

GUE Board of Advisors Meeting, April 2016

1. Welcome; importance of group support and GUE community development.
 - a. Currently, a very small group manage most items which stunts development and expansion.
 - b. Focus upon niche market limits organizational resources.
 - c. This issue remains key organization issue. BOA support much appreciated as a good start.
2. BOA meeting structure
 - a. April meeting was rushed as availability for coming month was limited. Future meetings will involve distributing agenda prior to meeting to GUE instructors. Agenda items can be submitted by all vested parties (instructors, staff and members).
 - b. Quarterly meetings with timing based upon GMT time and coordinated by online survey.
 - c. Technical/Cave Administrator (Kirill Egorov) officially acknowledged and confirmed by BOD to gather agenda items.
 - i. Agenda items sent to Kirill at any point during the year. Kirill will assemble these items and post to the instructor list at least five days prior to BOA meeting.
 - ii. Kirill is also responsible for distributing meeting summary to BOA for review within two weeks and then to instructors within 4 weeks.
 - d. All the above items in point two are approved and ratified by the BOA.
3. BOA purpose, responsibility and governance
 - a. BOA will provide democratic decision making and encouraging pro-active role in governing GUE, limiting dependence upon any particular individual.
 - i. Agreement to resolve issues by email where practical with one-week agreed turnaround for responses. This is working effectively thus far.
 - ii. Complex issues will be tabled for BOA group discussion by GoToMeeting or similar.
 - iii. Each BOA member may be solicited by instructors or GUE members seeking an advocate for a particular issue. GUE BOA members are in agreement regarding this arbitration role.
 - iv. Substantive policy issues will involve presentation to instructor list for open discussion.
 1. The list will be given a minimum of 2 weeks to share ideas/suggestions/concerns regarding the topic at hand.
 2. Some concern was represented as pertains to productive and open discussion. The Chairman was tasked with presenting a system for ratification by the BOA. The goal would be to support sharing but limit unproductive email traffic.
 - b. BOA will determine new IT/IEs by 2/3rds consensus.
 - i. IT/IE positions should not be considered a natural progression as they are chosen based upon both motivation and organizational needs.
 - ii. Kirill has been tasked with developing an IT/IE application form including prerequisites. Sample draft for group review by May 15.
 - iii. Candidates will apply and be evaluated quarterly during BOA meetings. Candidates must have their application submitted to Recreational or Technical Administrator (Dorota or Kirill) at least one month before scheduled meeting in order to be considered during that meeting.

- iv. Approved candidates will require a workshop for ratification which shall be developed and approved by the BOA.
 - v. Dorota will create a proposal including S&P review/update presentation to be shared with Panos and Gareth and used during IT/IE development. Draft for review by end of May.
 - c. All the above items in point three are approved and ratified by the BOA.
- 4. Discussion Regarding New Quality Control Structure:
 - a. Gareth Lock – proactive risk management role including materials and workshops for instructors.
 - b. From QC standpoint, Gareth and Panos will independently review complaints/cases providing redundancy and additional objectivity.
 - i. Each will present independent report to a larger QC board to be determined by Panos and Gareth. Neither Panos nor Gareth will sit on the board which will vote on the appropriate action.
 - c. Mark Devoldere – trustee of the standards. Mark will submit a plan to the BOA but in essence will keep the only live version of the standards which are only updated by BOA approval. Updates will be made by Mark and delivered to HQ. Mark will maintain a version control document recording all changes/updates to standards which will be circulated with any future standards revisions.
 - i. Mark supporting Dorota in new class development
 - ii. Mark evaluating areas of contradiction or needed refinement in Standards.
 - iii. Chairman has requested that Mark review GUE Standards for places in which the BOA process shall be incorporated.
 - d. All the above items in point 4 are approved and ratified by the BOA.

Submitted Agenda Items

- 5. Request for “Simplified” DPV program, i.e. single DPV and single stage
 - a. BOA consensus against this provision agreeing it drains resources with insufficient gain.
- 6. Request to allow 1:1 ratio during Fundamentals part 1
 - a. Majority of BOA members are in agreement to support this provision.
 - b. BOA will announce instructor discussion and finalize decision by email.
- 7. Request to split Rec 2 into subcomponent parts
 - a. For example, allowing a rescue component to be taken separately and possibly in the future as a requirement for other programs.
 - b. Various members are also receiving requests for Triox primers.
 - c. Splitting into parts has several advantages in making classes accessible and possibly increasing uptake, making better use of important skills/topics i.e. rescue. On the other side it might make scheduling Rec 2 classes more difficult and also make GUE class structure more complicated.
 - d. BOA members were mostly supportive and agreed to review a forthcoming Rescue Primer as a means to discuss details. This item will also be relayed to the instructor list for discussion.

8. Request for statement regarding current GUE position with respect to use of decompression computers. Historically GUE has taken a strong stance against decompression computers. Many aspects previously seen as problematic with computers are resolved i.e. appropriate decompression and general reliability. The BOA agree GUE students and divers should be able to use these computers as long as we maintain a thorough understanding of decompression and decompression planning. The Chairman has been asked to generate a preliminary restatement for review and approval.
9. Request for one-year advance announcement of GUE Conference.
 - a. All agreed in concept but appreciate the struggle to justify the resources especially when rotating to various locations which adds cost and complexity. Many questions were asked about the importance of the conference in general given the many options available.
 - b. General agreement in support of value for core contingent and especially instructors. As such agreement was to keep the conference in the best location in terms of cost and complexity.
 - c. Plan bi-annual, fixed in Gainesville/HS where cost and difficulty is at lowest levels. Support for alternating years will vary with proposals and may or may not occur as options develop.
 - i. HQ tasked with development of dates for next event: October 28-29, 2017, High Springs/Gainesville, FL
 - ii. Future bi-annual dates will hold to similar timing.
10. Request to coordinate training material release so as to provide all language versions simultaneously.
 - a. While desirable the BOA agrees this provision is not likely to be successful. It was decided to encourage this provision by allowing more time for future releases of English versions but not to inordinately delay the release of finished materials.
11. Request for teaching and activity requirements as hard limits in the renewal IT/IE status so that representatives not meeting requirements
 - a. Request to require all IT/IE representatives teach at least one entry class to novices in the relevant curriculum.
 - b. Request that all IT/IE representatives are active working with instructor candidates.
 - i. The BOA agrees in the general usefulness of these provisions, asserting active representatives generally make the best IT/IEs. As such there was general agreement that many or even most cases of inactive representatives would result in non-renewal.
 - ii. The BOA consensus is that non-renewal of IT/IEs can occur with lack of activity as in a. or b. but also for other reasons at the discretion of the BOA. While generally in agreement with the need for recent activity, the BOA felt certain life circumstances might come into play during a single year and instead unanimously voted to uphold a similar provision of automatic non-renewal for representatives not meeting the above provisions within a two year period.
 - iii. Therefore, representatives not meeting the requirements of a. or b. within a period of two years will automatically be suspended. Individuals not meeting the above requirements within one year may or may not be renewed at the discretion of the BOA and in consideration of recommendations by Quality Control.
12. Close of meeting
 - a. Next meeting options presented week of April 25
 - b. Open call for agenda items submitted to Kirill