



Report to the UB Executive Committee Nov 4th 2014,
regarding questions Asked & Answered by a Fellowship Member.

Judicial has been asked if the two IT motions the EC passed on April 29th 2011 in Salt Lake City, are still active.

Having reviewed GC, EC and IT Minutes and e-mails and other reports, there appears to be no indication that either the GC or EC has discussed, or in any manner considered, rescinding or amending either of these two motions.

Therefore, it is the conclusion of Judicial that these Motions are fully active and in force.

The full text of these two motions attached below.

In Mutual Service to The Fellowship,

Lenny Cowles



Be of Good Cheer

Motion was made by John Hay and seconded by Susan Cook to authorize the Executive Director to hire a full time IT Manager to create, implement and manage our IT plans, procedures and requirements, recommended salary range up to \$70,000. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Lila Dogim and seconded by Michael Challis that the Executive Director begin to implement a new direction with our IT via the Neworg.com system, or a similar Constituent Relationship Management System (CMRS) pending the reference checks of Neworg.com. Motion carried unanimously.

For Judicial Review - Further information concerning the IT Motions.

1 - Are these Motions still active? Answer - Yes.

2 - What are the responsibilities and obligations of the Officers and the EC in fulfilling active motions from previous Fellowship assemblies?

Answer - The 1st priority of both the Officers and the EC is to fully participate in the execution of all motions passed by the General Council and Executives Committee, while keeping the respective assembly fully informed regarding the status of those motions.

3 - Have the current Officers fully engaged in the execution of the motions in question?

Answer - No.

The newly formed IT Committee was created by direction of the President, without authorization or confirmation by vote of the EC or GC. This committee was not given written instructions. However the new Chair of the IT Committee felt that they did have full authority over all IT operational aspects.

According to the UBF Constitution and By-laws, the President has not been granted authority that would allow the officers to assume responsibilities or have cause to supersede the directions and authority granted to the Admin Director by the EC motions of April 2011.

Further, by Dec of '12, the Admin Director had grave concerns regarding what the new IT Committee was doing and wanted to talk to EC. The President refused her permission to talk to EC, citing her authority based in the Admin Directors job description. And citing a precedent based on; "Your predecessor, John Hales, was always present at the EC meeting but never spoke unless a question was asked of him."

In Mar '14, The Web-Master posted serious concerns that the EC needed to be aware of, and the Chair of IT (and officer) responded saying, "all who received this communication from David to not to respond to it, personally or collectively, or to share it with others. Creating an email record of this ill-conceived statement would not serve the interests of the Fellowship."

The EC cannot ask a question, if they do not know there is a problem. The Admin Director and the Web-master where required to pass on their requests or concerns, thru

the office of the President, telling them, "You are not to discuss anything related to IT with members of the Executive Committee; it will only confuse them."

The President, as well as the Chair of the IT Committee, unfortunately failed to pass on information to the EC, as repeatedly requested by Admin & the Web-master.

Copies of emails and other related documents cited are available upon written request.