

Feedback on Nordecke Bylaws Proposal, submitted via email to Chairperson

As of 5/17/2024

Proposal Document Content:

Member 1

- Section 1.1.3.: I would really prefer to have a specific mention of transphobia in the list of prohibited behavior. While it is covered under “bigotry,” that’s true for every other named form of discrimination. Our transgender community deserves specific mention, especially in the context of the political and legislative climate in Ohio and the political leanings of ownership.
- Section 4.2.d.6.a: how will the age of the voter be determined/verified?
- Section 4.2.d.6.f: What happens in the event of a tie or a non-majority vote (e.g., a plurality if three or more candidates exist)?
- Section 5.1.2, “regular meetings” is way too non-specific. Offer a minimum number (e.g., no less often than quarterly, monthly) so there is an expectation.

Member 2 - *Email conversation between Member and Chair (Katie).*

M: I have two concerns with the changes that popped immediately to mind when I saw the proposal.

1. Treasurer should be appointed not voted. It is too critical of a role to end up with someone who is not the most qualified possible. I know this well from experience in the role. If you make Treasurer and Secretary both appointed, non-voting roles you will ensure financial integrity and keep the needed odd number of voting.
2. The new terms should begin with the 2025 election with all 11 roles running - half for 1 and half for 2 year terms. This needs to be spelled out in the document. The Board proposing changes that impact current Board roles is not something that will promote trust in the organization.

K: Just to clarify your first point so I make sure I understand. Are you suggesting leaving at the 9 elected and then the Secretary and Treasurer would be appointed (not necessarily from the elected) and non-voting, more like the current senior leadership positions or the appointed officers described in the bylaws?

The intent was that the Secretary and Treasurer would not be an added role/responsibility to an elected Director position (as the current bylaws are written) since the workload has increased. I completely agree that the Treasurer is an important role for maintaining financial integrity, so your input is much appreciated (especially since you've served in that position).

M: Yes. I know that keeping the voting Board at an odd number is important. I feel strongly that the Treasurer cannot be an elected role - I have a story I will tell when there is a public forum for feedback that shows exactly why - as it is a huge risk for the organization if someone less than fully qualified - but generally well liked - runs and wins. To keep the voting membership at an odd number, making Secretary appointed too keeps that balance. (But I have no strong feelings about the Secretary role - just proposed that for the balance.) As appointed roles, both would be non-voting. And I totally agree that the Treasurer role should not be tied to another Board role. Secretary could go either way.

Member 3

- My biggest concern is that it was not necessary to spend significant amounts of time and money to basically extend the term limits of the current board. It seems like that was the bulk of the amendment. I would like the board to disclose how much money was spent to make these changes?
- I have questions about how the board decided on which positions are up for election in the odd or even year as it seems like those positions were aligned deliberately.
- When I bought my membership I bought it with current bylaws in place and understood that the board directors would be elected every year. When I voted in the previous election I voted for board members terms of 1 year. I do not agree to extending board terms without a new election. This seems like an issue the paid attorney should have addressed as it changes the outcome of what was voted on and agreed to when memberships were purchased in the middle of a term. When we last amended the bylaws we did so before a new board was elected and before memberships were made available at the end of our term.
- Knowing that the majority of the current board was appointed in secret it seems there needs to be a more transparent process to those appointments and to make the membership aware when a position is vacant instead of just appointing friends of the current board members to vacant positions. At one point when some of the current board members were appointed it was done without a minimum number of official directors positions filled in order to conduct official business as it was. I would like to see additional language in the bylaws that would address that issue.
- Can you explain why you decided upon not counting the appointed terms towards the term limits? As the majority of the board ran for election promoting themselves as the incumbents and went so far as to also indicate that on the Nordecke website, there was no transparency about how those directors were placed. This appears as an attempt by the current board to make changes to allow themselves to hold their positions as long as possible.

Member 4

- Look forward to the May 21st meeting. [GCGBAG is] still happy to meet and discuss ahead of time, including over Zoom or a call if that is more convenient.

Bylaws Revision Process

Member 2 - Addressed, public forum/discussion will allow for revisions prior to voting.

- Why is there not opportunity for revision prior to the up or down vote? My guess is there will be some common sense, no-brainer, opportunities to change these for the better (the word plurality above is a great example) and of course some more contentious things that might be best addressed up front. With the way the process is described, no matter what input is received, the document as it is now is what will be voted on. That seems silly. This seems like an opportunity to listen and get constructive feedback that makes the document the best it can be. Without doing that, anyone who has even a basic and easily corrected concern (like majority vs plurality) will have to vote no to have a chance to get the issue fixed. Us providing comments and feedback seems silly if it is not going to yield any updates.

Member 3:

- Was the entire board included in the entire amendment process or just a selected few?
It was mentioned in slack that there was a committee involved in creating the amendments. Who was part of that committee?
- The lengthy and expensive process to changing the bylaws would have been best done openly and with input from the community, I hope the feedback is taken into consideration. I also believe voters should be voting on individual changes not a blanket up/down vote. As is, I would not vote to approve this amendment based on the changes to the directors terms alone. I am sure others have the same concerns.

Grammar/Punctuation/Terminology:

Member 1

- Section 1.1.1, shouldn't it just be "Columbus Crew" and not "Columbus Crew SC"? Is this a legal business name that they're still using? I would refer to the team's media guide, but of course they don't have one because they're bad at their jobs.
- Section 1.1.6, it should be "who wish to engage" rather than "whom." Subject, not object. Grammar nerd.
- Section 4.2.a, this is the first use of the term "AGM" and should be spelled out (it is currently spelled out in the second usage, under sub-section d).
- Section 4.2.c.3, "Match Day Experience Director" ("Director" is missing).
- General: decide whether the term is "Supporter Groups" "organized supporter groups" or "supporters' groups" for consistency across the document.
- Section 8.5, need a period at the end of the final sentence.

Other:

Member 4

- At one point there was a request to highlight elements in the GCGBAG bylaws revision proposal that were not reflected in the board's. I noted a proposal that would require there to be a record of a board vote on any expenditures over \$1,000. I thought I saw a response that it was a moot point as there is already a vote for all expenditures. I'm glad to hear as it is a prudent practice.

Other feedback/questions not specific to this document were received, and those will be addressed individually or at the June Board Meeting.