



Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
November 9, 2022
6:00 pm
Location: Google Meetings

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Board Position</u>	<u>Attended?</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Board Position</u>	<u>Attended?</u>
Michael Richardson	President	Yes	Katie Villalobos	At-Large	Yes
Nancy Hitt	Vice President	No	David Rill	At-Large	Yes
Katie Niemi	Vice President	Yes	Kevin Welsh	At-Large	Yes
Adam Whittaker	Secretary	No	Steve Leaver	At-Large	No
Jeremiah Stevens	Treasurer	Yes	<i>Open</i>	At-Large	
			<i>Open</i>	At-Large	

M. Richardson called to order 6:04 PM

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Michael: Motion to approve the agenda as presented
 - b. Katie N. 2nd the motion, carried

STANDARD BUSINESS

2. Treasurer's Report
 - a. **2020 Audit** in progress, meeting scheduling underway to finalize by the end of the year
 - b. **2022-2023 Budget** in progress, one outstanding question before presentation: *Should some amount for the Managing Director position be budgeted for this year?* If not, the alternative would be to request a special budget vote at the time the funds are needed.
 - i. J. Stevens provided additional context:
 - We do have the funds in reserve to cover at least the first year salary
 - Listing a line item now does not negatively impact other areas of the budget
 - If we are not able to hire the position this year, they funds could be used for other expenses
 - No intention of raising member fees at this time, that action would be a future decision made in order to sustain the position
 - "This year," refers to our fiscal year, August 2022 - September 2023
 - ii. Discussion

- M. Richardson opposes the inclusion, citing lack of foundation to determine a budgetary line item and needing buy-in from membership before listing on our budget, especially if member fees increase.
 - *J. Stevens response:* Counters that the order of operations should be to budget then present to membership, so that we can show where the money- for at least the first year- is coming from and that it was a planned decision. No proposal to raise fees in this fiscal year.
 - M. Richardson asks for an update on the committee progress and how we can address any member questions/concerns on the basis we have to budget for this
 - *J. Stevens response:* We've met once, outlined some basic requirements, nice-to-haves, background and experience for the position. We have engaged a professional non-profit recruiter to help us complete the description and establish a competitive salary range.
 - *K. Villalobos response:* Cites the experience of the committee members is a key element when addressing member concerns; the individuals on the committee are all subject matter experts, or have professional experience in HR, recruiting, hiring, and non-profit management.
 - K. Neimi supports including in the budget now to establish the intonation, adding that special budget votes can have a negative connotation.
 - D. Rill supports including in the budget now, notes the timeline of hiring would be closer to half a year's salary at this point; thinking about it now is important as it has longer implications of how to fund (i.e.: raising fees)
 - K. Welsh supports including in the budget so that we are prepared to follow through. We need to have a budgeted line item to work against as we move forward in the process. Agrees with D. Rill that if a raise in membership fees is needed, that is a future decision, not something decided with this action.
 - J. Stevens thanked the group for their feedback and will add a line item in the budget and present it at the next board meeting for approval.
3. **Chicago Bears Sponsorship Opportunity** we were invited by the Bears to attend a box-suite, VIP experience that is invite-only from the Bears to local organizations with the intention to explore how our organizations can explore broader sponsorship/partnership. Jeremiah will represent CMSA at this event, anything you want him to have in mind please send to him directly **before Sunday**. Will report on the outcome at the next meeting.
 4. **Treasurer Report** See attached report and send questions to full group board@chicagomsa.org, J. Stevens will answer.
 - a. 1200 members for this fiscal year already
 - b. J. Stevens, motion to accept the report; K. Neimi second, in favor: KN, JS, KV, DR, KW, oppose: MR. Report accepted.
 5. **Team Chicago**
 - a. J. Stevens highlighted additional context that was provided via email to the Board 10/31/2022:
 - Team Chicago is the name of the CMSA Flag Football Travel Team(s).
 - Team Chicago raises money, which is deposited with CMSA, and CMSA pays any bills that they incur. This is typically reimbursement to players for expenses associated

with travel. We have been historically open in covering whatever they ask for, since they are in fact raising the money and it isn't coming from other CMSA funds.

- Things were a little different this year. There was \$10K in funds from 2022 Pride Bowl that rolled back to CMSA. The Pride Bowl leadership wanted to designate \$5K to help folks attend Gay Bowl 2023 in Hawaii. The Board voted to approve that usage based on an understanding that there were not enough funds for Team Chicago to cover it.
 - We gave them up to \$5K to cover their 2023 Gay Bowl registrations, and those checks were mailed to the individuals who attended.
 - Now, Team Chicago has determined that they have enough money from their fundraising that they want to reimburse Chicago players who registered for Pride Bowl 2022. The net effect of which is that CMSA paid for Chicago players to participate in Pride Bowl 2022.
 - Players spend \$5K for 2022 Pride Bowl. CMSA (via 2022 Pride Bowl) gives \$5K to Team Chicago for 2023 Gay Bowl. Team Chicago reimburses players \$5K for 2022 Pride Bowl.
 - Effectively, Team Chicago should have reimbursed its players for 2023 Gay Bowl, and I doubt we would have agreed to use our funds to pay for 2022 Pride Bowl registrations. At best, I believe we would have agreed to put 2022 Pride Bowl money into the hardship fund and allow Chicago players to apply for those funds.
 - Team Chicago leadership is upset because they feel the money is Team Chicago's to spend as they decide.
- b. J. Stevens presented the following options via email 10/31/2022
- Null (meaning the default option) - We reimburse players as requested from the Travel Football team funds.
 - Option 1 - Deny the reimbursement on the basis that the Board was misled into providing reimbursement for Gay Bowl and transfer funds from the Travel Team account back into the CMSA account. In effect using the travel team funds for the reimbursement of Gay Bowl.
 - Option 2 - Approve the reimbursement in the form of a credit for the players for future CMSA registrations valid for 1 year. Thus, effectively ensuring that CMSA is paid back by the Travel Team for funding Gay Bowl registrations.
- c. Discussion
- i. M. Richardson offered additional information on Team Chicago's fundraising goals that would normally lead to the reimbursement of Pride Bowl, but they did not reach that goal based on logistics of the fundraising event. Typically Team Chicago reimburses Pride Bowl players for their time, setup/teardown, etc of the tournament. Requests that in the future, we set up something in advance so that it is clear to both parties on how funds will be handled.
 - *J. Stevens Response* core issue is not about the administration of managing the money. It is that Team Chicago asked for funds from the main CMSA account to send players to Hawaii and we approved it. Now they are requesting to use the money they have leftover to give back to other 2022 Pride Bowl players without paying back the main CMSA fund.
 - ii. M. Richardson asks what is the source of the money? His understanding is it

comes from the tournament and not CMSA.

- *J. Stevens Response* the tournament does not exist outside of the CMSA umbrella, it uses our logo and our name as a CMSA event. There is not “CMSA Money” and “Team Chicago Money” like other sports, the remaining funds from Pride Bowl 2022 roll back to CMSA and do not stay in a separate Pride Bowl bucket.
- iii. K. Welsh supports Team Chicago giving back what CMSA fronted for Gay Bowl 2023 and whatever is left Team Chicago can do whatever they want with it.
- iv. K. Villalobos states the importance of making a broader decision about how individual leagues can handle national tournaments/associations and then defining what Pride Bowl is (treated like a league or a separate entity).

K. Villalobos called time at 6:35 PM to prepare for Commissioner’s Meeting

6. **Final Thoughts** M. Richardson and D. Rill discovered a website how-to video so they are working toward becoming experts on that and report back to the group.

Adjournment: 6:40 PM