership. That is up to the DC once it is established.
- Chris – The higher body, here the SEIC, does have authority to provide direction to the UPC.
- John T. – Does the other content in the motion form need to be removed to ensure there is no confusion on what is being approved?
- Steve – Other content on the original motion form, e.g. implementation plan, is not being voted on. Needs to be reviewed to determine if it agrees with the new motion. Just supplemental information.
- Chris – Already an issue with 6.b. Standards committee needs to look at who becomes new ITs.
- Steve – What is in red (purple here) is what the ACA Board approves. The other content is supplemental only and subject to review by the Standards Committee and staff.
- Marcel – Draft motion does not provide for equal representation.
- Chris – If we go back to what you said, we are starting over.
- Joe – At the last meeting, we created the UPC. Not just renaming the APC.
- Several – No, a new committee was not created.
- Trey – Retitling the APC is a shorter path to get to the UPC versus creating a new committee and disbanding the APC.

Amendments, if any:

Revised Motion: Expand the purview of the existing Adaptive Paddling Committee to become the more broadly defined Universal Paddling Committee and establish subcommittees within the Universal Paddling Committee to include an Adaptive Paddling Subcommittee and an Advanced Communications Subcommittee. The Universal Paddling Committee will strive to have equal representation of voting members from each subcommittee.

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed as amended.

Motion 2019-03-01-G

Proposal name: Creation of an Advanced Communications (AC) Endorsement

Submitted by: Joe Moore/Advanced Communications Endorsement Development Work Group

Exact wording of motion:

We move to adopt the new Advanced Communications Endorsement Criteria Document (attached and incorporated by reference) and to work with ACA Staff to roll-out the new program. A second motion for the creation of an Advanced Communications Endorsement Committee has been submitted alongside this motion.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- Joe – This is the actual endorsement document. Starting point. Likely to change. Included a sample of what might be included in a course, but is not part of the formal endorsement document.
- John M. – Change pre-requisite to L1 vs. L2.
- Joe – Hard to imagine someone at L1 having the instructional methods. Thought it should start at L2 (work group rationale).
- Beth – An L1 Instructor who wants the endorsement should have that option.
- Trey/John B. – There is nothing that says that a L2 Instructor is a better teacher than a L1 Instructor.
- Joe – Accepts the amendment.
- John M. – Wordsmithing in the course overview. The last sentence – must be ACA members to allow Kelsey to track. Reinforcing what is said in the prerequisites.
- Joe – Accepts friendly amendment.
- Joe – Add friendly amendment submitted by email, “Demonstrate knowledge ...”. Included in the AP endorsement criteria, but inadvertently omitted from the AC endorsement. Copy from the AP endorsement.

Amendments, if any:

Revised motion: We move to adopt the new Advanced Communications Endorsement Criteria Document (attached and incorporated by reference) and to work with ACA Staff to roll-out the new program. ~~A second motion for the creation of an Advanced Communications Endorsement Committee has been submitted alongside this motion.~~

Friendly amendments to the Endorsement Criteria Document:

- Course prerequisite for the endorsement: Be a certified ACA Paddling Instructor at **Level 1** or above.

- Reflect in the Course Overview that non-instructors must be members to receive certificate of completion.
- Add to endorsement criteria:
 - 2) Demonstrate knowledge & ability to perform & convey the following current best practices:
 - Development and application of Essential Eligibility Criteria
 - Interaction with persons with disabilities
 - Medical information collection and rules about disclosure
 - Transfers and carries

Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with revised wording and friendly amendments.

Motion 2019-03-01-H

Proposal name: Changes to SEIC Bylaws

Submitted by: ACA National Office Staff

Exact wording of motion:

Approve changes to the SEIC Bylaws to comply with U.S. Olympic Committee requirements based off of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act in regards to having at least 20% athlete representation on all ACA Councils and Committees.

See pre-meeting package for full motion form and bylaws markup, available at this [link](#).

Discussion/comments:

- Chris – Adding athlete representation, tweaks to IPC voting and Standards Committee tie breaker issues.
- Trey – Same version as in the most current pre-meeting packet.
- Chris – Walked through the changes in the bylaws markup in the most current pre-meeting packet.
- Chris – Clarified that athletes pay competition dues, but not SEIC dues.
- Trey – If an even number of members on the Standards Committee, the Vice Chair of the DC casts the deciding vote (Article VI.B., page 6).
- John T. – Clarify that any committee vacancies, not just athlete vacancies, e.g. SEIC Board vacancies, are not counted in determining quorums.
- Chris – Will make the change.
- Chris – Will change “Adaptive” to “Universal” wherever Adaptive appears.
- Chris – Trying to figure out how L1 Instructors can have a vote on the IPC members, Article F.4.a.iii.a on page 11.
- Beth – The IPC did not spend a lot of time on this yesterday. Cannot provide input from the committee. Plan is to provide input at the October meeting, before the next vote.
- Chris – Take “both” off and leave “one”. Leave the other changes for IPC in.

- Chris – Note that the revised roster was included in the premeeting packet. If approved by the ACA Board, the next steps will be:
 1. Call for nominations
 2. If anyone self nominates, there will be a vote by the athletes
 3. Will then let the SEIC board know the result
 4. Will be updated on the web site

Amendments, if any:

Amendments as covered in the discussion above.

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with amendments.

Motion 2019-03-01-I

Proposal name: L1 Curriculum for SUP, Canoe and Kayak

Submitted by: Introduction to Paddling Committee

Exact wording of motion:

Accept the final L1 curriculum for SUP, Canoe and Kayak

See the final SUP version as an example, attached as Appendix C.

Discussion/comments:

- Beth – In the last meeting, we approved the L1 Skills, Assessment and Instructor courses. However, there were a few things that needed to be changed to be consistent across all of the disciplines.
- Beth – Strokes are only listed in instructor criteria, so that is the only place where changes are required.
- Beth – So, used SUP as an illustration since it had one more change than the other Instructor Criteria.
- Beth – In all three, sweeps stay sweeps, forward and reverse. Draw out of water and in water recovery. For kayak and SUP, there is the low brace. SUP had several braces listed, now only low brace.
- Beth – Added “Techniques for bulldozing or towing a board and swimmer to shore”. After a long conversation in the DC, did not include SUPs unresponsive paddler requirement. The DC felt it was not appropriate at L1.
- Chris – Since removing unconscious, encourage the SEIC to approve as a motion.
- Chris – Revised documents have been submitted to NASBLA. Have heard they are close. We might have to tweak a few small things. Will get an unofficial update tomorrow.

Amendments, if any:

None

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. See Appendix A for details. Motion passed with amendments.

Old Business

Final versions of the L1 NOWS documents have been provided to Chris, Kelsey and the Executive Committee (Beth Wiegandt). See discussion above under Motion 2019-03-01-I.

Resolve governance issues regarding the Kayak Polo provisional endorsement approved at the last meeting (Trey Knight)

- Trey – Attended the last meeting by phone and did not hear a resolution of the governance discussion. The meeting minutes did not reflect a decision on which Discipline Committee would govern this endorsement. Was there a decision on this point or a recommendation from staff?
- Chris – Have not moved the needle on this point since the last meeting.
- Kelsey – They have groups and clubs that would like to attend courses. Also, the Kayak Polo work group would like to present at the upcoming IT conference.
- Steve – We have endorsements now that work both ways. Some are carefully controlled by a Discipline Committee that they naturally align with. Others are not controlled by a Discipline Committee, including Kayak Camping, Canoe Camping and Trip Leading endorsements.
- Trey – Is there a chance that the Standards Committee will have to vote on an IT for Kayak Polo?
- Steve – Should not happen.
- Trey – Only have ITs for UP endorsements. No consequence for not having a DC overseeing the endorsement, except that it slows down courses happening.
- Chris – The staff were supposed to determine how the endorsement would be governed, but did not have time to complete except for a conversation with Nigel.
- Trey – Mike and John B., would you bring this up with your committees and formulate a recommendation? It could then be discussed at the next meeting.
- Mike – Recommendation on which committee it should fall under?
- Trey – Which committee or both committees.
- John B. – A lot of Chinese students were originally kayak polo players.
- Mike – You can have it.
- Chris – There are a number of unique elements in Kayak Polo, like rolling in flat water. Need to think through.
- Trey – Ok, have a plan for resolving this issue.

New Business

Passed on discussion regarding preparing Instructors/ITs/ITEs to deliver programs with two different teaching models. Per Trey on his discussion with Greg, there was a lot of discussion on this issue in the IPC Discipline Committee meeting and it is no longer necessary to discuss in the SEIC meeting.

Update on SEIC dues change (Chris Stec)

- There are approximately 4,800 instructors. About 350 of those used to be Paddle America club members who are also instructors. Our dues before were \$30 to be an ACA member and \$35 to be an SEIC member for a total of \$65. If you were a Paddle America club member, your dues were only \$55.
- A regular family paid \$60. If you or your spouse were an Instructor, you paid an additional \$25. So, if you were a regular family and you were an Instructor, you paid \$85.
- If you were a Paddle America club family, you paid \$40. If you were also an Instructor, you paid an additional \$25.
- If you were over 62, you got a discount.
- Now it costs \$25 to be an ACA member and SEIC dues are \$35, period.
- The vast majority of the 4,800 used to be paying \$65. Now they are only paying \$60. The ACA BOD approved the decrease in revenue.
- Most members will see a decrease in dues. If you were one of 350 Paddle America club members who was also an Instructor, your dues will go up from \$55 to \$60.
- We are getting a little push back from a handful of prominent people about the increase.
- For the vast majority, dues went down. The perception is SEIC dues used to be \$25, now they are \$35. Why were dues increased? We need to walk people through the math.
- Beth – Got the same question.
- Joe – What percentage of total revenue is represented by all dues?
- Chris – ACA operating budget is \$1.1 to \$1.4 million depending on several factors. All memberships fluctuate between \$650,000 to \$725,000. About 60% - 70% of total revenue, depending on Olympic funding, grant funding, etc. We will take a little hit on the SEIC dues line.
- Steve – How the change would affect SEIC dues was discussed at the ACA BOD meeting. Steve raised the issue.

Update on efforts by the Tennessee State Director and the ACA Hq. on efforts to coordinate input on draft legislation for NMV's (Chris Stec)

- The ACA has part time staff, Brett Mayer, who is our Public Policy Chief and is based in Ashville, NC.
- The strategic plan for this year includes national issues as well as some state issues.
- Brett worked with Michael Gray in Michigan.
- In Tennessee there were some fairly hot topics. Working with Andrea White, our TN State Director. Helped get word out to our members who had a vested interest in Non-Motorized Vessels. Big impact on outfitters and Instructors.

In the next revision to the Instructor Manual, a goal should be to comply with the IAS "how to teach" guidance. (Chris Stec)

- Chris – The answer is yes. When we get to revising the Instructor Manual, need to include IAS. IAS is a fourth national standard on coaching. Verified by ANSI. Currently. with the other NOW

standards. is managed by The American Boat and Yacht Council, since the USCG stopped funding the NOWS program.

- Chris – When we do get to revising the Instructor Manual, there should be a section on this as well as differentiated learning and other things.
- Chris – Do not have enough resources in staff alone, will need help from some group.

IT Conference Planning Committee (Trey Knight)

- Working with the office on the content for the IT Conference.
- Let Trey know if you are interested in helping.
- Working on finalizing a survey to determine what ITs/ITEs want the conference to be about.
- Watch emails and Slack for the survey.
- Chris – One of the keynote speakers has already been picked. Futurist who specializes in outdoor recreation, Geoffery C. Godbey. Used to work at Pennsylvania State University, part of the Futurist Society of the US.
- Conference dates are the last weekend of the leaf season and the last weekend LL Bean will keep their facilities open for us. We had a great hotel. The contractor we used was a couple of days too slow and others usurped us. Actively looking for another conference hotel. LL Bean is providing the meeting facilities. If you know you are going, you can go to the web site. We have a block of 18 rooms reserved. Actively working to get more rooms at a reasonable price.

Upcoming SEIC Meetings

Fall 2019 SEIC Meeting – Friday, October 11, 2019

- Freeport, ME in conjunction with the IT Conference
- Motions and reports due August 27, 2019.

Plus/Delta for Meeting

Steve – Another good meeting. Appreciate the staff. Very pleased to see the transition. Thank Trey, John and Josh for stepping up to their new roles. Well done.

Josh – Thank you for the energy and time.

Paula – Very professional meeting. Thank you for putting in the time for organizing and managing it.

John B. – Good meeting. Thanked all for the support of Coastal Kayaking.

Chris – Rob, thank you for being here representing the Boy Scouts. Thanked everybody for their time. This has been a heavy lift. Thanked Joe for all of his efforts, realizing he did not get everything he wanted, appreciated his professionalism.

Kelsey – Happy all were here and we were able to get through all of the content in the agenda. Pleased to welcome the new officers.

Rob – Thank you for letting him be involved.

Joe – Appreciate seeing the elevated level of conversation on paddling. Walking away thinking we are in a very good place. Need to keep it going.

Beth – I love seeing people passionate about kayaking. Get excited seeing this passion. Also, snaps are back.

Greg – Congratulations to the new Board. Very much appreciate the involvement in committee meetings in the day before this meeting. Very positive. Thanked Joe, wonderful how he adapted to the situation.

Mike – Our officers and Standard Committee have earned their keep. Really helped solidify some issues. Got into and out of some pretty tall weeds.

John T. – Had good discussion. Impressed with how articulate and thoughtful the discussion was. Learned a lot.

Jeff – First meeting. Thanks for all of the work put into it and the professionalism. Wished that he could have been here with us.

Molly – Would have been helpful if folks would say their name when speaking to inform those on the conference line. Appreciate the opportunity to participate by phone. Kudos to Joe for all of the hard work.

Kyle – Meeting was great. A little hard to attend in person while in graduate school. Liked the fire, spirit and passion in this meeting and the DC meeting yesterday. Really excited to be involved in critical paddling things.

Trey – Echo all the things, Joe, Mike and John. Thank you for making his first meeting professional.

Trey – Motion to adjourn. John B. – so moved. Josh – seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:45

Respectfully submitted

John Traendly

SEIC Secretary

SEIC Board Meeting, March 1, 2019 - Attendance and Voting Record

SEIC Board - Voting Members	Name	Attending/Alternate	Minutes	Motion A	Motion B	Motion C	Mot D1	Mot D2	Motion E	Motion F	Motion G	Motion H	Motion I
Chair	Trey Knight	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vice Chair	Josh Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Secretary	John Traendly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Past Chair	Steve Hutton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Introduction to Paddling Chair	Beth Wiegandt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Adaptive Paddling Chair	John MacDonald	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	n/p	n/p
Canoe Touring Chair	Molly Gurien	Y	n/p	Y	Y	n/p	Abstain	Abstain	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Coastal Kayaking Chair	John Browning	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Prone Paddling Chair	Adam Masters	N											
Rafting Chair	Elisha Lynn McArthur	N											
River Canoeing Chair	Greg Wolfe	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
River Kayaking Chair	Mike Aronoff	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Abstain	Y	Y	Y
Safety & Rescue Chair	Sam Fowlkes	N											
Stand Up Paddleboard Chair	Raff Kuner	N											
Surfski Chair	Chuck Conley	N											
Surf Kayaking Chair	Sean Morley	N											
SEIC Chair Appointment	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>n/a</i>											
SEIC Chair Appointment	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>n/a</i>											
Board of Directors Appointment	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>n/a</i>											
Board of Directors Appointment	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>n/a</i>											
International Representative	Ge Wu	N											
International Representative	Jim Coffey	<i>n/a</i>											
At-Large Member	Jeff Atkins	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
At-Large Member	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>n/a</i>											
		For >>>	10	11	11	10	2	6	10	10	11	10	10
Quorum = 40% of the voting members		Opposed >>>	0	0	0	0	8	4	1	0	0	0	0
Voting positions = 24		Abstaining >>>	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Filled voting positions = 19		Result >>>	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed
Voting members present = 11													
Quorum = 8 Quorum Present		n/a = position not filled					n/p = not present at the time of the vote						

**Plan B: An amendment to the motion titled:
“Creation of an Advanced Communications Endorsement Committee”**

This single page is intended as an amendment to motion titled “*Creation of an Advanced Communications Endorsement Committee.*” This amendment will create one UPP with two sub-committees. All expressed goals (except for one) can still be met if we adopt the following subcommittee structure for a UPP Committee.

- A. All occurrences of the word “committee” within the existing motion shall be replaced with the word “subcommittee.”
- B. The structure below shall enter the record as an attachment to the motion. The structure below is intended to organizing the UPP into two subcommittees, each with governance over the curriculum for which it has subject-matter expertise.
 - 1.) The UPP Committee shall have only one vote on the SEIC
 - 2.) The UPP Committee shall be comprised of two subcommittees
 - 3.) The UPP shall have an equal number of AP and AC representatives (this requirement will be met with the existing motion as amended by this document)
 - 4.) Each subcommittee shall be comprised of subject-matter experts (this requirement will be met with the existing motion as amended by this document)
 - a. To be on the AP subcommittee, someone must be AP Endorsed Instructor
 - b. To be on the AC subcommittee, someone must be AC Endorsed Instructor
 - 5.) Each sub-committee shall govern the content and development of the curriculum for which it has subject-matter expertise
 - a. AP subcommittee shall have governance over topics related to the AP Program
 - b. AC subcommittee shall have governance over all topics related to the AC Program
 - 6.) The UPP shall have two co-chairs
 - a. One co-chair represents the AP
 - b. One co-chair represents the AC. (The AC subcommittee will elect a co-chair within one week of adoption of this motion).
 - c. Only one of the two co-chairs can vote on any given motion at an SEIC meeting
 - d. SEIC motions shall be presented and the discussion led by the relevant co-chair who has subject-matter expertise
 - e. If the relevant co-chair cannot represent a motion before the SEIC, then that subcommittee can appoint another subcommittee member to represent the motion and vote in place of the co-chair.
 - f. If both co-chairs are present at a SEIC meeting, the co-chair presenting a motion shall vote on that motion
 - g. The vote on SEIC motions that are not directly related to a UPP discipline may be voted on by either co-chair, or, in the absence of both co-chairs, a representative appointed by either sub-committee.
 - i. The UPP vote on these motions shall reflect the majority of the entire UPP not just the subcommittee of the person casting the vote
 - h. The AC subcommittee shall have a seat on each discipline committee currently offered to the AP subcommittee, including the Intro to Paddling Committee and the Instruction Committee.
 - 7.) Changes to this UPP subcommittee structure shall be decided by majority vote of both subcommittees and require SEIC approval.



Level 1: Introduction to Stand Up Paddleboarding

Instructor Criteria

Overview: Fundamentally, we expect that participants have the paddling skills, technical knowledge, rescue ability, teaching ability, group management, and interpersonal skills commensurate with this level of certification (Level 1) prior to presenting themselves for evaluation as Instructor Candidates at an Instructor Certification Exam (ICE).

Essential Eligibility Criteria (EEC):

ACA courses are open to all individuals who acknowledge the ability to perform the following essential eligibility criteria.

1. Breathe independently (i.e., not require medical devices to sustain breathing)
2. Independently maintain sealed airway passages while under water
3. Independently hold head upright without neck / head support
4. Manage personal care independently or with assistance of a companion
5. Manage personal mobility independently or with a reasonable amount of assistance
6. Follow instructions and effectively communicate independently or with assistance of a companion
7. Independently turn from face-down to face-up and remain floating face up while wearing a properly fitted life jacket*
8. Get on / off or in / out of a paddlecraft independently or with a reasonable amount of assistance*
9. Independently get out and from under a capsized paddlecraft*
10. Remount or reenter the paddlecraft following deep water capsize independently or with a reasonable amount of assistance*
11. Maintain a safe body position while attempting skills, activities and rescues listed in the appropriate Course Outline, and have the ability to recognize and identify to others when such efforts would be unsafe given your personal situation*

** To participate in adaptive programs, participants must acknowledge only the first six EEC listed above. Entry-level adaptive programs will involve teaching and practicing EEC #7-11.*

Course Prerequisites: Completion of the appropriate level skills course, assessment course or equivalent skills.

Instructor Trainer: This certification course may be offered by L1 or higher ACA Instructor Trainers or Instructor Trainer Educators in their discipline

Course Duration: Combined IDW and ICE - Minimum 2 days (16 hours) for one discipline. Each additional discipline would require a minimum of 1 day (8 hours).

Course Location / Venue: Flat water, protected from wind, waves and outside boat traffic, with current less than 0.5 knots, and within swimming distance of shore.

Class Ratio: 5 Instructor Candidates : 1 Instructor Trainer; with an additional instructor, the ratio can be 10:2

Succeeding courses: Level 2 Instructor Certification Courses in the appropriate discipline.



Level 1: Introduction to Stand Up Paddleboarding

Instructor Criteria

The following is a list of the criteria used to evaluate Instructor Candidates. The content and sequence of evaluation is to be adjusted to best fit the participant's needs, class location, time allowance, and be craft appropriate. The course content includes the [National On Water Standards for human powered craft](#). The full rubric for Level 1 paddling and rescue skills can be found in the above link, pages 16-46. The full set of related content knowledge standards can be found on pages 59-66.

General Requirements for all Instructor Certifications:

- Be at least 18 years old
- Meet the appropriate essential eligibility criteria
- Successfully complete an Instructor Certification Workshop (IDW and ICE)
- Be a full ACA member
- Upon successful completion, register with the Safety Education and Instruction Council
- Have and maintain first aid and age appropriate CPR
- Demonstrate a general knowledge of paddlesports and the ACA
- Demonstrate the ability to appropriately perform and teach all of the following material, unassisted, in the appropriate venue

Maintenance Requirements:

- Teach at least two courses, that meet ACA standards, within the four-year certification period and properly report the courses to the National Office
- Complete an Instructor Update, at the highest level of certification, during the four-year certification period
- Maintain ACA membership and SEIC registration annually
- Maintain appropriate CPR and first aid certification for the duration of certification

Level 1: Introduction to SUP Instructor Requirements:

- 1) Demonstrate a knowledge of ACA Paperwork:
 - How to register and report a course (with and without insurance)
 - An understanding of the ACA Waiver and Release of Liability
- 2) Demonstrate a knowledge of teaching and learning theory:
 - Have an understanding of multiple modalities of teaching and how they impact different learners
 - Differentiate instruction targeting different learners
 - Use effective teaching methods
 - Present information effectively (both prepared and impromptu)
- 3) Use of [National On Water Standards for human powered craft](#) (NOWS) to:
 - Evaluate other paddlers and provide effective feedback
 - Effectively make documented skill assessments



Level 1: Introduction to Stand Up Paddleboarding

Instructor Criteria

- Display familiarity with NOWS rubrics (pages 16-46)
- 4) Demonstrate the following:
 - Positive interpersonal skills
 - Appropriate group management skills (including leadership and judgment)
 - Ability to choose an appropriate venue /class site
 - 5) Demonstrate ability to paddle efficiently and comfortably, in flat water.
 - Board stability and trim
 - Stances: Prone, Sitting, Kneeling, Neutral/slight stagger variations
 - Efficient and effective paddle placement for intended maneuver
 - Safe and effective body usage: Bio-Mechanics (Body, Linkage and Rotation)
 - Parts of strokes: CPR (Catch, Power, Recovery), static and dynamic
 - 6) The ability to teach and model:
 - Forward
 - Back
 - Sweeps (forward, reverse)
 - Draw (out of water and in water recovery)
 - Low Brace
 - 7) The ability to teach and model these basic maneuvers effectively:
 - Enter and launch board from shore in a controlled manner, checking for clear departure
 - Propel the board forward in a straight line 15-20 board lengths
 - Stop the board within two board lengths
 - Move the board backwards 3-4 board lengths
 - Turn the board from a stationary position 180° to the right and left
 - Move the board sideways 10 feet (3 meters) to each side
 - Propel the board in a figure of 8 course around markers 3-4 board lengths apart
 - Turn the board while maintaining forward motion 90° to the right and left
 - Arrive at destination point, checking for clear approach, and exit the board in a controlled and safe manner
 - 8) Demonstrate the ability to teach and model basic rescue techniques/concepts effectively, **and as appropriate to craft.**
 - Awareness of rescue priorities: people, board, paddle, gear
 - Use of safe progressions T-RETHROG (Talk, Reach, THrow, ROw, Go) - including throwable floating aid/throw bag use
 - Responsibilities of: the group, rescuer, swimmers
 - Demonstrate the use of appropriate rescue and safety gear for the craft and planned activity
 - Rescue self and the board using multiple effective self rescue techniques (e.g., recover board and paddle, swim self and board to shore, with and without leash).
 - Deep Water Rescue: unassisted remounting of board from side or back of board



Level 1: Introduction to Stand Up Paddleboarding

Instructor Criteria

- Rescue a person in the water and capsized board using appropriate techniques and equipment for the board
 - Techniques for bulldozing or towing a board and swimmer to shore
- 9) Demonstrate knowledge of, and ability to teach, the following knowledge/skills effectively, referring to the [NOWS document](#) for human powered craft knowledge standards (pages 59-66):
- Weather conditions, forecasts, and other environmental hazards (wind, water, weather, waves)
 - Evaluating hazards to navigation
 - Importance of developing good judgment and group responsibility for a trip
 - Evaluating ability, water comfort, and confidence of participants prior to trip
 - Warm ups, conditioning, physical training to reduce injury
 - Securing board for transport using proper tie downs, straps, or knots.
 - Proper techniques to safely lift and carry the board on shore
 - Life jackets appropriate for the individual's size, craft, and activity, assuring all others in the group are properly wearing their life jacket
 - Inspect the board and all safety equipment to meet state, federal, and local requirements for the vessel and activity
 - Safe paddling practices (behavior, substance abuse, on water and land etiquette, leave no trace ethics)
 - Elements of a float plan (Who, What, When, Where, filing practices)
 - Review personal equipment needed for the board, activity and environment
 - Prepare board for departure: stowing gear securely, and ensuring board is balanced
 - Review paddling equipment, terminology (board and paddle), and care of gear
 - How to hold the paddle in correct orientation and grip for effective paddling
 - Personal and group gear including, but not limited to:
 - Environmental supplies (food, water, appropriate clothing, sunscreen, etc.)
 - Navigational and signaling tools (maps, charts, whistle, etc.)
 - Safety and rescue tools
 - Repair kit
 - First aid kit (appropriate to training)
 - Review the dangers of paddle sports and how to plan an appropriate course to avoid potential hazardous situations.
 - How to avoid/prevent cold water shock, hypothermia and hyperthermia by choosing proper clothing; recognizing and treating early symptoms; 1-10-1 rule.
 - Recognize the importance of hydration
 - Appropriately use communication (paddle/oar and whistle) signals
 - Basic navigational rules for inland waterways
 - Awareness of the group and effective on water management techniques; minimum/maximum standards
 - Secure the board and equipment before leaving unattended, with attention paid to environment and conditions
- 10) Demonstrate leadership, group management skills, experience and judgment necessary to be a safe, effective instructor.

Note: An Instructor is expected to be able to demonstrate, and teach, everything on the L 1 Skills Course and The L1 Skills Assessment for their craft.