

-Combined Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: August 19, 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 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
Tracey Erway	Kiki Pantaze	Ashley Bowers	Chris Stanko
Kristine Strasburger	Heather Walters	Eleanor Thomas	Maria Blackstone

Members Absent:

CWE: Ashley Bowers, Karen Burch, Natalia Lord, Jill Malone

WEU: Emily Kemp

Non-Voting Participants: Biddie Lowry, Doreen Atkinson

Meeting called to order at 8:06 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.

- Eleven members of WEU present, six required to pass any motion.
- Eight members of CWE present, five required to pass any motion.

Agenda:

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes for August 12, 2020 – Julie Alonzo

Motion made by Polly Limond to accept the minutes of July 22, 2020 as submitted. Seconded by Leslie Martien.

Discussion? none

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

Voice Vote: When asked, “ayes” were heard and “nays” were not heard. The Motion carried.

II. Ethics Proposal –by Leslie Martien

After the public comment period review, four documents had changes or clarifications made by the Ethics Team:

- A. Ethics Proposal
- B. Member Feedback Responses
- C. Social Media Policy
- D. Code of Ethics for Licensed Officials

A. Ethics Proposal

1. Key Points-> Three additions were made to the Proposed Process column of the document, Ethics Proposal_8-17-20.

- **The Ethics Committee cannot include a WE Coach**
- **Complaints must provide details as applicable**
- **A private email account will be set up for the Ethics Committee to provide confidentiality**

2. Detailed Discussion->

Chris Stanko posed a question concerning the Appeals Committee which is comprised of the four officers of the NatOrg. What if a complaint was made against one of these four? Leslie explained that that person would recuse themselves from the Appeals Committee, and the appeal would be heard by the remaining three members of the Appeals Committee.

Chris also asked if an attorney needs to look at this proposal. Leslie confirmed that a Colorado attorney has looked at this proposal. Jeanne clarified that she thought that Chris was wondering if an attorney should be part of the Appeals Committee. Jeanne replied that an attorney should not be a part of the Appeals Committee. Julie also stated that she has previously been advised that it is better if the Nat Org take care of any complaints or appeals “in house.” Leslie mentioned that one of the attorneys contacted is considering providing pro bono services to the NatOrg in some capacity and is being worked out. Leslie also mentioned that if it comes to a point that an attorney is needed, then that problem is outside the scope of the Ethics and Appeals Committees.

Kat wondered who would have access to the Ethics Committee email that will be set up. Leslie explained that it would only be accessed by members of the Ethics Committee.

B. Member Feedback Responses

1. Key Points-> The confidentiality agreement wording and the use of the word “discrimination” has been clarified. The document has comments in red font that await an attorney’s examination and clarification. This document will not be posted on the website until the team receives the recommendations from the attorney.

2. Detailed Discussion->

Leslie complimented the Ethics Team for all their hard work. One attorney looked over these documents, was very satisfied with what she read, and gave us an “A” on the documents! Jeanne said that this document will eventually be posted on the website. Currently, there are comments from the committee in red font; these are items that an attorney licensed in Oregon and Washington will examine.

Tracey asked about the Social Media policy and this was deferred to later in tonight’s meeting. Jeanne also explained that defining evidence and guilt is way beyond the scope of this organization so the response to that comment will be aided by an attorney. Leslie mentioned that if the attorney licensed in Oregon and Washington has a different opinion from the first attorney, then this document will come back to the Combined Board for review.

C. Social Media Policy

1. Key Points-> Changes to the document are made in red font. Below are the changes to the Social Media Policy:

In the “What You Should Do” sections:

- Keep your comments respectful, professional, and helpful. Respectful discussions are a way for the sport and the organization to grow
- Honor our differences. **Organization name** will not tolerate discriminatory comments of any kind...)

In the “What You Should Not Do” section:

- Do not disclose specific details of actions taken during a competition, either by you or that you are aware of by virtue of being a Licensed Official. Reference can be made in a general way to actions of competitors or decisions by officials as long as individuals are not identified.

2. Detailed Discussion->

Leslie said that the team was concerned about possible conflicts and the changes in the wording should clarify that. The first bulleted item in the “What You Should Not Do” section was rephrased and put in the “What You Should Do” section. She also mentioned that there may be teaching moments via social media, and this policy no longer prevents that discussion if no specific details are mentioned.

Tracey wondered if there was something in the policy to prevent a person using his/her position in the national organization to make a statement that might be conceived as “bullying,” obnoxious, or a power play. Julie responded that she felt this was covered in the Code of Ethics. Jeanne added that one of the reasons why the Ethics Committee’s private email will be established is to provide an avenue for members to mention or report a problem. Often

a situation can be rectified with a phone call and does not have to formally go to the Ethics Committee.

Chris added that the NatOrg cannot police social media 100% of the time. If a person is being obnoxious, eventually that person will have fewer clients and work. Tracey appreciated the explanation and acknowledged that the Social Media Policy and Code of Ethics covered her concerns.

D. Code of Ethics for Licensed Officials (LO)

1. Key Points-> The paragraph about show management and LO was shortened to remove any possibility of the Nat Org getting in the middle of a contract problem between the show management and the LO. There was also discussion about whether the Social Media Policy should add the word “agree to the policy” and it was determined to leave it as is: “I have read and understand the Social Media Policy.”

2. Detailed Discussion->

There was discussion about the fourth to the last paragraph mentioning that the Licensing Body would intercede on the behalf of the LO. Julie expressed concern about the Nat Org getting involved in a contract dispute between show management and LOs, expressing concern about the potential for the proposed wording to create the expectation, on the part of LOs, that the Nat Org would intercede on their behalf should they believe that a show manager had failed to uphold their contract, and the potential legal exposures that including a statement like the one proposed could create for the Nat Org. One suggestion was to have an attorney look at the wording, another said just to remove all but the first sentence in that paragraph. Many members agreed that keeping the first sentence and removing the remainder of the paragraph would be best.

Jeanne then suggested the Social Media Policy be inserted into the Code of Ethics for LOs. Julie asked Doreen Atkinson, representing the LO at this meeting, if she had polled all the LOs about the Social Media Policy. She responded that she had sent out emails and followed up with additional emails. She received only one negative response; the rest were positive responses. There were LOs that did not respond either way. Julie reminded the group of the negative reaction when the Confederation requested that all LOs sign their Social Media Policy earlier this year and cautioned against going further than referencing the Social Media Policy with the statement that “I have read and understand the Social Media Policy.” Tracey agreed.

Julie further clarified that having an LO agree that the Social Media Policy had been read and understood might be more palatable than requiring them to sign one. There was discussion from four members about whether the Policy should be signed or not and whether it should be inserted into the Code of Ethics for LOs. It was determined that the sentence “I have read and understand the Social Media Policy” would be left as is in the Code of Ethics for LO.

Chris mentioned in previous years that members often reported that finding documents like the Code of Ethics and the Social Media Policy was difficult. Could we have a link inserted into the document? Julie said that often a link in a document would end up becoming a dead link. It would be better to have a statement like, “see website for most current version.”

Julie complimented the work that was done by the Ethics Team and formulated a motion to include the changes discussed at tonight's meeting.

Motion by Julie Alonzo to vote (non-binding) to approve the Code of Ethics for Licensed Officials and Coaches, Code of Conduct for Officers and Directors, Social Media Policy, Confidentiality Agreement, Community Code, and Ethics Proposal itself, as well as the answers to the public comments received, with the exception of the responses in red font (pending attorney review) on August 19, 2020.

Seconded by Kristine Strasburger and Eleanor Thomas

Discussion? None heard

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

Voice Vote: When asked, "ayes" were heard and "nays" were not heard. The Motion carried.

III. Conclusion

Julie announced that the next meeting will be Wednesday, August 26, 2020 at 8 pm EDT; the governance proposals will be presented.

Before officially concluding, Chris Stanko wanted to know how previous and current ethics complaints from the separate organizations would be handled in the merged organization. Jeanne encouraged the Ethics Committees in both organizations to work hard to conclude any current complaints before the merge. Kat Waters, LOC Chair, stated that as of now all history of any LO will be moved to the new Nat Org. Chris also believed that the records should go to the new organization. Julie suggested that as we move into Phase 2, Implementation, that the Ethics Team be tasked with how to handle these items mentioned above.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 pm EDT by Julie Alonzo.

Minutes submitted by Biddie Lowry on August 21, 2020.

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