

FCC minutes Dec 21, 2010

In attendance: Jim *Stevens*, David *Howes*, Lynn *Seguin*

Business from last minutes:

Nov 29 minutes: **David and Jim to come up with sample questions for this “bank” of FCC questions as examples**

Agenda:

- LTAD coach implementation
- Instructional program with delivery & evaluation standard throughout the country
- Old NCCP to new NCCP

Old business:

Sample question for exams to be done for next meeting in Jan.

New business:

LTAD – where do coaches fit into the movement?

Educate coaches already in Comp Dev courses; what does it mean to the coach practically?

Coaches need to be involved in competition review committees in their clubs and provinces. Coaches are trained to know that the competition schedule, schedule of games and qualification for games and national teams plays a major role in the development of cadet & junior fencers. We are suggesting that all PSOs have at least one coach on their Board of Directors or a relevant committee so that the voice of coaches informs the decisions of the PSO.

National competition review (done by the CFF) should develop guidelines for the provinces so they can mesh their competitions guidelines. Specifically, the decisions of the CFF regarding competition schedule decisions should be transparent to the PSOs so that they can build their own schedules to work with the national system. At all levels (Cadet, Junior, Senior, Veteran), the national plans for Long Term Athlete Development should be reflected in the PSOs decisions around competitions.

Use of LTAD language in everything we do as coaches and administrators should be encouraged so a common understanding of the principles is developed.

Active for life area not really used or understood well. Coaches can encourage the continuation of fencers into their senior years and not always centred on making a senior team. Other parts of fencing can be presented to fencers such as refereeing, DT and armoury. The encouragement of paying provincial referees and DT and armoury personnel is important.

Arm Band/Instructional program

Standardization of examination: language not very clear in the main document so interpretation leads to different understanding of it.

Evaluation: yellow & orange levels should not be evaluated at one time. Same kind of idea as coaching exams, the exam should be more of a week evaluation done over time. The evaluation of students progressing through the levels should also be escalating in difficulty and formality. At each level the testing can evolve into more of an exam, but should initially be a low-pressure and on-going evaluation of the acquisition of the skills by the fencer. The progression of who does the evaluation should progress, i.e. the club coach – the provincial coach, the next province coach, national coach.

A disconnect within the instructional program with skill development. These skills are taught by community coaches, not national coaches. Some skills are too complicated for the club coach.

LTAD review should include skills review of the Instructional program.

Action:

Lynn to get a copy of the QC DVD to share with FCC committee to view skills in preparation of review for LTAD.

Jim to share his skills set-up plan next meeting.

Old NCCP to New NCCP doc.

Tabled for next meeting, information gathering needs to happen for this to progress.

Other discussion:

FIE courses –

Motion- Canada recognizes **Fencing Master** to be a Coach with **Level 4 (or Advance Comp Dev) in all 3 weapons**. *David, second: Jim all in favour – passed*

Motion – To have FIE courses, which the FIE is calling “For the Development of Masters”, recognized as “Trained” at Level 3 Comp Dev. “Certified” would require a board examination & Foreign Coach equivalencies obtained. *Jim, second: David all in favour – passed.*

Cadet/Junior selection criteria –

Cadet Developmental & junior developmental tournament criteria: when was criteria changed and not mentioned to coaches? This has to do with cadet achieving top 32 at a Jr. NAC receiving credit, but the current program does not allow Cadets to get HP program points in a Junior event.

Note that the recently released HP Program document from the CFF specifically mentions the policy for changing the interpretation of HP policy:

Any changes to this document shall be communicated directly to all National Team Members. This clause shall not be used to justify changes after a competition or trials which formed part of the internal nomination procedure, unless it is related to an unforeseen circumstance.

The purpose of this section is also to allow for changes to this document that may become necessary due to a typographical error or a lack of clarity in a definition or wording before it has an impact on athletes. The purpose of such changes must be in order to avoid disputes over the meaning of the provisions of this document rather than to allow changes to be made to justify selection of different athletes than would have otherwise been selected.

All changes must be reasonably justifiable in accordance with fundamental principles of natural justice and procedural fairness.

December 22, 2010

Next meeting Jan. 24th 8am SK time