

Combined Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: August 4, 2020, 5:00 p.m. Pacific, 6:00 p.m. Mountain, 7:00 p.m. Central, 8:00 p.m. Eastern

Meeting Modality: Zoom -Directions and password were sent out ahead of time. Meeting ID: 994 202 3002

Meeting Logistics

- The meeting was co-facilitated by Julie Alonzo and Jeanne Bond.
- Participants were given instructions as to meeting decorum in a Zoom Meeting. All members had an opportunity to speak on every motion up for discussion.
- Participant order for discussion was also established in an earlier email.

Voting Order

When we vote, the meeting facilitators will either call for a voice vote or a roll call vote. A **voice vote** will be used if there appears to be consensus on an item. A **roll call vote** will be used if any member of either Board requests it, or if there does not appear to be consensus.

If a voice vote is called, meeting secretary (Biddie Lowry) will record whether there were any ‘nay’ vote casts. If a roll call vote is called, Biddie will call on individual Board members by name and record the votes from the Confederation Board separate from the votes from the WE United Board, alternating between calling the votes starting with the Confederation Board and starting with the WE United Board.

Voting order was established prior to meeting. Roll Call Votes are recorded on the Voting Record Sheet and saved in Shared Drives > Collab – BOD meetings folder. There were no Roll Call Votes at this meeting.

Members in Attendance:

WE United		The Confederation for Working Equitation	
Julie Alonzo	Sarah Pinney	Jeanne Bond	Lauren Gueswel
Polly Limond	Cindy Branham	Karen Burch	Natalia Lord
Trisha Kiefer-Reed	Emily Kemp	Jill Malone	Adair Soho
Erin O’Shaughnessy	Barry Dornon	Leslie Martien	Kat Waters
Tracy Erway	Kiki Pantaze	Ashley Bowers	Chris Stanko
Kristine Strasburger	Heather Walters	Eleanor Thomas	Maria Blackstone

Members Absent:

CWE: Maria Blackstone, Natalia Lord, Jill Malone

WEU: Emily Kemp, Polly Limond

Non-Voting Participants: Biddie Lowry,

Agenda:

I. Meeting called to order at 8:05 pm EDT by Julie Alonzo, President of WEU. Both organizations must have at least 7 members present for quorum. Quorum was met.

All motions will be voted on by the Individual Board of each organization.

- Ten members of WEU present, six required to pass any motion.
- Nine members of CWE present, five required to pass any motion.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes for July 29, 2020 – Julie Alonzo

Motion made by Leslie Martien to accept the minutes of July 29, 2020 as submitted. Seconded by Trisha Kiefer-Reed.

Discussion? none

Seeing no further discussion, Julie called for a Voice Vote on the Motion.

Voice Vote: When asked, “ayes” were heard and zero “nays.” The Motion carried.

III. Governance Proposal Presentation–by Kristine Strasburger

The Governance Proposal has five sections. Tonight’s meeting only discussed the first three sections.

- Full Board of Directors
- Board of Directors’ Term Lengths and Limits
- Clerical Assistant
- Committees
- Revisions to Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws

1A. Full Board of Directors

a. Key Changes-> Although a straw poll voice vote (not from a motion) was made in favor of the Proposal 1 (with these officers: President, Vice-President, Secretary, & Treasurer), continued discussion brought the conclusion that both proposals would be presented to the public for feedback.

b. Detailed Discussion->

1) Discussion on Vice-President vs President Elect

There were two proposals presented for the Full Board of Directors; the difference was Proposal 1 included a Vice-President and Proposal 2 included a President-Elect. Kristine explained the difference between the two positions. With the President-Elect, the person elected in year one for this position will be the President the following year. There would not be a President-Elect on the ballot the second year. Many members were fine with either proposal. When Julie informally polled the group, a few more people thought that Proposal 1 was the best choice. Discussion continued.

Some of the benefits of the President Elect structure:

- Pres-Elect would learn from the President.
- It provides a “ramp in” structure.

Some disadvantages of the Pres-Elect:

- If the person was not as good as expected during the first year of learning, then the organization is “stuck” with that person as President.

Another person said that the Vice-President would be able to learn from the President and could possibly run for the President position at the next election. Others said that having a Vice President allowed someone to hold that office who wants to contribute, but not as a President.

An straw poll vote was taken by Julie on whether to go with the Proposal 1 (containing a Vice President) or Proposal 2 (containing a President Elect).

WEU: Vice President-3 in favor, President Elect-6 in favor

CWE: Vice President-7 in favor, President Elect-1 in favor

Key Development->

After continued discussion about the At-Large Directors and whether the board was going to choose which proposal tonight, it was determined that the Governance Team created two proposals so they could get feedback from the public. The informal vote mentioned above was put on hold for now.

1B) Discussion about At-Large Directors

There was much discussion about the need for At-Large Directors. Jeanne suggested that the three major appointed committee chairs (Competitions, Licensed Officials, Membership) be on the Board but without a vote. It was clarified that this is not part of Governance and those three could be invited to board meetings, but without a vote. Kristine wondered if those three appointed positions could be made Board Members. Julie clarified that the previous membership survey strongly expressed the desire that all Board members be elected and not appointed.

Julie asked for additional opinions. Barry explained that the results of the member survey showed concern for having a small four-person appointed Executive Committee. The Governance Team suggested the Executive Committee have two At-Large Directors in addition to the four officers. He also stated that the Team believed that this proposal would go to the public as is and not decide on which proposal to use at this meeting. Julie explained that in the past when there were 2 options or proposals, the Combined Board would vote on one to present to the public. Since Governance is such an important part of the new organization, the Governance Team wanted to receive feedback from the public on both proposals. It was decided that both proposals under the Full Board of Directors would stay as is for now so that the public could comment on the two proposals.

2) Board of Directors' Term Limits and Lengths

Since the proposals for structure and term limits and lengths were a little bit confusing, Julie asked Kristine if she could create a graphic to illustrate the details.

3) Clerical Assistant

Barry pointed out that the clerical assistant is not part of the Governance structure and should not be included in the proposal to the public. It needs to be included in the planning of the structure, but the public does not need to see this as part of Governance. At this time, only the first two parts, Full Board of Directors and Board of Directors' Term Limits and Lengths would be presented to the public for comment.

Motion made by Julie Alonzo to authorize sharing the first two parts of the Governance Proposal (Full Board of Directors and Board of Directors' Term Limits and Length) with the public to solicit additional feedback.

Seconded by Barry Dornan.

Discussion followed: Tracy was concerned that the two At-Large Directors could possibly give a region more power on the Board. Kiki said that was a possibility. Kat mentioned that it helps to have the three major committee chairs at the Board meetings; they do not need a vote. Kiki agreed. The two At-Large Directors would be part of the Executive Committee and would be elected by the entire membership just like the four officers. Seeing no further discussion, Julie called for a Voice Vote on the Motion.

Voice Vote: When asked, "ayes" were heard and zero "nays." The Motion carried.

Julie asked that Kristine create a graphic that explains these first two parts.

IV. Coaches Network, Post-public Comment Period Review – by Kat Waters

a. Key Changes-> The five WE Professionals and Ambassadors from the Confederation would pay the renewal fee of \$75 to apply instead of the \$150 application fee for all other individuals. There was mention of the possible pushback from this being the only concession to these five persons, but the Combined Board was ready to stand by the program as proposed.

b. Detailed Discussion->

After looking over the public comments, grandfathering in the Confederation's WE Professionals and Ambassadors was the single most commented about topic. The Committee decided since this was a new program unique to the new Nat Org, everyone had to meet the same requirements. The five WE Professionals and Ambassadors from the Confederation would be offered a reduced initial fee of \$75 to apply instead of the \$150 expected from all other applicants.

A lengthy discussion followed about the possibility of "pushback" from the supporters of the existing WE Professionals and Ambassadors. There may be some members of the public that are offended. Board members indicated that they felt the Coaches Program was an amazing program for the new organization and that they were prepared to handle possible pushback or negativity that may result. Board Members want everyone to start at the same place and want to present the program in a positive way.

Kiki suggested that the introductory fee might be \$75 for everyone, then raise the price later. Julie responded that when she had brought up a similar suggestion to the work team, they had told her that they felt strongly that \$150 for 2 years is a reasonable fee for this program.

WE Consolidation

Kristine suggested the five individuals might be given a different time limit to get in requirements. Another suggested that because of the unique 2020 year, some may not be able to fulfill the requirements in a certain amount of time. Some are comparing this program to the LOC program, but that is a completely different program. Several board members mentioned that this is a great program for the new organization and complimented the team for developing it. Kat mentioned that changes made after the public commentaries are made in red on the proposal.

Motion made by Jeanne Bond to approve the 7-29-20 version of the Coaches Network Program Requirements.

Seconded by Cindy Branham.

Discussion? none

Seeing no further discussion, Julie called for a Voice Vote on the Motion.

Voice Vote: When asked, “ayes” were heard and zero “nays.” The Motion carried.

V. Conclusion

Julie announced that the next meeting will be on August 12, 2020 at 8 pm EDT.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:42 pm EDT by Julie Alonzo.

Minutes submitted by Biddie Lowry on August 10, 2020.

Note: Because there were no calls for Roll Call Voting, there is no Roll Call Vote Record for this meeting.