

BARS Committee Meeting Agenda

Please include your initials after any general entries that you make.

Attendance: Tim B., Terrell B., Alex Y., TJ B., Dom P., Julian D., Alex K., Stephen E., Matt B., Josh T., Troy S., Michael F., Michael W., Dennis T., Juni M., Steve B., Janghyun J.

1. Open Discussion from the Committee

- a. Want something discussed at the meeting? Think there is a problem? Have a good idea and want to get more involved? Toss it in the mix for discussion!
 - i. Question about offering use of small balls intermittently at open-play to help improve preparedness for regional/national leagues
 1. Small ball open-plays agreed upon, will post in advance to inform players of specific nights, currently looking at April 13th as first date
 2. Lead into discussion regarding a new, separate small ball league night → there will be a player survey to find level of interest

2. Updates from the Commissioner

- a. No exec board votes since last meeting
- b. Upcoming Elections – eBoard election happening at end of April, end of May for rest of board
- c. Shirts for dodgeball reverted back to American Apparel, imported due to color selection options, Tuesday kickball will continue with short sleeves, Saturday will return to long sleeves
- d. TJ Brune voted as PR chair in special election, runoff voting not needed
- e. Conflict of interest announcement from commissioner – both he and Director of Kickball accepted positions on Kickball USA board to formulate charter and rules

3. Proposals + Sport Discussions

- a. Dodgeball Rule Clarification (AK) [see below](#)
- b. Quorum change (TB) [see below](#)
- c. Voting method change (TB) [see below](#)
- d. Pride Cruise (DT)
 - i. [Approached by Matinee to offer discounted tickets to BARS players for Pride Cruise – can we participate again? Motion passes](#)

1. Brief Sports Updates From Directors

- a. Bowling
- b. Dodgeball
- c. Kickball

2. Philanthropy

- a. BARS Scholarship (TC and SB)
 - i. Funds due 4/15
 1. [Applications start March 1st, end March 31st and pre-screening by Point Foundation](#)
- b. Flip Cup Tournament [in planning stages](#)

3. Treasury

4. Press/Marketing

- a. Social Media Update (TJB)
 - i. [Instagram is now business account](#)
- b. Website Refresh (TJB)

- i. Working together with Troy to make changes to improve readability and make new-user-friendly
 - c. Spring 2018 Weekly Player Spotlights (TJB)
 - i. Follow-up w/directors
 - d. Promotional Video Content (TJB)
 - e. Logos are being updated to improve resolution for larger prints since older files aren't as good quality
- 5. **Social**
 - a. Updates on opening and closing parties of all sports
- 6. **Miscellaneous**
 - a. Dodgeball USA (AK - just wanted to discuss if there are any next steps?) – still pending additional information – BARS has not yet been excluded
 - b. Web Registration/League Management Software (TB) - postponed
 - c. Kickball: Creation of a Saturday Kickball Director (discussion). (MF/AV) – separate discussion over Slack – official proposal in April

PROPOSALS:

1. **Proposal to amend Dodgeball rule 12.E**

Current rule reads: If a LIVE ball hits a ball that a player is holding, and knocks that ball out of their possession, then that player is OUT. Players are not out if they drop a ball first to catch a LIVE ball thrown by an opponent player.

Issue: you can lose and regain possession and should still be in. The rule should read that once you lose possession and the ball dies.

Revised rule reads: If a LIVE ball hits a ball that a player is holding, and knocks that ball out of their possession and the ball dies, then that player is OUT. Players are not out if they drop a ball first to catch a LIVE ball thrown by an opponent player.

- Question about the added benefit of the second. Second sentence removed from proposal.
- Current definition of “possession” was reviewed
- Discussion regarding adding to Scenario 12 regarding situation related to 12E where the ball that was knocked out of one player's hand is then caught by a second player on their team before dying
 - o First vote: must an individual regain possession of their OWN ball vs whether or not the ball dies (meaning ANYONE can prevent the ball from dying) – poll of present board and committee members to determine interpretation of final definition of the rule
 - o Proposal with specific situation above for future meeting
- Motion to pass modification of 12E with removal of second sentence: **Motion passes**

2. **Proposal to Change Quorum Requirement**

Rationale

Board meetings are often held up by latecomers or by last-minute cancellations. The point of a quorum is to prevent a small minority of the board to dictate policy by arranging meetings at time where the full board is not present or in ways to exclude other board members. Given our board meetings are announced at least one week in advance and individuals are allowed to call in remotely, this reduces the risk of this

occurring.

Proposal

Change quorum from three quarters of the eligible voters to two thirds of the eligible voters.

Note: This motion requires a two-thirds majority to pass given changes to our bylaws.

In Practice:

With 15 board positions:

- $3/4 = 11.25 = 12$ members present for quorum (it's a strict minimum, we do not use rounding rules)
- $2/3 = 10$ members present for quorum

Discussion Point:

The risk, would be that more people could be excluded from decision making process.

This is troublesome if the absent board members share a similar opinion. However, given our history of meeting attendance, this may be more appropriate and is not a particularly small proportion compared to traditional quorums (House of Representatives: >50%, Senate: 51 senators (> 50%))

Motion passes with current quorum voting requirements

3. Proposal to change to Instant-Runoff Voting method for all elections

Rationale:

More frequently, we are seeing multiple candidates running for the same positions. This is a good sign as we have more interested people wanting to get involved with the board and help organize the leagues. Elections should be designed to have the most desired candidate elected, and this becomes more difficult when there are more than two candidates.

The current problem: In a simple plurality voting system, a person can be elected without the majority will of the voters.

Example: Three Walking Dead Candidates up for Election

Election Results:

- Carol - 25% of votes
- Michonne - 35% of votes
- Maggie - 40% of votes

The Problem: What if everyone who voted for Carol prefers Michonne over Maggie?

IN A PLURALITY VOTE (CURRENT SYSTEM)

- MAGGIE WINS with the most number of votes
- ... but, most people (60%) didn't actually want her to win

IN AN INSTANT-RUNOFF VOTE (PROPOSED SYSTEM)

- If nobody receives > 50% of the vote, the votes for the candidate with the least amount of votes get redistributed to those voters' second choice.
- The voter's selections who went to Carol get reassigned to those voters' second choice (who we said was Michonne in this scenario).
- MICHONNE WINS with the majority interest of the voters

Summary: It's more fair in elections with more than 2 participants in representing the will of the voters.

- Formatting and rationale briefly discussed (discussed in more detail in the February meeting)
- Format put into place as a trial for special election for PR chair due to volume of candidates, though not needed
- Motion to pass: **Motion passes**