RCRF Board Meeting 11/13/2016

Attendees: Karl Harshe, James Hughes, Kevin Vermeesch

1. Old business
	1. HOCR Wrap Up
		1. Find location early next year to hold dinner
			1. Private room
				1. Possible “tickets” up front so that RCRF pays for everyone
	2. Post Dinner Meeting
		1. Confused by the lack of response to the new boat and oars from CRI
2. Set up link between Bryan-RCRF-other alumni
	1. Pass through so that people can ask questions about the team/future/concerns
		1. Make it so that we have an idea of what is going on and what issues are popping up that alumni want addressed so that we can attempt to address them directly through action
	2. Email with google form embedded
3. December email
	1. Get access to Mailchimp
	2. Write up PDF/email reminding people of year end donations
	3. Outline what the foundation has done over the last year in regards to direct benefits for the team
	4. Needs to be sent out by December first full week of December
4. Website
	1. Ask Courtney to set up basic Weebly account with:
		1. Contact info
		2. Donate button with redirect to a page that says “Please send check to the following address, made out to Red Cedar Rowing Foundation”
		3. Submissions page for contact info on current alumni
			1. Name
			2. Email address
			3. Physical address
			4. Phone number
5. Recruiting women
	1. Karl’s approach:
		1. Foster good will with Matt by actively recruiting women on behalf of the funded team for 2 years
			1. At the end of 2 years, approach Matt with the idea of the club restarting the women’s team by using women Matt will cut in the following season
				1. Treat the club team like a JV to develop rowers who otherwise would not make the funded team as a novice in hopes of making the team in the future – and lightweights
	2. Issues brought up in relation to Karl’s approach:
		1. The club already has issues recruiting and maintaining a novice men’s team
			1. This would just draw resources away a weakness of the current club - recruiting in general
			2. Matt can always say no, so the team will have wasted 2 years in this effort
			3. The club is already supposed to be co-ed, why should we have to ask Matt for permission
				1. Jimmy’s opinion being the club shouldn’t and the club should be supported by the club sports department in efforts to provide for rowing for all genders
			4. We’ve tried this before and it didn’t work out
				1. If anything, it caused more friction because Matt started to invade into the club’s meetings
				2. The club saw 1 rower participate in the club for 3 weeks
			5. Women who don’t make the funded team may feel scorned by the sport and not want to participate at any level
				1. Especially when they find out they have to pay and they don’t have a dedicated women’s coach
			6. Even if this does work out, unlikely there will be enough women to pay for a women’s coach, even part-time, creating a situation the team experienced in the past when there weren’t enough coaches to go around nor boats
	3. Positives from this approach
		1. If it is successful, a women’s team will restart, bringing women alumni back into the fold who have otherwise said they would not donate to a men’s only program
		2. More rowers = more money and easier budgeting
		3. The team was the most successful when there were both men and women on the team with the following conditions
			1. Serious head coach
			2. Serious novice coach
			3. Emphasis on competition and winning
	4. As an alumni board, we find that at least attempting to spur growth of a women’s team is worth the effort. However, an emphasis on recruiting is a must, otherwise the idea will most likely fail
6. Future business
	1. Website by December
	2. Talk with Bryan about clothing and labeling
		1. We are not MSU Men’s Rowing and the clothing should not say that either
			1. Alienates women alumni who had interest in purchasing clothing
				1. They saw it and declined to purchase because of the phrasing
	3. Postcards