

AGA Board Meeting, Sunday, 15 Feb. 2003, 7 PM EST

Roll call:

Allan Abramson
Dave Weimer
Willard Haynes
Jon Boley
Bill Cobb
Harold Lloyd
Chris Kirschner
Susan Weir

Absent: Jeff Shaevel

1. Approval of Minutes

- the minutes from the 12-18 and 1-2 meeting were generally approved, except for the comment (12-18 meeting) about Bill Cobb's being paid to do AGA work, which is not entirely accurate. Bill will send correction on to the board, then to Susan. Minutes were then approved.

2. Old Business

a. Consideration of nominations for the Leadership Development Committee

(Current names under consideration include: Sam Zimmerman, Bob Barber, Ernest Brown, Duane Burns, Steve Burrall, Robert Cordingly, None Redmond, and Eric Wainwright, Larry Gross)

Discussion: The board is not sure if Ernest has been contacted. Joe Carl is also interested.

- if this is a standing committee, we might want to have fixed, staggered terms, and name an initial chair. If Ernest declines, we'll ask Joe Carl to serve on the committee. We'll delegate to the chair to ask members for one, two or three year terms. All names were approved. Sam Z. is nominated as initial chair for committee. Previous questionnaires to candidates for president will be sent to Sam also.

- Need to move up the date for new nominations for president from the end of March to the end of April.

- Allan will draft a statement as to define the purpose of the committee.

3. New Business

a. Governance Committee issues: Keith Arnold has asked for prioritization and guidance to the committee

1. Voting for directors: chapters, members, hybrid?

Discussion: This is urgent, but not at the exclusion of a thorough investigation and

report at the assembly. It was noted that at the last national meeting, a committee was formed to poll the chapters and membership about this issue, and see what the sentiment of the organization is, and come back with their results not later than the 2005 Congress. There was also some fear that this divisive issue should wait until we have recovered more completely from the recent crises. It was noted that we need to address both constituencies. Half our membership has no political power, yet chapters are the source of our strength. Some kind of hybrid is needed. We don't expect it to be ready for a decision before the upcoming Congress.

2. Regional representation of the Board
is linked to #3, see discussion below.

3. Term of President (See attached discussion by Dave Weimer)

Discussion: Board can always enact things as policy, does not have to be a by-law. Much discussion about whether the board or by law changes would be more appropriate. It was decided to table this until the next board meeting, ask for and refer to the advice of the governance committee as to this issue. the board may do a short term solution at the next meeting for the immediate presidential appointment coming up.

4. Director terms and recall procedures

5. Director replacement procedures

6. The Board's power of appointment and dismissal of Officers

Discussion: the above three are high priority. #4: we need to eliminate the "lame duck" period, to have elected members join the board immediately after election. #6: we need super majority to dismiss an officer.

7. Role of the National Assembly

Discussion: This is as important, but will take more time to address, not as urgent.

8. Quorum for the Board

Discussion: This is fairly easy to fix, also a high priority

9. Respective roles of President and Board

Discussion: Not sure what this means. Dropped.

10. Do we need a dispute resolution/mediation committee?

Discussion: It was decided to take this one off the governance committee's agenda, transferred to the board's agenda to pursue.

11. Procedures for Presidential appointments

Discussion: Also decided this should be a board issue to pursue.

Other Discussion:

Other issues that have been raised : communication between board members and president, especially personnel appointments. George Zhou's recommendations for Ing policies are awaiting approval. David Dinhofer's nomination for fundraising committee. Location of Go Camp for 2005. None Redmond has raised the issues concerning the

children's room at Congress. Allan suggested we should refer this to the president. Also raised was the need to codify policies on who gets AGA 'benefits', such as: Congress fees being paid for some workers, overseas trips, hiring spouses for paid work, etc. Do we need a policy? Also brought up was the need for regular reports from committee chairs. On tournament software development: Chris Kubica is working on this. IGF meeting, do we send someone?

Allan:. Suggests the next meeting in three weeks., March 7

Meeting was then moved to closed session at 8:15 pm.

NOT COVERED IN OPEN MEETING

b. Finances

1. Diversification: fund-raising committee

c. Legal

1. Expectations of counsel

d. Professionals

1. AGA principles for representation at tournaments(See attachment)
2. Goals for the relationship
3. Strategy for positive relations
4. NAMT status
5. Upcoming international events
6. Long-term planning, such as "League"

e. Membership

1. Goals for growth
2. Preparing for Hikaru; reaching out to kids
3. Marketing issues and goals
4. Vision for the AGA web site

f. Procedures

1. Invite AGA officers to the Board meetings? Note that some have been invited by sending this agenda to them.

g. Relationship with AGF

4. Open discussion

5. Adjourn

6. Closed Session on Personnel

Allan

Attachment A: Dave Weimer's thoughts on Presidential term, as a starting point for the discussion; others have questioned a one-year term, for various reasons, so the discussion should be interesting!

"I will argue for a system in which we have people move through a series of chairs before they take a one-year term as president. The simplest version would be to have a president-select who serves during the one-year term of the current president before taking over for one year --- this is the system used in most of the professional associations to which I belong.

A more complicated version might have a two-step, two-year run-up, as is common in fraternal organizations. We might seek advice about this from the Leadership Development Committee, or we might discuss it among ourselves.

My motivation for advocating this sort of approach is based on three considerations. First, explicit fixed terms are one way to balance better the relationship between the board and president. Second, there is value to rotating more people through leadership positions and not burning them out to the extent that they are no longer likely to want to take leadership positions. Third, getting a president-select in place would provide help for the president and prepare the president-select to begin office with a sprint.

I don't think it is good to have a tournament --- say, choosing the president from among several VPs. Important that the succession be clear and certain so all involved can plan their activities. Basically, what I have in mind is a relay team of sprinters rather than a series of marathoners who carry a big burden for a long period."

Attachment B: Starting point for discussion of principles for professional representation at tournaments

1. Should the AGA initiate development of a specific statement of principles for professional representation at tournaments at this time, or should we start with a general statement of principles, and get more specific at some later date?

2. If we start with a general statement of principles, Dave Weimer has

offered the following for consideration:

"The AGA should seek through its own policies and in its dealings with other organizations to promote procedures for selecting representatives to international tournaments that are inclusive, fair, and transparent. To the greatest extent possible, representatives should be chosen on the basis of competition among those eligible."

3. If, on the other hand, we initiate development of a more specific statement of principles, then a number of questions should be addressed:

- a. Should the AGA take a position at this time?
- b. If so, should any resident professional contributing actively to the US GO community, either citizen or green card holder, be eligible?
- c. Should the AGA support selection by open competition?
- d. If open competition is not feasible, should the AGA support selection by rating?
- e. If selection is by rating, how to do this?
- f. If selection is not by competition or rating, what other options would the AGA support?
- g. Any other principles to discuss?