

## MPC Meeting Minutes

2025 Winter Cup

February 23, 2025

Meeting called to order by Chair, Mike Serra at 9:04am ET.

Members present:

Mike Serra – Chair (voice, no vote)  
Randy Jepson – Sr Coaches Rep  
Tom Meadows – Sr Coaches Rep  
Matt Henry – Jr Coaches Rep  
Pavel Sargsyan – Jr Coaches Rep  
Cameron Bock – Athlete Rep  
Tyler Yamauchi – Athlete Rep  
Jon Corbitt – NGJA Representative (voice, no vote)  
Jason Woodnick – VP Men’s Program (voice, no vote)  
Brett McClure – High Performance Director (voice, no vote)  
Raj Bhavsar – Development Program Director (voice, no vote)  
David Klein – MDPC Chair (voice, no vote)

Non-members present:

Lisa Mendel – Men’s Program Manager (voice, no vote)

### I. Reports

#### a. National Office (Woodnick)

- i. Quad Debrief in December – community stakeholders brought perspectives and ideas into group discussions. Feedback has been very positive.
- ii. National Apparatus Leader Program – main focus on coaches education. 6 NAL’s are in place. Contracts to be sent out immediately after Winter Cup.
- iii. National Coaches Council – The NCC will be made up of 6 NAL’s & 6 Regional HPD’s. They will take over majority of the duties from the

JNCS. This group will start after the Development Program Championship season.

- iv. USAG looking for a new COO
- v. Several major partner contracts expiring in 2025 (GK & AAI). USAG evaluating bids.
- vi. The Men's National Qualifier will take place at the US Air Force Academy in June. We need to determine a set plan for either a Qualifier or the US Classic for the rest of the quad.
- vii. USAG Training Center – down to three cities. Financial feasibility being determined.
- viii. Proposed Mixed Pairs medal event in LA 2028. A format being proposed by LA28 and NBC. Push for USAG to host a mixed pairs team event next year.

b. High Performance (McClure & Bhavsar)

- i. Several key topics coming from the December Debrief:
  - 1. Support for continuing the D-bonus
  - 2. Need to improve coach development – ways to improve coaches' technical proficiency
  - 3. Strong opinions on the makeup of the Senior Development Team
- ii. Sr/Level 10 NT camp in December continues to be a highlight each year
- iii. We have new Senior Selection Committee members. The SSC will come together soon to establish Senior Dev Team selection and Sr National Team selection at US Championships.
- iv. The 2025 World Championships Pre-camp will take place in Funabashi, Japan, which will continue to grow our relationship with the city for future opportunities.
- v. Raj would like to see a summary of the Debrief action items and work on how to implement them

- vi. MDPC member and judge, Paul Evatt has been attending Junior National Team camps, which has been helpful for coaches and athletes.
  - vii. The Level 8's and 9's have been progressing with many working Senior level skills. Level 10's have shown a significant D score improvement.
  - viii. Finalizing details for the upcoming Future Stars Camp. Up to 64 athletes will be invited. The camp will be combined with coaches lectures/presentations.
  - ix. The international calendar for Sr and Jr National Team starts right after Winter Cup
  - x. Raj would like to plan an international camp for the Juniors in 2026. Potentially back to Funabashi after a great experience in 2023.
  - xi. We need to evaluate how to promote the Club Track more. More direct marketing.
- c. Senior Program (Jepson & Meadows)
- i. Need to solidify the qualification system to US Championships & Winter Cup.
  - ii. After seeing results from NCAA competitions this season, coaches may want to evaluate the rules for next season
  - iii. National Team athletes are in a challenging situation with collegiate commitments and NT responsibilities
- d. Junior Program (Henry & Sargsyan)
- i. The combined camps have been highlights for athletes and coaches involved. Would like to see more continuity from camp to camp.
  - ii. Many feel that we have too many rules within the Development Program. This makes it hard to ensure consistency.
- e. Athlete Reps (Bock & Yamauchi)
- i. Cameron and Akash Modi (USAG Athletes Council) enjoyed the Debrief and being involved in discussions

- ii. General feedback is that the Windy City Open has gone down in quality and the NCAA coaches and athletes feel that it is no longer at the standard required for a Winter Cup Qualification Event.
- f. NGJA (Corbitt)
- i. September-November fall judges certification courses were happening
  - ii. December-January preparation for the FIG exams. Great results for the US judges.
  - iii. New competition prep for Winter Cup – new online LMS for judges to review routines. Technical presentations at WC judges meetings using FIG MTC presentation info.
  - iv. Multiple NGJA teams/working groups have been created to help build judging processes and focus on growth

## II. Winter Cup Qualification Process

A proposal was submitted from Ohio State University (Attachment A) that focused on either having one singular qualification event for Winter Cup qualification or splitting the country in half and having one event in the East and one event in the West. The MPC discussed the ripple effect on this decision. This would add another competition to NCAA, GymACT and the Junior club calendar, which increases travel expenses for everyone. Clubs find it easier to attend qualification events with Senior & Junior levels as they can bring more of their athletes to compete.

The MPC agreed that the level of qualification event could be elevated by amending the application to host a Winter Cup Qualification event and that may solve the issues we are seeing. Ultimately, this current system is effective in qualifying athletes to Winter Cup. The group does not feel like there needs to be a complete overhaul to the process. They would like to continue with the current process but amend the hosting application to elevate the level of competition.

Jason will amend the application to host a 2026 Winter Cup Qualification Event and send it out to the community in the next week.

## III. 2025 Junior World Championships

At this time, there is still confirmed date or location for this event. The FIG Executive Committee is meeting next week, and we expect to hear some information coming from that meeting. Should Junior Worlds happen, we need to have a strategy in place for those team members to remain on the National Team if they are forced to miss US

Championships. For any FIG 18 year olds who make the team, the Senior Development Team seems like a logical way to integrate them into the Senior National Team, but that would be a decision by the Senior Selection Committee (SSC). The MPC would like to be able to provide recommendations to the SSC once we have firm information on Junior Worlds.

#### IV. 2025 US Championships Qualifications

The MPC received proposals from Mike Burns (Attachment B) and Jordan Gaarenstroom (Attachment C) regarding the [2025 US Championships Qualification Process](#). Mike would like to see a qualification pathway from the GymACT National Championships using a set standard from Winter Cup results. Jordan would like the qualifications from the National Qualifier to be entirely points based or should include points for all-around results, which has not been done in recent years.

There was a thought that for the future, if we can set a standard score/placement, then we can use that for all qualification events (NCAA, GymACT, Dev Nationals, etc.). The Committee had majority support for the GymACT proposal, but not for 2025. For 2026, a set standard can be created for all those athletes attempting to qualify.

The Committee also did not feel compelled to adjust the qualification pathway from the National Qualifier. They felt that a combination of all-around and points would provide a fair path for all participants.

#### V. Competition Rules for 2025 Development National Championships

This discussion centered around the competition rules for JE athletes at Development Nationals in 2025. Development Nationals has been Junior FIG rules for the JE levels for the past several years, but the community is under the belief that this year will be Development Program rules. Coaches feel it may be too late to change to FIG rules, and it is definitely too late to implement an exponential bonus system for this event.

**Motion: To use Men's Development Program rules with Development Program bonus tables for all Junior Elite levels at the 2025 Men's Development National Championships.**

**Motion: Matt Henry**

**Second: Tyler Yamauchi**

**Passed 5-0 (1 abstention)**

VI. Bonus Tables

The Bonus Working Group met and discussed anticipated gold medal standards on each event at the 2028 Olympics based on potential routine construction with the new Code of Points. Research is being done, and data is being collected from Winter Cup and international events in February/March. The new bonus system will be in place for the National Qualifier and for US Championships.

VII. New Business

The last order of business is to set regular MPC meetings for the second Tuesday of the month at 1:00pm ET, starting on March 11<sup>th</sup>.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58am ET



---

MPC Chair

March 5, 2025

Date

**Mission:** Provide a fair, safe and memorable qualification competition for the USA Winter Cup for all athletes, coaches and spectators.

**East Coast Location:** Covelli Center (2640 Fred Taylor Dr. Columbus, OH 43212) Hosted by Ohio State.

**West Coast Location:** TBD

**Dates:** January 18-19<sup>th</sup>, 2026 (MLK weekend) We for sure can have facility availability on Monday MLK Day, and possibly a half day on Sunday. (can have a better idea of dates once we submit our desired days and cross check with other sports)

**Benefits:** A safe, electric competition event venue where all athletes are on the same competition floor in their respective “coast”. This would be a countable NCAA Competition for all 15 NCAA Programs.

After much conversion regarding the qualification process this current cycle into the Winter Cup, many college coaches have not been happy with the process of having several different qualifying meets throughout the country. Not just due to the lack of inconsistency across the country with judging, but also the safety of the venues/equipment and quality of the competitions. With support from the USAG, we are proposing the elimination of the multiple qualifying competitions and narrowing it down to if not one competition, two competitions. The two competitions would have one on the East Coast and one on the West Coast, with the Coastline being split down the middle for the NCAA Teams that geographically make the most sense to participate on their respective “coast”. The individuals would also be split into two coasts, and this can be decided by USAG of where the coastline is.

**NCAA East Teams:**

1. ARMY
2. ILLINOIS
3. MICHIGAN
4. OHIO STATE
5. NAVY
6. PENN STATE
7. SPRINGFIELD
8. WILLIAM & MARY

**NCAA West Teams:**

1. AIR FORCE
2. CALIFORNIA
3. GREENVILLE
4. OKLAHOMA
5. NEBRASKA
6. SIMPSON
7. STANFORD

\*The goal would also be to accommodate the Elite Team Cup competition as well and provide the East and West Coast Regions with the opportunity to participate in the morning session on Monday January 18<sup>th</sup>. (again, dates not confirmed)

**Format: 3 sessions**

Session 1 Morning- ETC Regional Competition (3 Regions on East & 3 for West Coast)

Session 2 Afternoon- 4 NCAA Teams and up to 12 individual athletes

Session 3 Night- 4 NCAA Teams and up to 12 individual athletes

(As you see, the West Coast has only seven NCAA teams, so they could potentially accommodate one more rotation of individual athletes.)

\*There would be no more than 6 gymnasts on each event in Sessions 2 & 3.

\*\*4 Rotations of NCAA Teams. The NCAA teams would have their normal 4 up 4 count lineup and could add 2 more outside their lineup if they are All-Around gymnasts or individual qualifiers. (Any individuals should not be within the 12-man competition roster)

\*\*\*Two rotations of up to 6 Individual athletes.

---

We are open to any feedback, suggestions or possible concerns to help strengthen this proposal to gain the support of USAG to make the Winter Cup Qualification process a success for all athletes, coaches and spectators.

Thank you,

Drew Moling

[Moling.1@osu.edu](mailto:Moling.1@osu.edu)

614-581-7705

**FROM: Mike Burns, GymACT President**

**TO: Mike Serra, Men's Program Committee Chair**

**RE: Proposal for GymACT National Championships as a Qualifying Event for USA Championships**

**DATE: 2/18/25**

Dear Members of the Men's Program Committee,

I am writing to formally propose the inclusion of the 2025 GymACT National Championships and future Nationals as official qualifier events for the USA Gymnastics Championships and Future Championship events. As an organization dedicated to the continued growth and development of men's collegiate gymnastics, we believe that recognizing GymACT Nationals as a pathway to USA Championships will provide increased opportunities for athletes while strengthening the competitive field at the national level. By allowing GymACT Nationals as an additional avenue for qualification, it will also enhance the legitimacy and credibility of GymACT as a program and league. This will ultimately benefit the entire Men's Program by fostering greater athlete development and retention, ensuring a deeper talent pool for USA Gymnastics in the long term.

### **Rationale for Inclusion**

- **Expanding Competitive Pathways:** GymACT has seen substantial growth in both participation and competition levels, serving as a critical bridge for collegiate athletes who seek continued elite-level competition.
- **High Competitive Standards:** The GymACT National Championships adhere to FIG-based judging standards, ensuring that athletes compete at a level comparable to other qualifying events.
- **Athlete Development:** Many GymACT athletes demonstrate elite-level skills and routines, warranting the opportunity to qualify for USA Championships based on their performances at our national event.
- **Strengthening GymACT's Legitimacy:** Recognizing GymACT Nationals as a qualifier will further establish the program as a viable pathway within the men's gymnastics ecosystem, benefiting the entire sport.

### **Proposed Qualification Criteria**

We propose the following qualification criteria for GymACT Nationals to serve as a pathway to the USA Gymnastics Championships:

1. **The top all-around athlete from GymACT Nationals will qualify**, provided their all-around score meets or exceeds a predetermined FIG-based threshold (Based on results from 2025 Winter Cup)

2. **Up to 6 Individual Event Petitions**, with a maximum of 1 per event. The individual petitioning must place 1st on the event and their score must meet or exceed an established FIG-based standard.
  - a. If necessary, the individuals' scores can be converted to FIG scoring by applying the FIG ruleset to the D-Scores of the GymACT athletes' routines.

## Comparison of GymACT Rules to FIG Code of Points

- **Stick Bonus:** 0.2 (GymACT) vs. 0.1 (FIG)
- **Double Flipping Dismount on FX:** 0.1 GymACT Bonus
- **Rings Strength Bonus:** 0.3 GymACT Bonus
- **Element Groups:** A/B = 0.3, C = 0.4, D And higher = 0.5

For the highest-level GymACT athletes, the expected conversion of scores from GymACT to FIG would be roughly **0.4-0.9 points lower** in the all-around, depending on the number of stuck dismounts. The top GymACT athletes will typically be performing D's in every element group, gaining the 0.3 Strength Bonus and Double Flipping Bonus.

## Supporting Data

### 2024 GymACT Nationals Results:

The results from GymACT Nationals demonstrate that the top three all-around gymnasts are performing at a level consistent with USA Gymnastics Championship qualifiers.

### Top 3 All-Around Scores (Not Converted to FIG):

- **Aidan Myers:** 80.4
- **Kellen Ryan:** 79.8
- **Ben Letvin:** 78.7

Additionally, individual event scores reflect strong performances when compared to FIG COP 2025-2028 standards:

Event	Gymnast	GymACT (2024) Score	FIG Score
Floor Exercise (FX)	Charlie Larson	13.9	14.1
Pommel Horse (PH)	Carter Hawthorne	13.65	13.45

Still Rings (SR)	Aidan Myers	14.0	13.5
Vault (VT)	Kellen Ryan	14.8	14.3
Parallel Bars (PB)	Eliot Foster	14.35	13.95
Horizontal Bar (HB)	William Pearce	13.35	12.85

These scores illustrate that GymACT athletes are competing at a level that aligns with the standards set for USA Championships, reinforcing the justification for recognizing GymACT Nationals as a qualifying event. Typically, the highest-level athletes on each event have routines that need little modification towards the FIG ruleset.

\*These conversions reflect scoring differences without factoring in routine adaptations for the FIG Code of Points. Athletes who tailor their routines to FIG standards may achieve even more competitive scores.

## Conclusion

We appreciate your time and consideration of this proposal. By formally recognizing GymACT Nationals as a qualifier event, USA Gymnastics will provide a valuable avenue for athlete development while solidifying GymACT as an integral part of the men's gymnastics landscape. This move will not only strengthen GymACT's legitimacy as a competitive program but will also ensure a stronger, deeper talent pool for USA Gymnastics in the long term.

We welcome any discussions or modifications necessary to align with USA Gymnastics' strategic objectives and look forward to collaborating with the committee on this initiative. Please let us know how we can further assist in this process. We would be happy to provide additional data, host discussions, or attend a committee meeting to present our case.

Thank you for your time and dedication to the sport of gymnastics.

**Dear MPC,**

After reviewing the recent minutes regarding the qualification procedures for the 2025 U.S. Championships, I wanted to bring forward a point for consideration.

In 2023, the qualifier for the U.S. Championships was entirely points-based, allowing athletes who may not compete in the all-around but can challenge Senior National Team members on one or multiple events the opportunity to qualify and showcase their abilities at the premier event. However, as written for this upcoming year, the qualifier spots will be divided evenly between points and all-around results. Notably, no specific parameters have been set for this change—meaning that if only a few athletes compete in the all-around at the qualifier, they could all advance regardless of score. This differs from the NCAA Championships, where athletes must place within the top 10 to qualify. Additionally, the new system does not exclude pre-qualified athletes, meaning an athlete would not necessarily have to outperform all competitors at the meet to advance. In contrast, the points system accounts for pre-qualified athletes, as it should.

When I presented at the MPC meeting in February 2024, I provided data showing that the strictly points-based system used at the 2023 U.S. Classic was effective, resulting in several National Team members qualifying through the event. My concern is that we do not have enough competitive all-arounders to justify the model chosen for this year's qualifier. As a result, athletes who otherwise would not have qualified—and who may not be competitive at the U.S. Championships—could advance, while event specialists who earn points (which requires placing in the top 10 on an event) may be left out.

**Current qualification structure:**

- Senior National Team: 5 AA, 5 points, discretionary picks/petitions/SDT (typically 5–10 AA)
- 4 Junior National Team members (AA)
- 5 non-qualified athletes (points)
- 2 juniors from the JE division (AA)
- 2 non-qualified athletes from the top 10 at NCAA (AA)
- U.S. Qualifier: 50% AA, 50% points

This structure results in 18–23 all-arounders before the U.S. Qualifier and nearly 30 all-arounders after it. It is difficult to believe that our 30th-ranked all-arounder will post a score that challenges anyone on the Senior National Team. Meanwhile, every year, we see multiple athletes left at home during Winter Cup or the U.S. Championships, raising the question of why they were not given the opportunity to compete.

I strongly believe the U.S. Qualifier should remain strictly points-based, or at the very least, that top-10 finishes in the all-around should be awarded points—allowing all-arounders to benefit from their performance while still ensuring event specialists have a fair shot at qualifying.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Jordan Gaarenstroom