

## CalChess Board meeting

Date: 9/2/2018

Start at 9:00am

Present members for quorum: 12 voting members.

Including following board members: Joe L., Lynn R., Richard K., Abel T. and Tom L.

Voting ballot was open from 9am, and people could cast their vote. Present at the voting table: Tom Langland, Joe Lonsdale, and on a rotating basis: Ruth Haring and Lynn Reed.

Present at 3:30: Tom Langland, Joe Lonsdale, Ruth Haring, Lynn Reed, Richard Koepcke, Abel Talamantez, Judit Sztaray

At around 3:45pm: Candidate statements were made.

President of the Board read the following:

Director elections: Whether held at a member meeting, or by written ballot, must provide reasonable nomination and election procedures:

- 1) Including a reasonable means of nominating persons
- 2) a reasonable opportunity for a nominee to communicate to members
- 3) a reasonable opportunity for all nominees to solicit votes
- 4) and a reasonable opportunity for all members to choose among the nominees

President is asking if these were met?

Votes yes: 90%+ present members raised hand.

All oppose – two members.

Voting officially closed.

Election votes counting committee: Jim Eade, Ruth Haring, Lynn Reed.

Jim Eade announcing the winners

Voted: 84 voters

Winners: typically number of votes is not read, but anyone curious can go to the voting committee or president to inquire.

Jim mentioned: close race, therefore they preformed a double count, consistent result with the first count.

### **Official vote counts for the 2018 CalChess Board of Directors elections.**

52 for Judit Sztaray

49 for Tom Langland

45 for Stephen Shaughnessy

37 for Joe Lonsdale

36 for Hui Wang

35 for Ashik Uzzaman

26 for Kiki Chen

18 for George Jeffers

## **Closed session of the newly elected board:**

### **Elect new officers**

Joe L. nominates Tom L. for president. Ruth H. seconds. All vote yes. Motion pass.

Stephen S. nominates Joe L. for Vice President, Ruth H. seconds. All vote yes. Motion pass.

Tom L. nominates Richard for treasurer, Ruth H. seconds. All vote yes. Motion pass.

Tom L. nominates Judit S. for secretary, Ruth H. seconds. All vote yes. Motion pass.

Tom L. nominates Richard K. for membership secretary. Ruth H. seconds. All vote yes. Motion pass.

No votes necessary, but appointed positions:

Abel T. is club coordinator

Lynn R. is scholastic coordinator

## **Discussion on mission statement**

### **Motion by Judit S.: Reinforce mission statement, and that the board will work on a strategic plan in the next few months and put together a draft strategic plan within 6 month.**

Tom L. seconds.

Discussion: Abel T. – need all board member input. Lynn R. – need strategic plan. Judit S – strategic plans need community input, as well as performance indicators to measure progress.

Tom L. calls the question.

All in favor. No opposition.

Motion passed.

### **Few notes how to make meetings better:**

- Ask people about agenda items in advance.
- Open meeting, to all members.
- Need a parliamentarian.

### **Motion by Ruth H. to have 3 parents representative as added to the board as nonvoting members and able to participate in the discussion.**

Judit seconds.

Discussion: Abel T.: can't be in the same family to have the parent and scholastic representative.

Tom L.: board of directors need to vote to approve.

Lynn R.: parent of the active scholastic player (needs to play 1 uscf rated tournament/year)

Joe L.: Perhaps 2 years. This was rejected as it's lot can change in 2 years, and members can always easily re-approved.

Abel T. – call the question

All in favor. No objections.

Motion passed.

### **Motion by Stephen S.: to open have a family membership for CalChess.**

Second: Joe L.

Discussion: Tom L. needs to modify the website, and also need to know how many parents/kids included.

From the floor: suggestion - 2 parents and 3 kids.

Real issue: not good enough communication, and parents are already willing to pay the \$5 so we'll lose money overall.

Stephen S. – suggested price \$15  
Ruth H. – defer it via email since it's a complex topic.

**Stephen S. – rephrase motion: Calchess reinstates its family membership, and the price is 3x the original price.**

Stephen S. withdraws his motion.  
And the topic was referred to the board of director for further discussion.

Motion by Tom reaches out to interested parties on website/email blast for writer for calchess journal to discussed details and report back to the board.

Abel T. seconds.  
No discussion  
All in favor. No objections.  
Motion passed.

Ruth H. moves to adjourn.  
Judit S. Second

Meeting adjourned 6:15pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

Dr. Judit Sztaray  
CalChess board members, secretary  
[judit@calchess.org](mailto:judit@calchess.org)

### **Supplemental to the meeting minutes: Online motion, discussion and voting during Sept 2018**

→ after meeting, Board received the following motion via email.

**Motion by Abel Talamantez:**

**I make a motion that we publish the election results on the CalChess website. This would include the vote totals for each candidate and indicate that the top 4 vote getters won seats on the CalChess Board for 2018.**

Second by Judit Sztaray.

Discussion occurred.

Summary of the mentioned points:

**Richard K.:** Against announcing the total votes: current policy of announcing the winners and providing the providing the vote totals privately to those interested board members and candidates is a better policy in my opinion. That way the losers ( particularly at the bottom ) do not have to see their losing margin's displayed for the world to see.

This years vote was unusual in that 82 members 14 and over voted. That is very high by CalChess standards though the number is tiny relative the the number of members or voting age members. When the number is down around 10 to 15 as it was last year do you still want to publish it? My feeling is that for such a small organization and small number of voters we don't need to publish the final vote tallies, and furthermore it probably is not a good idea to

publish how small the vote count is overall. And again, I don't see the need to publicly show the world how low the losers vote count really was.  
That being said, if we do publish, I would do so in the minutes to the Annual Meeting, which would be posted on line in the usual location. Not on the front page of the web site.

**Abel T.:** How does protecting the possible hurt feelings of losing the vote outweigh the need for transparency of all those who voted to actually know the raw results of the vote? I don't many elections in which results are kept from those who actually voted, and as a CalChess member, what is to stop me from questioning the vote itself if the organization will not publish the results? That doesn't make any sense in my opinion.  
I'll add another thought on this; I have the privilege of knowing Lynn, Ruth and Jim Eade, and of course I have no issue with the legitimacy of the votes they counted and verified. But there are many CalChess members that do not know them and their integrity in the same way we do. We are basically telling our membership to vote in an open election, but trust us that the votes are accurate and we have a winner without being able to show actual totals and results. There is a greater potential for corruption if elections are held in this manner rather than an open publishing of not the ballots themselves, but the actual count! If I was a member that did not know the people counting personally and had trust in their integrity, I would have a serious issue with an organization being unwilling to publish election results.

I respect the opinions of the members of this Board, but frankly the rationale I'm hearing against publishing election results are an insult to the membership and a poor example of transparency. It's actually embarrassing in my opinion, especially as such a big deal was made about the lack of transparency of past Boards. There is nothing here to suggest to me or the membership that anything will change in the future. I guess I make the assumption that people run for office because they want to make a difference and change for the better, not because they care what place they end up. May I ask why you think publishing the results of a democratic election is inappropriate?

I would ask people to consider how you would answer the everyday chess player CalChess member who we are supposed to represent, why we would not want to publish election results. Stephen offers a mere opinion that it is unnecessary and inappropriate without explaining why. This vote will go on the record and I expect all those who oppose it to be able to justify their vote to members that ask for an explanation.

I am starting to fear that there are those among us on the Board that want anything but transparency. We had opposition initially from this Board in even opening up more time for members to vote. We have past Treasurers on this Board who have never taken an active role in ensuring transparency in finances, and in fact, are the very people that are opposing publishing election results.

I think this will be the moment we need to take a collective inventory of who we want to be moving forward, of avoiding the instinct to draw "party" lines and just do what is right and just in the interest of democracy and the public good. If we continue along the path of keeping things as usual, of blocking transparency, of not participating and just being a Board member in name only, then we risk the very legitimacy of CalChess and it will be an organization anyone who truly cares about chess would not want to be a part of. I thought we all saw how members were excited at the opportunity for more openness, and now we may be on the verge of turning our backs on those ideals. Just my opinion. I have more than a basic understanding of political theory and electoral politics. But opposing posting the results of a democratic election goes against everything that stands for openness and democracy.

**Joe L.:** I strongly agree with Richard. The vote totals are embarrassing to those at the bottom. Also they are a shout out to possible future candidates, do not run or you will get embarrassed.

Judit and Abel want everyone to know that if you run against a Bay Area Chess person you will get crushed and the results will be made public to embarrass you.

If we are going to be democratic we should treat this like a real election and publish (before the election) the occupation of each candidate and the chess rating of each candidate.

If anyone wants the results of the election they should be allowed to Email the membership coordinator (Richard) and get the results. The results are not secret. We have never publicized them. Judit and Abel believe that it will be in their interest to publicize them which is why they are trying to do it.

**Judit S.:** I think it would encourage people and I have my reasons to think that based on conversations with the chess community! I got a lot of question inquiring about the results. Either way, everyone can have their own opinion how it would or would not affect people, candidates and community.

But the facts don't change: in a democratic election the number of votes should absolutely made public to be transparent and clean. And there is nothing in the bylaws to prohibit that (it couldn't have cuz it's an open election.) Can you imagine if running for the school district board the city would not publish the results? What would you think of city of Fremont for example?

For your consideration:

I have asked around and also did quick internet research and many state affiliate publish the results especially where competitive, so does USCF.

If you need a few examples:

<https://www.floridachess.org/resources/Documents/Florida%20Chess%20Mag/fcaoct2017-compressed.pdf>

<https://secure.electionbuddy.com/results/T8GJNXXMERY2>

<https://www.nevadachess.org/category/governance/>

USCF results are in September's TLA and they also published very fast via their Facebook page.

**Ruth H.:** Since Jim Eade was involved in the process, I suggest we consult him as well. I agree with Jim that we have an obligation as a 501(c) (3) to make the record public.

**Jim E.:** Thank you for including me. It is always an honor to be entrusted with this kind of (vote counting) responsibility. I agree with those who advocate publishing the votes. The USCF does this, or at least they did when I was involved.

There can be a discouraging aspect for those who had low vote totals. However, those who fell just short might ratchet up their efforts for the next election. These are but secondary considerations, in my humble opinion.

Transparency is the most important principle to keep in mind. Make the votes public. Make the finances public. Make the meeting minutes public. As a 501(c)-3 these things are a must do, not an ought to do.

**Stephen S.:** I strongly object to Abel's and Judit's motion to publish the vote counts. It is unnecessary, and inappropriate.

**Lynn R.:** I think that we should be open, and should follow what are by-laws say. What do they say we should do? Going forward we need a clear policy on this for future elections.

**Tom L.:** During this discussion several people have referred about CalChess being a 501c3 organization. I spent a lot of time making that happen, and I am sure we all don't want us to lose that! During our recent meeting Elizabeth wanted to know the vote count and also if the final results were posted in count order. She seemed very concerned about us hiding the vote counts. Elizabeth has voiced fears in the past about CalChess maintaining our 501c3 status and Joe has been especially concerned about us losing sponsorships if we forfeit our 501c3 status.

Elizabeth trusted Jim Eade to be in charge of the vote counts and Jim says because we are a 501c3, we should publish the vote counts. Ruth has also specifically mentioned our 501c3 status in her email. I don't see how we can risk doing something that would endanger our 501c3 status as Ruth, Joe, Elizabeth and Jim have agreed we need to protect.

**Amendment to be motion by Ruth:** I move that we include all vote totals for the election of CalChess board members in the minutes of the annual meeting.

**Same motion for amendment was made by Abel later, so it was considered a "friendly" amendment, hence no vote required:**

**Votes on the original motion:**

Yes: Joe Lonsdale, Tom Langland, Judit Sztaray, Abel Talamantez, Lynn Reed, Richard Koepcke

No: none

No vote received: Stephen Shaughnessy

Motion passed.