

Whisperwood Home Owner's Association
Minutes of the Whisperwood HOA Board Meeting
November 1, 2024

Date: November 1, 2024

Location: Groves Branch Library

Time: Meeting called to order at 6:02 pm

Attendees

Board Members Present:

- **Randal Hamilton**, President
- **Robert Guerrero**, Vice President
- **Rehj Hoeffner**, Secretary/Treasurer
- **Priscilla Elliott**, Member at Large
- **Marnee Bolen**, Member at Large

Association Members:

Several members of the association were present in the audience.

Meeting Proceedings

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by **Randal Hamilton** at 6:02 pm, with a quorum of board members confirmed.

Governance and Agenda Protocol

Randal Hamilton discussed the governance of the new board and the process for getting items on the agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

- **Rehj Hoeffner** mentioned corrections made to the previous minutes and moved to accept them as amended.
- **Robert Guerrero** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.

Action Item: **Marnee Bolen** inquired about additional changes to previous minutes. **Rehj Hoeffner** assured her the corrections were made but noted the webpage revision had inadvertently not been made permanent. **Rehj Hoeffner** agreed to ensure that this revision is updated on the website.

Note: Before these minutes were published, the pending website revisions were completed, ensuring all corrections are reflected both in the official minutes and on the association's webpage.

NEW BUSINESS

Treasurer's Report

Rehj Hoeffner provided the Treasurer's report and requested a motion to pay outstanding bills and honor existing contracts entered into by the previous, now-recognized invalid board.

- **Marnee Bolen** moved to accept responsibility for fulfilling previous contracts to ensure continuity of obligations.
- **Priscilla Elliott** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.

Dual Signatures on Checks

Presidential Directive (Not on Agenda): **Randal Hamilton** commented that, moving forward, all checks will require two signatures to ensure accountability.

Appreciation for Pool Volunteers

Discussion took place regarding recognition for pool volunteers with a gift card.

- **Marnee Bolen** suggested a proclamation and an amount equal to the 2025 staffing budget allocation (\$30,000) split evenly for volunteer appreciation.
- **Priscilla Elliott** moved to give \$50 gift cards to the volunteers.
- **Robert Guerrero** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried** with four votes; **Marnee Bolen** voiced abstention.

Action Item: Randal Hamilton requested a letter of appreciation to accompany the gift cards.

- **Robert Guerrero** moved to have a letter of appreciation written and presented with gift cards for \$50 to the pool volunteers.
- There was a delay in receiving a second; **Marnee Bolen** eventually seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried** with three votes in favor; **Priscilla Elliott** and **Rehj Hoeffner** abstained by default.
- **Procedural Irregularities**
 - ❖ ***Seconding the Motion:** The motion for a letter of appreciation was delayed in receiving a second. The motion should have failed for lack of a natural second.*
 - ❖ ***Voting Procedure:** During the vote on letters of appreciation and gift cards, the chair did not call for opposition, which led some members to abstain by default. To ensure all members have a chance to cast their vote, the chair should call explicitly for votes in favor, against, and abstentions.*

Additional Action Item: Marnee Bolen will provide the board with a list of 2024 pool volunteers, with no deadline stated.

Pool Renovation Bids and Project Management

The board discussed the need to re-bid outdated pool renovation bids and considered appointing a project manager to oversee specifications.

Pool Consultant:

Randal Hamilton shared that **Chad Seay** agreed to act as a project manager without charge, but there was discussion about potential compensation.

- **Marnee Bolen** moved to appoint **Chad Seay** as the “point person” while seeking an alternate project manager.
- Motion **failed** for lack of a second.
- **Rehj Hoeffner** then moved to appoint **Chad Seay** as the “pool consultant” to work alongside **Randal Hamilton** and **Robert Guerrero**.
- **Priscilla Elliott** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.

Pool Overseer:

- **Marnee Bolen** moved to have Chad Seay oversee the project with **Robert Guerrero** and **Randal Hamilton**.
- **Robert Guerrero** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.
- **Chad Seay** will serve as both to “oversee the pool project” and “pool consultant” with **Randal Hamilton** and **Robert Guerrero**.

Action Item: The board will should draft a policy outlining the specific duties and responsibilities of the “pool consultant” and the Pool Renovation Project oversight team (**Chad Seay, Randal Hamilton, and Robert Guerrero**). This policy should be prepared for review and adoption at the next board meeting.

Additional Volunteer Support for Pool Project

Chad Seay suggested potential candidates for the project leadership role, including **Santiago Ramirez**, who holds an engineering degree, and **Tim Collins**. Concerns were raised regarding the personal liabilities associated with the position, and **Santiago Ramirez** indicated he did not wish to be involved.

Rubber Cement Coating Presentation

A presentation was given on the use of rubber cement coating for the pool area. Following the presentation, **Rehj Hoeffner** requested additional information on paver options and quotes.

Marnee Bolen stated that paver information and samples had been presented in a previous meeting. However, **Rehj Hoeffner**, who attended that meeting, noted she only observed Cool Deck examples, but had observed no paver examples.

Audience members began to comment vocally on a variety of subjects. **Chad Seay** intervened to remind attendees that the Board is **required** to adhere to the agenda for an orderly discussion.

Proposed Work Session

Chad Seay suggested holding a “work session” before the next board meeting to allow members the opportunity to voice grievances. The suggestion was discussed informally, but no vote was taken.

2025 Proposed Budget

Randal Hamilton presented the proposed 2025 budget for a vote.

Public Review: The budget has been published on the website for two months, allowing board members and home owner’s alike to review and submit questions or concerns.

Member Feedback: One question was received regarding the tools used to prepare the budget, which included pencil, paper, computer, analytic skills, and previous board experience. Another

request to post the 2023 financials was received and complied with. Additionally, the 2022 financials were also posted. More years to be posted as time permits.

- **Robert Guerrero** moved to accept the proposed 2025 budget as published.
- Instead of a second, **Marnee Bolen** moved to table the 2025 budget for additional information, stating discrepancies without giving specifics or asking questions.
- **Marnee Bolen** requested a second, and **Robert Guerrero** provided it following her prompt.
- The motion **carried** with three votes **for** and two **against**.
- **Reason:** Further research and more information were needed.
- **Revisit Date:** No specific date was set to bring the 2025 Proposed Budget back from the table.
- **Condition for Resolution:** No specific conditions were outlined for resolving the tabled 2025 Proposed Budget.
- **Procedural Irregularities**
 - ❖ ***Premature Motion to Table:** Marnee Bolen moved to table the budget immediately after Robert Guerrero's motion to accept it, without waiting for a second on the primary motion.*
 - ❖ ***Tabling Without Specific Reason:** Marnee Bolen moved to table the agenda item without providing specific reasons for doing so and before any discussion or questions were entertained. As no specific rationale beyond a generalized statement about needing "additional information" or conducting "further research," without providing specific details or examples of what information was lacking. Moving to table even though the policy in question had been posted on the website for over two months, during which no questions or concerns were raised, is inappropriate. Other members did not have a clear basis for agreeing or disagreeing with the motions. This lack of information limited members' ability to make informed votes and could contribute to a sense of coercion for some and confusion for others, as they could feel pressured to support the motion without understanding the purpose.*
 - ❖ ***Tabling Due to Lack of Preparation:** Marnee Bolen moved to table items, citing the need for additional information, despite the fact that relevant materials had been available on the website for over two months without any prior questions or concerns raised by her. Tabling items because of lack of preparation is generally inappropriate and can delay necessary decisions.*
 - ❖ ***Inappropriate Tabling of Amendable Items:** Marnee Bolen moved to table the proposed budget, an item that could easily be amended through board discussion. Tabling amendable items, such as budgets, is generally inappropriate, as these items are intended to be adapted as needed based on input from board members.*
 - ❖ ***Soliciting a Second:** Requesting another member to second any motion, rather than allowing a natural second to occur is inappropriate. The motion should have failed for lack of a second.*

2025 Proposed Pool Policy

Randal Hamilton brought up mixed member feedback on pool staffing.

- **Marnee Bolen** moved to table the Proposed 2025 Pool Policy, but received no immediate second.
- A second for her motion was requested, and **Robert Guerrero** provided it following a prompt.
- The motion **carried**, with three votes in favor; **Priscilla Elliott** and **Rehj Hoeffner** abstained by default.
- **Reason:** More information necessary and time to gather further details.
- **Revisit Date:** No specific date was set to bring the budget back from the table.
- **Condition for Resolution:** No specific conditions were outlined for resolving the tabled budget.
- **Procedural Irregularities**
 - ❖ ***Premature Motion to Table:** Marnee Bolen moved to table the 2025 Pool Policy without waiting for a second on the primary motion.*
 - ❖ ***Tabling Without Specific Reason:** Marnee Bolen moved to table the agenda item without providing specific reasons for doing so and before any discussion or questions were entertained. As no specific rationale beyond a generalized statement about needing "additional information" or conducting "further research," without providing specific details or examples of what information was lacking. Other members did not have a clear basis for agreeing or disagreeing with the motions. This lack of information limited members' ability to make informed votes and could contribute to a sense of coercion for some and confusion for others, as they could feel pressured to support the motion without understanding the purpose.*
 - ❖ ***Soliciting a Second:** Requesting another member to second any motion, rather than allowing a natural second to occur is inappropriate. The motion should have failed for lack of a second.*
 - ❖ ***Repeated Tabling:** Marnee Bolen made multiple motions to table agenda items before any discussion took place, which affected the progression of scheduled discussions. Members who move to table an item are encouraged to provide specific and quantitative reasons to support transparency and accountability.*
 - ❖ ***Voting Process:** During the vote on the motion to table the 2025 Proposed Pool Policy, the chair did not call for those opposed. Consequently, members who did not vote in favor were not given a clear opportunity to voice opposition, which led some to abstain by default.*

Community Survey

Presidential Directive (Not on Agenda): **Randal Hamilton** suggested a community survey to gather feedback on future policies for board consideration. No vote was taken, as the item was not on the agenda.

Attorney Search

Discussion on the need to hire a new attorney due to the current attorney's retirement.

Marnee Bolen and **Robert Guerrero** volunteered to seek out candidates for the board's legal counsel.

- **Priscilla Elliott** moved to approve their role in finding a new attorney
- **Robert Guerrero** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.

Following this decision, **Marnee Bolen** requested permission to speak with the current attorney to facilitate the transition process. However, as no vote was taken, formal authorization was not granted for this action.

2025 Proposed Election Policy and Timeline

Randal Hamilton discussed the 2025 proposed election timeline and policy covering mail-in, proxy, and in-person voting procedures, with nominations beginning on November 18.

Development: Board President Randal Hamilton assigned **Rehj Hoeffner** and **Marnee Bolen** the joint responsibility of collaborating to develop a 2025 Proposed Election Policy, a task essential for ensuring transparency and consistency in upcoming board elections. In accordance with this assignment, **Rehj Hoeffner** promptly took the initiative to develop a working draft of the policy. This draft was completed and submitted to **Marnee Bolen** on October 19, 2024, specifically for her review, feedback, and collaboration, as was outlined in her role on this task. Despite the ample time provided for review and the significance of the policy to the board's operational framework, **Marnee Bolen** did not submit any responses, questions, comments, or suggested revisions in relation to this draft prior to the present meeting.

Correction: Marnee Bolen commented that ballots and proxies could not be requested on the same day nominations ended (November 9th), indicating they should not be requested before nominations close. However, it is permissible for members to request ballots and proxies before the nomination period concludes, as there is no bylaw or state law restriction on this timing.

- **Marnee Bolen** moved to table the 2025 Proposed Election Policy, but the motion received no immediate second.
- After repeated prompting, **Robert Guerrero** seconded the motion.
- The motion carried with three votes; **Priscilla Elliott** and **Rehj Hoeffner** abstained by default.
- **Reason:** More information necessary and time to gather further details.
- **Date to Revisit:** No specific date set to take from the table.
- **Condition for Resolution:** No specific conditions were outlined for resolving the tabled budget.
- **Procedural Irregularities**
 - ❖ *Premature Motion to Table: Marnee Bolen made a motion to table the 2025 Proposed Election Policy prior to a main motion and second.*
 - ❖ *Tabling Without Specific Reason: Marnee Bolen moved to table the agenda item without providing specific reasons for doing so and before any discussion or questions*

were entertain. As no specific rationale beyond a generalized statement about needing "additional information" or conducting "further research," without providing specific details or examples of what information was lacking. Other members did not have a clear basis for agreeing or disagreeing with the motions. This lack of information limited members' ability to make informed votes and could contribute to a sense of coercion for some and confusion for others, as they could feel pressured to support the motion without understanding the purpose.

- ❖ **Tabling Due to Lack of Preparation:** *Marnee Bolen* moved to table items, citing the need for additional information, despite the fact that relevant materials had been available on the website for over two months without any prior questions or concerns raised by her. Tabling items because of lack of preparation is generally inappropriate and can delay necessary decisions.
- ❖ **Soliciting a Second:** *Marnee Bolen* repeatedly prompted another member for a second on her motion, rather than allowing a natural second to occur. The motion should have failed for lack of a second.
- ❖ **Repeated Tabling:** *Marnee Bolen* made multiple motions to table agenda items, impacting the progression of scheduled discussions. Tabling multiple items without substantive discussion, leads to potential delays in necessary decision-making.
- ❖ **Voting Process:** During the vote for the motion to table the 2025 Proposed Election Policy, the chair did not call for those opposed. As a result, members who did not vote in favor were not formally given the opportunity to voice opposition, leading some to abstain by default.

Tabling Impact on Election Calendar

Due to the tabling of the 2025 Proposed Election Policy, the election calendar will need to be adjusted. This change compresses the timeline, allowing less time for members to submit nominations, request ballots, and vote prior to Election Day, scheduled for January 13, 2025.

Revised Election Calendar

The election calendar has been adjusted to accommodate the necessary steps within a shortened timeline:

- **Nomination Period Begins:** November 22, 2024
- **Requests for Ballots/Proxies Begin:** November 22, 2024 (perfectly appropriate)
- **Nomination Period Ends:** December 15, 2024
- **Deadline to Request Ballots/Proxies:** December 22, 2024
- **Voting Deadline (Ballots/Proxies Received by):** January 10, 2025
- **Election Day for In-Person Voting:** January 13, 2025

Compliance with Texas Property Code

Section 209.00593 of the Texas Property Code requires that HOAs provide notice to members soliciting board candidates. This notice must include instructions for eligible candidates and specify a deadline for submitting candidacy requests, which must not be earlier than 10 days after the notice date. *In this case, with a December 15, 2024, nomination end date, a start date of November 22, 2024, remains compliant with the legal requirements.*

Meeting Scheduled

The next meeting was initially set for November 14 but was rescheduled to November 12 at **Marnee Bolen's** request.

No change in venue was noted nor was any vote was taken.

The annual meeting and election of Board Members has been set for January 13. During this meeting, a suggestion was made for board members to familiarize themselves with **Robert's Rules of Order** to support effective governance and procedural adherence.

Adjournment

- **Robert Guerrero** moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 pm.
- **Marnee Bolen** seconded the motion.
- The motion **carried unanimously**.

Minutes Submitted by:
Rehj Hoeffner, Secretary/Treasurer

Procedural Notes:

BRINGING AN ITEM TO THE FLOOR

Opening Motion and Second: To bring an item to the floor for discussion, a board member must first make a primary motion related to the agenda item (e.g., "I move to approve the 2025 budget"). Another member must second the motion to indicate that at least one additional member is interested in discussing it. Without a second, the motion fails and does not proceed to discussion.

Chair Calls for Discussion: Once the motion is made and seconded, the chair opens the floor for discussion. This gives board members an opportunity to share their views, ask questions, and raise any concerns about the item. The chair should ensure that all members have a fair chance to participate before any additional motions, such as a motion to table, are introduced.

Motion to Table or Postpone: Tabling or Postponing the item is only appropriate after the initial motion has been made, seconded, and discussed. A motion to table can be made if additional time or information is genuinely needed. This motion also requires a second and a vote to pass. If a board member tries to table the item immediately upon introduction, the chair should call a **Point of Order**, reminding the board that a main motion and discussion should precede any tabling motion.

Example of Proper Sequence:

Member A: “I move to adopt the 2025 pool policy.”

Member B: “I second the motion.”

Chair: “The motion has been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?”

Discussion proceeds.

After discussion, **Member C** might then move to table if needed, with a second and a vote.

Following these steps ensures that each item is properly introduced, discussed, and, if necessary, tabled with transparency and respect for procedure.

SECONDING ITEMS

For future reference, it is noted that according to Robert’s Rules of Order, motions require an immediate second to proceed. If a second is not provided promptly, the motion fails, and the board should continue with the agenda without prompting for a second. There is no further action necessary. The meeting just continues on.

Here’s the proper approach: Wait Briefly for a Second: After a motion is made, the president should pause briefly to allow another member to second it. This brief pause gives members a chance to support the motion without prompting.

No Second, No Action: If no one seconds the motion after a brief pause, the president should immediately state, “The motion fails for lack of a second,” and move on to the next agenda item.

Avoid Prompting for a Second: It’s not appropriate for the president or the person making the motion to ask for a second, as doing so can create pressure on members to support a motion they might not fully agree with.

Implement a Procedural Reminder: At the beginning of each meeting, remind board members that motions require a quick and natural second without prompting. This will help reinforce that seconds should come naturally if there is genuine support.

Consider a Governance Policy: Adopting a written policy that defines the meeting process—including how motions, seconds, and votes are handled—can help prevent these issues. This policy could outline that prodding for seconds should be avoided to uphold procedural integrity.

Who can Second a Motion: Presidents often refrain from making or seconding motions to maintain neutrality, especially if they are facilitating the meeting.

This approach keeps the meeting orderly and respects the board’s procedural integrity, allowing only motions with sufficient support to proceed.

SOLICITING SECONDS

During the meeting, it was observed that a second for a motion was actively solicited rather than occurring naturally. Under Robert's Rules of Order, a second to a motion should be voluntary, arising naturally to demonstrate genuine support. Actively requesting a second can pressure members into supporting a motion they may not fully agree with, which compromises the integrity of the voting process.

Guidance for Future Meetings: To uphold procedural standards, board members are encouraged to allow seconds to arise voluntarily. If a motion does not receive a second without prompting, it typically does not proceed, as a lack of support indicates it may not warrant further discussion. Members are reminded that they may raise a Point of Order if they observe solicitation of a second, to ensure adherence to Robert's Rules and maintain the board's commitment to transparent and fair procedures.

TABLING ITEMS

Robert's Rules of Order does allow for a motion to table an item, but it is intended to be used sparingly and for specific purposes. Here's a summary of Robert's Rules on tabling multiple votes or issues:

Purpose of Tabling: The motion to table, or "lay on the table," is meant to temporarily set aside an item because it cannot be dealt with at that moment, often due to the need for additional information or an unexpected priority. It should not be used to avoid dealing with issues indefinitely or as a stalling tactic. Members are encouraged to be prepared to act on agreed agenda items by asking questions and gathering needed information prior to the meeting. Being unprepared should not be a reason for "laying an item on the table".

Avoiding Abuse of Tabling Motions: Repeatedly tabling multiple agenda items without clear and specific reasons can be viewed as obstructive and is discouraged. Under Robert's Rules, it would generally be out of order to table multiple items as a means of delaying decisions without a valid and specific reason given for each. Each member voting in favor of "laying on the table" should be able to publicly state their reasons for doing so.

Handling Multiple Tabled Items: If several items are tabled, it is the responsibility of the board to ensure that they are addressed promptly once the reason for tabling is resolved. To bring an item back, a member would move to "take from the table," which requires a majority vote.

Requirement for a Motion and a Second: Each motion to table must be proposed individually, properly seconded, and voted on by the board. This process ensures that the decision to table is

intentional and agreed upon by the majority for a specific reason, which should be included in the meeting minutes.

Accountability: When items are tabled, it's good practice to record in the minutes the given reason for tabling each item and to set a specific time or condition for bringing it back. This prevents issues from being forgotten or perpetually delayed.

Implement a Procedural Reminder: At the beginning of each meeting, remind board members that tabling items should be used sparingly and only with a specific purpose. This will help reinforce that members should come to the meetings prepared and only table items for genuine reasons.

Consider a Governance Policy: Adopting a written policy that defines the meeting process—including how motions to lay items upon the table are handled—can help prevent these issues. This policy could outline that multiple tables for identical reasons should be avoided to uphold procedural integrity.

In summary, **Robert's Rules** discourage using tabling motions as a blanket strategy to delay multiple issues, or for members who come unprepared to discuss or vote on each item on the published agenda. Each motion to table should have a specific, valid reason, and the board should commit to addressing tabled items as soon as the stated reason for delay is resolved.

PREMATURE MOTION TO TABLE

It was noted that a premature motion to table was introduced during the meeting before the primary motion had been formally made, seconded, and opened for discussion. According to Robert's Rules of Order, a motion to table should only be introduced after a main motion has been properly presented and seconded, allowing for initial discussion on the item. This procedural step ensures that all board members have an opportunity to consider the item before any decision is deferred.

Recommendation for Procedural Adherence: To support orderly and efficient proceedings, board members are encouraged to wait until a primary motion has been fully established and discussion opened before proposing a motion to table. Moving forward, if a motion to table is introduced prematurely, members should consider raising a Point of Order to maintain proper meeting structure and ensure informed decision-making.

TABLING WITHOUT A SPECIFIC REASON

During the meeting, a motion to table certain agenda items was introduced without a clear and specific rationale, citing only general terms such as "additional information needed" or "further research." According to Robert's Rules of Order, tabling should be accompanied by a concrete

and compelling reason to allow board members to make informed decisions on whether deferral is necessary. Tabling without a specific reason can hinder efficient board operations and delay decision-making unnecessarily.

Guidance for Future Meetings: Board members are encouraged to provide a detailed rationale when proposing a motion to table, specifying the exact information needed or reason for the delay. This practice allows other members to understand the purpose of the deferral and supports transparency and accountability. If a motion to table lacks specificity, members may consider raising a Point of Order to ensure adherence to procedural standards and to maintain the board's focus on timely and effective governance.

TABLING DUE TO LACK OF PREPARATION

During the meeting, certain agenda items were tabled with a rationale of “needing additional information” or “further research,” despite relevant materials being available well in advance. According to Robert’s Rules of Order, tabling should be used sparingly and primarily in situations where genuinely new or unexpected issues arise that prevent immediate decision-making. Using a motion to table due to lack of preparation undermines the efficiency of board operations and deviates from the intended purpose of the tabling motion.

Guidance for Procedural Adherence: Board members are encouraged to review all distributed materials thoroughly prior to meetings, allowing them to participate in informed discussions and timely decision-making. In future instances, if a motion to table is made due to unpreparedness or lacks a specific, compelling reason, members should consider raising a Point of Order to maintain adherence to Robert’s Rules and to ensure efficient board proceedings.

REPEATED TABLING

It was observed during the meeting that multiple agenda items were tabled consecutively. According to Robert’s Rules of Order, tabling is intended to defer discussion temporarily when new or pressing information is required, not as a routine practice. Repeated tabling of items without specific and compelling reasons can disrupt the progression of scheduled discussions, delay essential decision-making, and hinder the board’s ability to fulfill its responsibilities effectively.

Guidance for Future Meetings: Board members are encouraged to limit the use of tabling to situations where genuinely new information or unforeseen circumstances justify deferral. When considering tabling an item, members should provide specific reasons and clear timelines for revisiting the matter. If repeated tabling occurs without sufficient rationale, members may raise a Point of Order to ensure that board business proceeds in a timely and efficient manner. By minimizing unnecessary delays, the board can maintain a productive and effective meeting structure.

VOTING PROCESS

During the meeting, it was noted that the voting process did not consistently include a clear call for those opposed or abstaining. According to Robert's Rules of Order, the voting process should include an opportunity for members to express opposition or abstention, ensuring that all voices are heard and recorded accurately. Failing to provide this opportunity can lead to unintentional abstentions or lack of clarity in the board's decision-making record.

Guidance for Future Meetings: To uphold transparency and accuracy, the chair is encouraged to explicitly call for votes "in favor," "opposed," and "abstaining" during each vote. This practice ensures that all members are given a clear opportunity to cast their votes and that the board's decisions are accurately documented. Members may also raise a Point of Order if they observe that the voting process is incomplete or unclear, helping to maintain procedural integrity and clear outcomes in the board's governance.

Impact on Voting Integrity: According to **Robert's Rules of Order**, the chair should call for both "ayes" (votes in favor) and "nays" (votes against) to ensure a complete vote count. When the chair only calls for "ayes" and fails to ask for "nays," members who do not support the motion are not given an opportunity to formally vote "no." This oversight may pressure members who disagree to abstain by default, which inaccurately reflects the board's stance on the motion and skews the record.

Procedural Note for Correction: If this irregularity occurs, a board member may raise a Point of Order to request that the chair calls for "nays" to ensure a complete vote. If the chair accepts the point, they should immediately reopen the vote and ask for "nays" before concluding the results.