Washington Science Olympiad Board of Directors:

Spring Board Meeting

Meeting Details

- **2025-04-26, 09:00 – 11:00 PDT / 12:00 – 14:00 EDT**
- https://yale.zoom.us/my/george.sun

Attendance

Invited	**Region**	**Present?**
Lei Jiang (Interim State Director)	SW	yes
George Sun (Chair)	NW	yes
Scott McComb (Vice Chair)	NW	yes
Marla Haugen (Secretary)	E	yes
David Rosi (Treasurer)	SW	
Sheila Guard	NW	yes
Edie Lie	NW	yes
Jay Loutherback	E	yes
Senthil Natesan	E	yes
Banny Wong	SW	yes
Florence Liang (Student Advisor)	SW	
Amanuel Nega (Student Advisor)	NW	
Jane Park (Student Advisor)	E	yes

Meeting Notes

I. **Call to Order**
   A. Called to order 9:02 AM.
II. **Roll Call**
   A. See above
III. **Approval of Prior Minutes (5 min)**
   A. 2025 01 04 - Winter Board Meeting
   B. Edie moved and Senthil seconded to approve the minutes, passed unanimously by hand vote
IV. **Agenda**
   A. Updates
      1. State Director [Report]
         a) Highlights from Lei
            (1) 144 teams overall in Regionals
            (2) 2 NW Tournaments thanks to Edie hosting another tournament when growth demanded it
            (3) No new schools in SW (existing teams grew so numbers did increase)
            (4) State had one school limit numbers because of Spring Break … another school was invited to fill that spot…3 First place Finishers invited for B & C each
            (5) 120+ volunteers @ state starting in Fall to recruit State Test Writers
            (6) Fewer CWU volunteers this year but they were good and picked up when needed
            (7) Overall timing of getting results in was faster. A few events to improve
            (8) Great stats in Lei's slides about the challenge of the event tests.
            (9) Had to re-write some of the tests written by HS students for B division - solidify how we want those tests written
            (10) Thanks to Edie and Scott for their work on managing B and C logistics
            (11) Overall, most feedback very positive!
            (12) Simon: had 2 separate audit teams but could have used 3 audit teams of 2 people each. Scoring had a more robust process this year, but could have used more

people. Duosmium couldn't handle FPQ scoring as we wanted it to.

(13) Some events didn't run as smoothly as desired due to supervisor inexperience (eg, Sustainable Energy didn't have necessary supplies)

(14) Many hands make light work but everyone in charge means nobody is in charge so need to find a balance.

(15) Simon suggests an event supervisor training …so much does depend on the volunteers we find. They hosted zoom training for Regionals and thought that helped.

(16) Jane says Regionals WIDI was very different than State and continuity would be nice

(17) Sharing resources across Regionals is a great start and now we can work to improve those.

(18) Scott brings up that teams bringing volunteers should bring experienced volunteers…not newbies (even Regional supervisors should have some experience)

(19) Action Items:

(a) Training supervisors? Early in Season

2. Finance/Treasurer
    a) Still wrapping up state expenses, defer update to Annual Meeting
    b) Better than start of season, fundraised $9,000, with contributions from HP and volunteer matching from Intel, estimate $10k remaining

B. Regional tournament recap
1. Eastern: Overall positive, nearly 70 volunteers, both B and C teams; Senthil printing tests at the last minute because he was waiting for supervisor input. Location was good, except for basketball game was noisy for events in the gym. Kudos to Marla and Jay for all their help! The whole experience was very rewarding. Jane: high school students enjoyed it.
2. Northwest:
    a) Bothell C
        (1) 30 teams from as far away as Olympia
        (2) Printed tests ahead of time
        (3) Ran smoothly and supervisors had no major issues

(4) Having Lei and Scott present was a plus

b) Raisbeck C
    (1) Positive
        (a) Efficient grading
        (b) Wrapped up quickly
        (c) Went home early
        (d) Experienced volunteers taught newer ones
        (e) School spirit (Raisbeck, Sehome)
        (f) Coordination re: tests
        (g) Collaboration! [thanks, Edie!]
    (2) Weaknesses
        (a) Fewer teams
            (i) Last-minute back out
        (b) Getting volunteer help from other schools

c) Bothell B
    (1) Parents were an issue because they were too aggressive in the hallways of the 300 building
    (2) Certain teams from the same school were arguing with each other
    (3) Used Performing Arts Center for awards - plus!
    (4) Ran smoothly overall except when parents scored their own child's event (despite saying it's not allowed ahead of time)

d) Northshore B
    (1) Strengths
        (a) Echoing positives from Raisbeck C (above)
        (b) Keynote speaker good and gave time for scoring
        (c) Training of supervisor ahead of time really helped
        (d) Volunteer coordinator addressed scoring needs and made use of extra volunteers
        (e) Lots of pre-planning for volunteer coordination
        (f) Handful of new schools in attendance
            (i) One new team started by a partnering high school
            (ii) One new team started by coach with previous experience who resumed coaching

(iii) A couple new teams reached out but eventually didn't show

(2) Weaknesses

(a) High schoolers writing tests only meant Edie was gathering more chemicals/supplies (usually would be handled by the school running the event)

3. Southwest:
   a) Most volunteers from Camas region
   b) No arbitration
   c) 2 teams from Willow Prep signed up last-minute (1 B, 1 C)
   d) Added Toledo, happy to qualify for State
   e) Ran very smoothly - thanks, Dave!
   f) LCC is great facility, hope to return next year

C. State tournament recap
   1. Test stat, day-of timeline/volunteer stat, test writing, tournament assignment/preparation document are in SD report
   2. Feedback: > 90% response (30 meet or exceed expectations (all seven questions)

	+	Δ	Next Time
Site		• Chemical issue (location and lack of for Potion) • EMS kids climbing steel cables outside Pavilion • RFTS challenging / boring (may suit MIT prospect, not CWU prospects)	
Events & Supervisors	• Much better build and award venues • Clear communication • Openness of scoring organizers • Chem Lab set up details	• Food ran out • Lack of vegan choices • Transfer score to Duosmium from build sheet • More timely scoring (award still late?) • Tower supervisor brought long heavy chain and canted bucket	• Use CWU catering for lunches, and WSO provide breakfast options • More food & options, hold food for ES who can't leave room • Open door 15 min before • Room with sink for Sus Energy

Coaches	• Supervisors, wonderful campus and facilities • Multi-school volunteer per event • **Scott or Edie for S-Director**	• Want test back • Air flow in Air Traj • Supervisor training • Hotel cost 2X • Did not see Helicopter shift or Award location (not ideal location)	• SciOly TShirts • Place for bus driver to rest on campus • Advertise hotel options in Yakima • Advertise CWU dorm room options
Teams	• Fun, nice supervisors (especially build) • Awards venue/screen • Proximity of events • Test quality (Fossils had specimens)	• Venue direction • Delay in events • RFTS / Optic test easy • Want raw scores or test back • Potion lab poorly executed	• Award on both screens • Faster and "flashy" awards • ES enforce notes, calc/equip rules
Other (Lei's)	• Relied on ES's expertise and ES taking ownership (no formal training) • Volunteer-by-team is very helpful but lots of work	• Arbitration: one optics B question thrown out • EV Kit ambiguity (ES did the right thing, National to clarify better?) • Test review / revision too much effort (state/regional)	• More CWU volunteers? • More score counseling, better trained

D. Status for next year's tournament sites
    1. 2025-26 Regional and State Date
    2. CWU and Clark College alternation?
    3. Revisit UW group
        a) Bureaucracy of UW challenging (student organization requirements, facilities under different departments, expensive and requires commitment)
        b) Consider inviting UW group to host tournament at say RAHS where they're only responsible for organizing and not venue
        c) Scott to reach out to Ashwin/Samy
    4. Two NW tournament directors retiring!
    5. Edie to reach out to LWTC and EMS for hosting invitational or regional
    6. Sheila reached out to Allison (coaching North Creek now, potential invitational), Rohan interested in continuing
    7. Revisit SO Inc. state incentive grant - https://www.soinc.org/usafoundation
E. Board nominations

1. Terms ending: Scott, Sheila, Senthil
    a) Scott and Senthil to re-apply
    b) 10+ students
    c) Plan to follow up with student advisor nominees who aren't elected and involve throughout year
2. Ballots: Lei will send out after May 1
3. Annual Meeting date: June 7, 2025
    a) Lei to announce to coaches with ballots

F. How to incentivize and support new volunteers
1. Presidential Volunteer Service Award (PVSA)?
2. Ways to incentivize/recognize students who are involved with leadership positions, volunteer hours
3. Social media, outreach coordination (speakers..), test writing

G. State Director status
1. Lei transition sometime before September
2. Continuing discussion

H. Topics to revisit for current or Annual Meeting – some discussion started this meeting and will revisit at Annual Meeting:
1. Revise bylaws for 60 day/4 week requirements for ballots and Annual Meeting notice
2. Policy revision for wording of teams advancing to nationals if more than 1 bid in a division
    a) Original: One school may advance only two (2) teams to the State Tournament. Only one team from a school may advance to the National Tournament (unless more than one team is allowed to advance to Nationals).
    b) Proposed: One school may advance only two (2) teams to the State Tournament. Only one (1) team from a school may advance to the National Tournament, even if Washington state receives multiple qualifying bids.
3. Policy addition for suggestion/requirement for winning teams
    a) Notes from Winter meeting – in blue:
        (1) Question - do we want to "require" a school to host an invitational? Maybe…but administrators and district support vary. Might want to leave as a recommendation
            (a) Moses Lake only starts in January so not ready for invitational
            (b) East side has transportation issues

(c) As a state we give a lot of support to our National teams - should they repay by hosting?
(d) Nationals provides educational resources but not so much financial resources (to help with hosting)
(e) Might be easier to require test writing or volunteering instead of hosting
(f) Keep looking for a balance of Regions contributing to the overall health of WA Sci Oly
(g) Last bullet needs more discussion so we will vote on the first 3 policy revisions

(2) **Invitational Tournaments**

WSO encourages both high schools and middle schools to host Invitational tournaments throughout the season. It is the best way for teams to practice, build camaraderie, and provide feedback for regional tournaments. In particular, we recommend the state champions to host an invitational at Div A, B, or C levels as appropriate in the two years subsequent to their championship. It is a wonderful way to give back to the community and help new teams in their communities. Outstanding volunteers (or teams) would be recognized at Invitationals, and those schools with the biggest community impact would be considered for the annual Spirit award given out at Regional or State tournaments.

4. Revision on EDQ guideline and penalty
    a) A clearer guideline for EDQ vs. DQ may be useful
    b) Suggestion by Simon: <u>penalty be a team penalty rather than +5 points for specific events. This is such that even if EDQ applied to trial events, team still get penalized for score</u>
5. Discussion of use of AI in events
    a) Teams using GPT during events
    b) Issue in particular for events that allow computers (Cybersecurity, Quantum Quandaries, Astronomy)
    c) Difficulty drawing lines for AI use - large-language model-based conversational interfaces vs. built-in file search with AI
    d) Writing prompts that are difficult to GPT
    e) Continuing discussion
6. Scoring for FPQ (First-Place Qualifier) teams

a) Increasing qualification this year. Need to consider how this affect team ranking (last year we include FPQ for team ranking)
b) This year, we did include FPQ for team ranking, but offset the number of total teams to match regular team numbers (with intent to not penalize teams too much for Participation or NS). It does cause confusion for NS vs. last place (e.g. C total N=21, the C Entomology has 23 participants).
c) Future options: Either separate tracks for FPQ (con: more medals, managing tournament), or exclude FPQ from Team scoring. The latter can be easily implemented in Duosimium.

7. WSO schedule alignment with National Tournament schedule

V. Next Meeting

A. Annual Meeting – Board Meeting Availability
   1. June 7, 2025 (9 AM – 1 PM)

VI. Adjourn

A. Meeting adjourned 11:15 AM.