

Sam Girson <sgirson@comcast.net>

2:00 PM (6
hours ago)

All — Copy of message that should be of interest to you concerning the recent Bylaw Review Committee Report. If you agree, please share and pass it along to you CP, FP, RVP and other members.

Also, if you have any thoughts or comments — good, bad or indifferent -- let me know.

Suggest you scroll and read up from the bottom.

Take care and “keep on truckin!”

Sam g.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sam Girson <sgirson@comcast.net>

Subject: Q

Date: February 23, 2018 at 4:00:23 PM EST

Gary and All — I believe most of you will be interested in my recent exchange with our HQ Executive Director on the recent ByLaw Review Committee Report. This aspect is concerned mostly about the Reports formal distribution thru the NARFE website and publication of a hardcopy duplication, on request.

BTW, please be advised I'm not on some crusade for the visually impaired. I've been contacted by some other members who have voiced similar concerns. Plus, it's worth bearing in mind with a large part of our total membership being older and senior. I'm quite sure there are members out there with visual issues. Along with this, as you will note in the cited concerns, there are issues of logical/basic organization/orderliness, identification and presentation. Additionally, necessary navigation and instructions are equally important. To wit, it ain't to USER FRIENDLY for ALL!

So, you are aware, I have reviewed both the website and hardcopy versions. I found the website most difficult to navigate, so I ordered the hardcopy. An exact duplicate of the website version, I am told. The analysis and items cited t covered in my message are from the hardcopy. Since it's a duplicate most of what I've cited would also apply to the website version.

Anyhow, I call specific attention to these concerns as it relates to the formal Ballot that will be published via both the Internet and Magazine. It is vitally important that it be “accessible” for the general membership population, and of course, for those that are physically challenged. Bottom line, we have to make sure we get the BALLOT right the first time to avoid any "do overs! there won't be any do!

BTW, a couple of members have indicated I'm being a bit to tough, since this is the first time we're installing the 1M1V process. What I am focusing on is basic administration and management oversight stuff. Wthat one would and should minimally practice and put into play, whether its new or old!

Any questions or comments, please let me know. Also, in case I missed anything, which happens, let me know.

Take care and "keep on truckin!"

Sam g.

Barb — Thank for your prompt response and apology! I hear you, but I'm not the only one out there that has to work with and work thru this problem and what may be forthcoming on the Ballot. Plus, you also mentioned “Lessons Learned” -- that's definitely an item — past, present and future!

Look, I'm not trying to lay this on your doorstep! I know some of this went forward before your time and perhaps you were not in the loop as this was working its way thru the system! So, If this, or whatever did or does not fall within your purview, please pass this on to the powers-that-be, or whomever is responsible for the concerns noted. Starting with who was and is still involved from start to p;resent. To assure necessary attention, action and appropriate response going forward!

As we know, Communications is an art form! Regardless of the methodology or new technology, it still requires that what ever is presented verbally or published, that it be accessible and that the recipient(s) understand what is being offered. This applies to the general population, along with reasonable accommodation for those who are physically challenged! As I'm often want to refer to as "USER FRIENDLY" for ALL!

I appreciate your predicament and the fact this is new. I know I'm being repetitive, but there should have been some more upfront "due diligence" in an attempt to avoid and minimize simple negative outcomes that have been duly noted. Where is the "Standard of Excellence? It makes no difference who it was, is, or will be!

In any case, please pass this on for remediation!

Thank you and take care!

Sam g.

On Feb 23, 2018, at 11:06 AM, Executive Director <execdir@narfe.org> wrote:

Sam,

We published, digitally and in hard copy, the material exactly as it was provided to us by the Bylaws and Resolutions Committee. We were not authorized to revise it in any way. All we added was the table of contents. I readily acknowledge it is far from perfect. This is the first vote under OMOV, so there was inevitably going to be some lessons learned. I apologize that you found it difficult.

I do not know the answers to your two questions. As I said previously, exactly what is going in the magazine and what is going on the ballot and what all of that will look like is yet to be decided.

Barb

On Feb 23, 2018 10:25 AM, Sam Girson <sgirson@comcast.net> wrote:

Good Morning Barb — Slept on it, but did not change my original message that was written last night, as follows:

YEGADS! HQ, ought to be ashamed of themselves for allowing a document like this to be published and distributed to the membership. Where is the "qual check" that is obviously missing before sending out a document? Ditto, where's IT, if as you indicated, the hardcopy is a duplicate of what's provided on the NARFE website. You've got a bigger challenge than you think! You have a Committee, management and performance problem that needs immediate attention!!!! I know you don't like all the exclamation points, but somebody better wake up!!!!!!

I have just spent about 6-7 hours trying to go thru and make sense of this document. I must say, with great difficulty!!!!!!

The first page of the Report lists Table of Contents. There are 5 Headers listed in order as follows: BTW, there is no overall paging throughout the document, except for individual proposals that have multiple pages (e.g. pp 1 of 3, 2 of 4, etc)

- Report of the Bylaws and Resolutions Committee
- Proposal to Amend NARFE Bylaws — Ballot Items
- Content of Proposals Acted on By C1ommittee
- Proposals to Amend NARFE Bylaws — All Submissions
- 2018 Bylaws Committee Rationale — Ballot Items

I presume from your message that the two documents you are referring to, are the first two listed documents from the Table of Contents — correct?

The first page of the report is a summary chart. Initially listing proposals recommended for "adoption" grouped together separately in number order. Then followed by another group of proposals, listed separately, in number order, that were all "rejected!"

Then what followed supposedly in sequence (?), is all the individual proposals, starting with #1801, 1802, 1803, no 1804, 1807. 1805, no 1806, 1803, 1805 inserted here, 1804 again, 1808, 1811, 1811 again, 1813, 1813 again, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1824, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, BC01, BC03, 1840R, BCR01,

Was the above supposed to be all A/Rs in number sequence order? It was certainly not sequential. In some instances, I had to rip the binding back to read the proposal #, plus certain pages there was no A/R number indicated, or it was partially printed and you couldn't tell what it was.

Then the next Header was "Content of Proposals Acted on By the Committee." Again, a summary chart listing the proposals, both adopted/rejected in sequential order.

BTW, there were a couple of notes along the way, I presume for computer usage, "Back to Table of Contents." I suppose that was intended to indicate the end of one Header and the beginning of another — correct? A blank page divider, or one with the Table of Content HEADER would have helped.

Anyhow, the next Header was "Proposal to Amend NARFE Bylaws. There were 2 such Headers listed in the Table of Contents. The second one identified as "Ballot Items" and the fourth one was "All Submissions." Neither of which was identified in the body of A/Rs. Which is which, or is one to assume it follows the Content order?

At this stage I stopped! I could not handle it visually any more! Maybe it's my limited vision, but I wonder to what extent if at all, those of you who have vision, could follow the flow of this entire document. Or, did members just disregard and maybe search only for the A/R of interest, if at all? I'm curious what kind of feedback has HQ received on both the computer and hardcopy version of the BRC Report? BTW, I Intend to re-cycle the Report, at least there it will have some VALUE!

Sorry, but I have to ask you again to please answer my ballot questions.

- 1) Will ALL the Amendments/Proposals (A/R) on the Ballot be co-mingled/integrated in number sequence order, irrespective of whether the BRC recommended adoption or rejection?
- 2) Also, will the BRC recommendations (adppton and rejection0 be deleted/excluded from all the proposed A/R balloted items?

I trust the answer will be "yes" to both questions to avoid bias, to be neutral and above board, plus in all fairness to present a level playing field. Apply a similar philosophy you mentioned about HQ Staff avoiding what might be construed as involvement in the Candidate selection process. An application that I feel also applies from a Committee standpoint as well!

I actually worked on this off and on during the day Thursday. I purposely held sending this message until this morning, because I am very disturbed, as you can no doubt tell. I'll let you know if I add any morning thoughts.

One last comment — a bit more "due diligence" would and will go a long way to facilitate communication with the membership-at-large.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and answers!

Sam g.

On Feb 23, 2018, at 8:58 AM, Gary Roundtree Sr <groundtreesr@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi Stu-

John wants you to identify specific changes in 18-24. Gentlemen appreciate our engagement with the resolution book. Has everyone order or receive an copy from NARFE HQ.

Gary

From: John D Stackpole <jstackpo@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, February 23, 2018 8:45 AM

To: Gary Roundtree; Stuart Sklamm

Cc: Dr John D

Stackpole; sajdurrani@aol.com; llange3751@aol.com; mizonks@comcast.net; groundtreesr@yahoo.com; sudhabhagwat2002@yahoo.com; edr3vigil@yahoo.com; Richard Strombotne; Patricia Farmer; Richard Strombotne; Dan McGrath;

Ted Jensen; Ron Bowers; Sam Girson

Subject: Re: Proposed Bylaws and Resolutions

Looking at Proposal 18-24 I am not clear what Stu's concern is based on.

Could Stu, please, identify the specific changes in 18-24 that cause his concern.

And use "reply all:" so we can all see his answer.

Best,

John

John D Stackpole
[401 Epworth Court #524](#)
[Solomons, MD 20688-3034](#)

jstackpo@alum.mit.edu

Land Line: [410-394-3293](tel:410-394-3293) (If I'm home)
Cell: [301-221-9462](tel:301-221-9462) (Better)

On Feb 23, 2018, at 8:32 AM, Gary Roundtree Sr <groundtreesr@hotmail.com> wrote:

From: Stuart Sklamm <srsklamm@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2018 12:51 PM
To: Gary Roundtree Sr
Cc: evelyn Kirby
Subject: Proposed Bylaws and Resolutions

Gary,

I did a preliminary review of the proposed bylaws and resolutions and am especially concerned Standing Rule Amendment 1824. It appears to have the effect of eliminating the federation concept. Please clarify. Thanks.

Stu Sklamm