



Recommendations for State Chairs on Sanction Requests

1. Management of Competition Calendar and State Needs

- **Assessment of Calendar Saturation:**
 - **Prevent Oversaturation:** State Chairs should monitor the number of competitions scheduled within specific regions and time frames. If adding a new event would lead to an oversaturation that negatively impacts participation in existing events, the sanction request may be denied.
 - **Balanced Scheduling:** Aim for a balanced distribution of competitions throughout the year and across different regions to maximize accessibility and participation.
- **Strategic Event Planning:**
 - **Serve Underrepresented Areas:** Prioritize sanctioning events in areas with fewer competitions to expand the sport's reach.
 - **Avoid Conflicts with Major Events:** Deny sanctions for events that conflict with national or significant regional competitions unless they serve a different demographic or purpose.

2. Verification of Meet Director Qualifications

- **Minimum Qualifications:**
 - **Knowledge of Rules:** Ensure the MD has a thorough understanding of USAPL rules and regulations and are familiar with how to run an event.
 - **Must be a current State Referee at minimum.**
 - **Resource Availability:** Confirm that the MD has access to the necessary equipment, venue, and qualified personnel to run a compliant and safe event.
- **Compliance History:**
 - **Past Performance:** Review the MD's history for any previous sanctions, complaints, or violations of USAPL policies.
 - **Corrective Actions:** If past issues exist, determine if the MD has taken appropriate corrective actions to address them.

3. Objective and Fair Decision-Making

- **Avoid Personal Bias:**
 - **No Denial Based on Animosity:** Personal disagreements or animosity should not influence the decision. If the MD is qualified and the event serves the community's needs, the sanction should not be denied on these grounds.
- **Transparent Criteria:**
 - **Clear Guidelines:** Decisions should be based on established, transparent criteria that are communicated to all potential MDs.
 - **Documentation:** Keep records of all sanction requests and the reasons for approval or denial.

4. Communication and Conflict Resolution

- **Open Dialogue:**



- **Engage with MDs:** If there are concerns about a sanction request, discuss them openly with the MD to seek resolutions before making a denial.
- **Provide Feedback:** Offer constructive feedback and guidance to help the MD meet the necessary requirements.
- **Escalation Process:**
 - **Disputes should first be sent to the Chair of State Chairs (CSC).** If CSC can't resolve, then CSC sends to ED for review by the EC. The EC intent is to give you/CSC full confidence and authority to resolve issues

5. Denial Based on Legitimate Concerns

- **Valid Reasons for Denial:**
 - **Oversaturation:** The event would lead to an excessive number of competitions in a short period or area, harming overall participation.
 - **Unqualified MD:** The MD lacks necessary experience, has a history of non-compliance, a history of canceling events, or cannot meet USAPL standards.
 - **Resource Limitations:** The MD cannot secure appropriate venues, equipment, or staff to conduct a safe and compliant event.
 - **Conflict with Significant Events:** The proposed event directly conflicts with major state, regional, or long standing events, potentially dividing the participant base.

6. Prohibited Reasons for Denial

- **Personal Conflicts:**
 - **Animosity or Rivalry:** Personal issues between the State Chair and the MD are not valid grounds for denial.
 - **Competition Between MDs:** Denying a sanction to limit competition among MDs is not acceptable if the event benefits the lifters.
- **Discrimination:**
 - **Bias Based on Identity:** Denial should not be based on the MD's race, gender, religion, or other protected characteristics.

7. Support and Development for Meet Directors

- **Training Opportunities:**
 - **Mentorship:** Facilitate mentorship opportunities with experienced MDs.
- **Resource Provision:**
 - **Guidelines and Checklists:** Offer comprehensive guidelines and checklists to help MDs understand meet requirements.
 - **Ongoing Support:** Be available to answer questions and provide assistance throughout the event planning process.

8. Continuous Review and Improvement

- **Feedback Mechanisms:**
 - **Post-Event Evaluations:** Collect feedback from participants, officials, and the MD after events to assess performance and identify areas for improvement.
 - **Adjust Policies as Needed:** Regularly review and update sanctioning policies to reflect the evolving needs of the sport and the community.



9. Collaboration with the Executive Committee

- **Policy Alignment:**
 - **Reporting:** Keep the EC informed of significant issues, trends, or disputes related to sanction requests.

Example Scenario Application

Acceptable Denial:

- A Meet Director requests a sanction for an event scheduled two weeks after another major competition in the same city. Approving this could split participation and harm both events. The State Chair discusses alternative dates with the MD, but no feasible solution is found. Based on calendar saturation and potential negative impact, the State Chair denies the sanction.

Unacceptable Denial:

- A Meet Director with whom the State Chair has had past disagreements submits a sanction request for a well-planned event that meets all requirements and serves an underserved area. Denying this sanction based on personal animosity is not acceptable. The State Chair should approve the sanction or refer the matter to the EC if they feel unable to make an unbiased decision.

Conclusion

State Chairs have a critical role in managing the competition landscape within their states. By adhering to these recommendations, they can make fair and objective decisions regarding sanction requests. This approach ensures that personal biases do not hinder the growth of the sport and that the needs of lifters are placed at the forefront.