

**What:** Utah Republican Party (UTGOP) State Central Committee Meeting (SCC)  
**When:** Saturday, September 9, 2017 - 10:00 a.m.  
**Where:** North Salt Lake City Hall - 10 E Center St, North Salt Lake, UT 84054  
**Attendees:** 134 credentialed State Central Committee members  
**Secretary:** Lisa Shepard

During the course of our UTGOP State Central Committee meeting on September 9th, our Professional Registered Parliamentarian, NAP District 8 Director, Ms. Carrie Dickson, demonstrated incompetence and misfeasance by not preparing adequately for our SCC meeting and consistently demonstrated a lack of knowledge of; and disrespect for; our governing rules and their precedence. Additionally, Parliamentarian, Ms. Dickson, consistently failed to advise our Chair and the SCC body on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure. The result was a 5 hour contentious meeting with many new members feeling hopeless as much of the body's business was not addressed. We find this lack of service to our organization and to our Chair unacceptable.

## **Background**

### ROLE OF THE PARLIAMENTARIAN

There are many stories of how a bully presiding officer has hidden behind the 'ruling' of the parliamentarian. Don't allow that misconception to be used against you! One of the misconceptions of parliamentary procedure is that the parliamentarian makes rulings. There is nothing further from the truth.

The parliamentarian is an advisor and therefore makes no final decisions. The parliamentarian may give an interpretation of a rule, an opinion on a rule, or even be asked to cite a rule, but never rules.

The only person who can rule is the chair of the meeting. If you disagree with the ruling of the chair, then you have an avenue to deal with that disagreement—you can make the motion to Appeal from the Decision of the Chair. Notice there is no motion to appeal from the decision of the parliamentarian. That's because the parliamentarian does not make decisions.

Professional parliamentarians should be impartial advisors. They should avoid getting into the issues being debated and instead focus on the procedure of that debate. Because the rules are the same no matter which 'side' you are on, good parliamentarians are able to advise both sides on an issue."

In addition, because professional parliamentarians are focusing on the parliamentary procedure, attendees are free to focus on the issues." "The leader's role is to facilitate the

group in making decisions. The focus is on the will of the members, not the will of the presiding officer.”

## **NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PARLIMENTARIANS COMPLAINT REVIEW**

### **Example 1:**

#### **Facts:**

- (1) The SCC meeting agenda on September 9, 2017 was published contradicting our UTGOP By-Laws. Binding business was listed as item #10. By-laws require binding business to be #1.
- (2) Point of information motion to remind the Chair of our By-laws was ignored by the Chair without explanation.

#### **Complaint:**

- (1) The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed “to prepare adequately for each job and fulfill all commitments.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.2)
- (2) Parliamentarian Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)

**NAP Determination:** “The Parliamentarian prepared a script for use by the Presiding Officer and was present for the entire meeting. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

#### **Conclusion:**

- (1) If the Parliamentarian prepared a script for the meeting, she must have advised the Chair of the By-law violation and he ignored her advice. The Chair was out of order!
- (2) The NAP ignored the fact that the parliamentarian failed to advise the client on acknowledging the Point of Order motion on the floor. This could not have been in the script.

### **Example 2:**

#### **Facts:**

- (1) A candidate who failed to meet the filing deadline was posted as a candidate. Our By-laws require letters of intent to be sent by the deadline.

- (2) A motion was made to not allow any candidates to run for election that failed to meet the filing deadline.

**Complaint:**

- (1) The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed “to prepare adequately for each job and fulfill all commitments.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.2)
- (2) The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:**

- (1) “The script prepared by the Parliamentarian for use by the Chair provided handling a vote to allow the individual who filed late to be a candidate.” Regarding 4.2, this complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.
- (2) Regarding 4.7, “the Ethics Committee determines that the respondent did not act properly, and this complaint is upheld. The Parliamentarian is hereby reprimanded for allowing this violation of the Utah Republican Party Bylaws.”

**Conclusion:**

- (1) If the Parliamentarian prepared a script for the meeting, she must have advised the Chair of the By-law violation and he ignored her advice. The Chair was out of order!
- (2) In this case the Parliamentarian gave bad advice to the Chair (and the Chair acted under this advice) and she was reprimanded. The Parliamentarian was out of order!

**Example 3:**

**Facts:** The Chair announced without notice to the body, that we would use electronic voting for the scheduled elections during the meeting.

**Complaint:** Regarding use of electronic voting, the Parliamentarian failed to advise the client regarding ballot voting that might have been harmful to the organization.

**NAP Determination:** “Although a section of Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised, the organization’s parliamentary authority, was quoted, a subsequent section on Page 419 allows electronic voting. The Ethics Committee finds that the Parliamentarian acted properly, and the respondent is exonerated.”

#### **Example 4:**

**Facts:** The Chair, Robert Anderson made a motion to accept Electronic Voting (EV)... It was obvious the Chair wanted to use this method of voting even though it is not prescribed in our By-Laws. This was a surprise motion as the body had no previous knowledge of the Chair's intention to use EV.

#### **Complaint:**

- (1) The presiding officer cannot make a motion as impartiality is required when chairing an assembly. Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** “Conflicting information was received regarding whether the Chair made a motion or asked for unanimous consent. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** The Chair continues to make motions even though as a presiding officer he is not allowed to do so by our governing rules. The Chair was out of order!

#### **Example 5:**

**Facts:** A Point of order was made claiming – “nothing regarding Electronic Voting (EV) are in the Bylaws...” Motion was then made to vote by paper ballot... citing Roberts Rules of Order... page 412. This Point of order and subsequent motion was dismissed by the Chair without explanation?

#### **Complaint:**

- (1) By not acknowledging the motion, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** Conflicting information was received regarding handling of a Point of Order. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.

**Conclusion:** Again, the Chair continues to ignore motions on the floor. As the presiding officer of a deliberative assembly, his role is as a facilitator with the responsibility to encourage debate and the resolution of issues before the body. The voting body determines the outcome... not the Chair by ignoring motions on the floor. The Chair was out of order!

### **Example 6:**

**Facts:** Morgan County Chairwoman, Kera Birkeland made a motion to use both paper ballots and EV – the motion was seconded. The Motion was ignored by the Chair, Robert Anderson.

### **Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Regarding handling of a motion, the Parliamentarian did not advise the client and call to the attention of the presiding officer a deviation that might be harmful to the organization (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

### **NAP Determination:**

- (1) “Conflicting information was received regarding the Chair’s handling of a motion. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”
- (2) “Conflicting information was received regarding the Chair’s handling of a motion. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** Again, the Chair continues to ignore motions on the floor. I can’t understand what conflicting information was received with respect to advising the Chair to act within the rules? He either dismissed the Parliamentarian’s advice or followed bad advice. The Chair was out of order!

### **Example 7:**

### **Facts:**

- (1) A motion was made on the floor to call to the previous question (Kera's motion to use both EV and paper ballots that was ignored by the Chair) to vote. The Chair called the motion out of order and ignored the motion.
- (2) The Chair, Robert Anderson told the members, "we have used this EV before and people loved it." It was obvious the Chair's personal desires were to use EV only.

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)  
... and the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)

**NAP Determination:**

- (1) "Conflicting information was received regarding a motion to order the Previous Question. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof."
- (2) "Conflicting information was received regarding a motion to order the Previous Question. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof."

**Conclusion:** The Chair's desires to use EV resulted in his ignoring a motion on the floor to call for the previous question... then ruling it out of order because his desires were to use EV. The fundamental rights of deliberative assemblies require all questions to be thoroughly discussed before taking action! The Chair was out of order!

This is when many members of the SCC had their phones tapped and their personal information compromised by logging into the EV system.

**Example 8:**

**Facts:** The Chair, Robert Anderson, announced "return to your seats... we are prepared to go on with paper ballots." There was no motion made or acknowledged to proceed with paper ballots. It was a decision made by the Chair. The Chair was out of order!

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)

**NAP Determination:**

- (1) “Conflicting information was received regarding use of paper ballots. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”
- (2) “Conflicting information was received regarding use of paper ballots. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** The Chair was out of order! The presiding officer cannot demand the body do something. He must wait or ask for a motion and the motion must receive a second to do so.

**Example 9:**

**Facts:** the Chair, Robert Anderson announces approval of auxiliaries... the Chair said “the executive committee did not have a quorum so there are no recommendations to the body today regarding auxiliaries.”

Without a recommendation from the Executive Committee, The Chair, Robert Anderson, reversed and said “our By Laws require the axillaries to be approved each year and now it’s time to do it.” It was obvious the Chair’s desires were to approve Auxiliaries, doing so would give EC and SCC voting rights to his pit bull Daryl Acumen (Black Caucus) and his wife Kathleen Andersen (Republican Women).

Our By-laws claim “To remain a Party Auxiliary, an Auxiliary shall re-petition prior to the 1st State Central Committee meeting following each State organizing Convention by providing documents meeting criteria established in Section 3B.”

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Additionally, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** “Conflicting information was received regarding the Chair’s handling of recognition of auxiliaries. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** If there was “conflicting information received regarding the Chair’s handling of recognition of auxiliaries,” I can’t imagine what it was. As required by our By-Laws, there was no vetting by the EC of auxiliaries because they did not have a quorum... resulting in no recommendation to the SCC for their approval? The Chair was out of order to try and move the process forward against our By-laws.

**Example 10:**

**Facts:** The Chair, Robert Anderson, announces that without objection all auxiliaries will be retained in their current form. He made this statement without recommendation from the EC who’s responsibility is to vet these Auxiliaries prior to approval by the SCC.

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Additionally, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:**

- (1) “The respondent’s response, and the script for handling of retention of auxiliaries did not support the requirement in the bylaws that a new auxiliary would have to be recommended by the Executive Committee for action to be taken by the State Central Committee.”
- (2) “The Ethics Committee determines that the respondent did not act properly, and this complaint is upheld. The Parliamentarian is hereby reprimanded for not providing alternate wording or acknowledging the possibility of no recommendation from the Executive Committee.”

**Conclusion:** The Chairman was out of order! THIS ACTION BY THE CHAIRMAN WAS A DIRECT VIOLATION OF OUR BY-LAWS – and the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, failed to advise the Chairman of this violation and was reprimanded by the NAP. So apparently the script must have approved this action.



### **Example 11:**

**Facts:** an objection was made regarding approval of auxiliaries... an SCC member then motions that each auxiliary is to be voted on by the body one at a time so individual consideration can be made... the motion was seconded. The rules call for a vote on a seconded motion... or at least debate.

Rather than call for a debate or vote, the Chair, Robert Anderson invited the member to come to the microphone and state which auxiliaries she objected to (another bully tactic). The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to advise the Chair, Robert Anderson to address the motion on the floor... the member reminded the Chair of her motion.

Finally, the Chair, Robert Anderson, calls for a standing vote on the member's motion that each auxiliary is to be voted on by the body one at a time the motion – Chair, Robert Anderson rules the motion fails.

The member calls for division on the vote... the Parliamentarian; Ms. Carrie Dickson leaves her chair to count votes. Chair, Robert Anderson says motion fails... 22 to 30.

Our governing rules require the Chair or the Party Secretary to count the standing votes... not the Parliamentarian. It seemed she had an interest in the outcome.

### **Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Additionally, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** The motion regarding voting on each auxiliary separately was taken by a rising vote. There is no division on a rising vote, and a motion for a counted vote was not offered. The Ethics Committee finds that the Parliamentarian acted properly, and the respondent is exonerated.

**Conclusion:** If there was no “counted vote” how could the Parliamentarian have acted properly counting votes? Not sure why the NAP ignored the fact that the Parliamentarian did not advise the Chair to have the Secretary count the vote, per our governing rules. The behavior at the very least presented a conflict of interest, hardly objective.

### **Example 12:**

**Facts:** A member called for a Point of Information. She had an Auxiliary and wanted to know why their application was rejected... the Chair argued they weren't accepted because their platform did not match the Republican Party platform... The Chair said all other auxiliaries had the same platform as the Republican Party... Not true (see Daryl Acumen's Black Caucus).

The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to advise the Chair, Robert Anderson, that with respect to Auxiliaries, the Executive Committee, according to our By-Laws makes recommendations to the SCC... not the Chair.

Kera made her case to change her bylaws... the Chair said he would work with her.

Kera's request for another women's auxiliary was denied because the chair said "there was already a Republican Women's group," namely the one his wife, Kathleen Anderson chairs.

### **Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to advise the Chair, Robert Anderson to recuse himself from this portion of the meeting discussing and rejecting a women's Auxiliary because there was already one... the one his wife Chaired.
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (4) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** "The Chair answered a question and offered to assist with bylaws for the Auxiliary seeking recognition. Recognition of any new Auxiliary would require the recommendation of the Executive Committee. The Ethics Committee finds that the Parliamentarian acted properly, and the respondent is exonerated."

**Conclusion:** Not sure I understand this determination? Thye Chair was out of order! The Chair rejected a women's Auxiliary without the involvement of the EC whose constitutional authority is to approve and recommend Auxiliaries to the SCC? Then said he would work with them, again without the EC. The NAP was in denial!

### Example 13:

**Facts:** a motion was made to use multiple round voting at convention next year – Chair; Robert Anderson says the motion passes. There was a Call for division of the vote from the floor... the Chair; Robert Anderson said “he will not use division today.” Division does not require a second, and cannot be debated, or amended per Roberts Rules of Order.

### Complaint:

- (1) The Professional Registered Parliamentarian, NAP District 8 Director, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to advise the Chair on the proper application of Division.
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (4) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** The motion regarding using multiple round voting at convention was taken by a rising vote. There is no division on a rising vote, and a motion for a counted vote was not offered. The Ethics Committee finds that the Parliamentarian acted properly, and the respondent is exonerated.

**Conclusion:** They must have been getting tired of this process as they do not address the complaint.

### Example 14:

**Facts:** A Point of order motion came flying from the floor for a roll call vote on the motion to use multiple round voting at convention next year ... the Chair, Robert Anderson said 25% of those credentialed was needed to qualify for roll call vote. The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to advise the Chair, Robert Anderson that our By-Laws call for 25% of those present.

The Chair, Robert Anderson, based on the number of credentialed members present (131) said “34 votes would be needed to pass.” Prompted by the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, members in favor of the roll call vote stood and called out sequential numbers as they voted then sat down... Then those against the roll call vote were asked to stand and

the Chair, Robert Anderson, corrected the number that 25% of credentialed members would be 33 votes needed, not 34. The Chair, Robert Anderson declared the Roll call vote failed...

There was an immediate objection that the vote wasn't a real roll call vote... Chair, Robert Anderson said the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson "made the call..." Parliamentarians do not make rulings... only the Chair makes rulings... There is no way to "appeal the ruling of the Parliamentarian" only to "appeal to the ruling of the Chair." Then the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson lectured the body "that if a minority of the body can take over a meeting by asking for these roll call votes we could be here all day." (There were two roll call vote requests made on extremely controversial issues in a 5 hour meeting)

The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, said "a roll call vote would take too long and the outcome of the vote is obvious." She said "the vote count was clearly obvious." Reporters and non-voting staff present as well as other members of the body waiting to speak continued standing as the standing vote was counted making the actual number voting or which way they were voting hard to tell.

#### **Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Additionally, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** "Conflicting information was received regarding taking the vote that the motion be handled by roll call. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof."

**Conclusion:** I must suspend disbelief to accept this cowardly response.

#### **Example 15:**

**Facts:** A motion on a point of Inquiry came from the floor asking "is the 25% requirement a fraction of those present or credentialed? The Chair, Robert Anderson said 25% credentialed... Our By-Laws clearly state 25% or more members present.

(Note: that by this time, given their frustration, over 2 dozen members had left the meeting never to return).

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** “Conflicting information was received regarding the number of votes required and status of those voting for a roll call vote. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** The Parliamentarian should be aware of our By-laws and the 25% present. This question was never addressed and the vote was not tallied properly. This is a huge disservice to the SCC as our only role in life is to vote on policy. Not sure what conflicting information the NAP is referring to?

**Example 16:**

**Facts:** An Inquiry was made – “is the 25% requirement a fraction of those present or credentialed?” The Chair, Robert Anderson again said credentialed... A member immediately appealed the ruling of the Chair... it was seconded... THE APPEAL TO THE RULING OF THE CHAIR WAS IGNORED!

The Chair, Robert Anderson, said he is on record for the appeal... Someone shouts 25% of those present not credentialed is the rule... which is true!

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)

- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** “The Chair responded to an inquiry (Request for Information), and only a ruling of the Chair following a Point of Order may be appealed. The Ethics Committee finds that the Parliamentarian acted properly, and the respondent is exonerated.

**Conclusion:** This is a technicality. The proper role of the Parliamentarian is to advise the body and the Chair to make sure debate and decisions are done correctly. The NAP did not address why the Parliamentarian failed to advise the Chair to correct his answer to the By-law inquiry...then assist the member in his appeal to get to the correct answer.

#### **Example 17:**

**Facts:** Probably the most controversial issue before the committee, the Lawsuit Resolution, was the next Agenda item. The Chair, Robert Anderson stepped down for the discussion since he had publicly advocated on both sides of this issue. Jon Crane, Vice Chair steps in to Chair the meeting for this section. (It appears here that the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson did advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure).

A member immediately called a point of order and reminded the Chair, Robert Anderson and the Vice Chair Joni Crane, that voting members were poll watching and said we need these people in the room for this controversial vote. The member then called a Motion for recess “until votes are counted,” it was seconded... Call for standing vote – motion passed ... the meeting was now in recess. Many people left the room and scattered as the votes were being counted in the secure elections room.

THE UTAH GOP STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING IS NOW IN OFFICIAL RECESS!

While in recess, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson entered the Secure Elections room while officer votes were being counted in the company of the Elections Chairwoman and selected poll watchers and usurped the responsibilities of the Elections Chair. The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson told poll watchers to “shut up” and “raise your hands if you want to speak.” She asked the Elections Chairwoman “how many ballots do you have?” Then, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, told the Elections Chairwoman how to do her

job with no apologies. The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson was extremely rude and unprofessional.

THE UTAH GOP STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING IS STILL IN OFFICIAL RECESS!

While in recess, while votes are still being counted, a member made a motion to come out of recess to read reports, etc. While a majority of members were out of the room while in recess... the Vice Chair, Joni Crane calls for a vote to come out of recess... objections by multiple members from the floor noted that we were in recess until votes were counted and no motions should be allowed. They were ignored!

The Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, failed to advise the Vice Chair, Joni Crane (conducting as the Chair stepped down) on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure.

A member raised a Point of order. "Recess was until vote counting was done"... "we were out on recess how can you entertain a motion while in recess?" The Vice Chair, Joni Crane was argumentative and proceeded after lecturing the members in the room that many have come a long way and didn't want to extend the meeting EVEN THOUGH WE WERE IN RECESS!

Again, the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson, failed to advise the Vice Chair, Joni Crane, on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure.

The acting chair, Joni Crane and the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson wrongly resumed the meeting, while members were out of the building and the assembly was still at recess.

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to "call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization." (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:**

- (1) The Ethics Committee determines that the respondent did not act properly, and this complaint is upheld. The Parliamentarian is hereby reprimanded for allowing this violation of the basic tenets of parliamentary procedure.
- (2) This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.
- (3) The Ethics Committee determines that the respondent did not act properly, and this complaint is upheld. The Parliamentarian is hereby reprimanded for allowing this violation of the basic tenets of parliamentary procedure.

**Conclusion:** “A motion to recess until the ballots were counted was adopted. During the recess, a motion to “come out of recess” was made and adopted. No motion is in order when the assembly is in recess, and the meeting should not have been called to order until such time as the ballots were counted so that the first item of business would be the reading of the election results. The rights of those in the counting room and any others who did not return to the meeting room were violated.”

#### **Example 18:**

**Facts:** A motion from Daryl Acumen, leader of the Black Caucus, to speak to his own resolution to drop the lawsuit, (which the Chair advocates)... from the floor you could hear... “votes are still being counted”... “we are in official recess”... “with no second to the motion...”

After Mr. Acumen’s lecture to the body, the acting Chair, Joni Crane, calls for the vote without a second... the Chair, Robert Anderson and the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson started counting standing votes...

Objection! What about the substitute resolution?

Objection! What about the poll watchers?

The Chair, Robert Anderson says the motion on the floor is the resolution without acknowledgement of the substitute resolution. Chair, Robert Anderson, calls for the vote. Chair, Robert Anderson does the vote by counting standing bodies... he asks the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson to help count votes... she leaves the podium for the third time to count votes for the Chair, Robert Anderson.

#### **Complaint:**



- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)

... there was a Call for acknowledgement of the substitute resolution... Chair, Robert Anderson and the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson continue to count the votes asking folks to stand...

It was obvious to a majority of the body we were being played... a Motion to adjourn was raised. The acting Chair reminded the assembly that a motion to adjourn requires a majority vote! She screamed there “is still business to conduct... the Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson calls for a standing vote while still counting... Motion passes! ... applause fill the room! Poll watchers return to the counting room as the meeting is adjourned.

**Complaint:**

- (1) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “advise the client on the proper application of the accepted rules of parliamentary procedure notwithstanding the client's personal desires in the matter.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.3)
- (2) Parliamentarian, NAP District 8 Director, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “maintain a position of objectivity and impartiality and refrain from participating in debate.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.6)
- (3) Parliamentarian, Ms. Carrie Dickson failed to “call to the attention of the presiding officer any deviation from the rules that may be harmful to the organization.” (NAP Ethics Code violation 4.7)

**NAP Determination:** “Conflicting information was received regarding whether the meeting was in recess, and no evidence was received regarding a conflicting motion. This complaint is dismissed as not attaining the required level of proof.”

**Conclusion:** The NAP refused to consider these complaints. How can there be conflicting information. There is the recording of the meeting I transcribed... and the Parliamentarian’s notes and script. Can’t find a reason here, the whole process was witnessed: All 131 Credentialed members in the room, including: William (Bill) Olson, Don Guymon, Lynda Pipkin, Bob McEntee, Brent Odenwaler, Elizabeth Carlin, Andrew Young, Drew Chamberlain, Helen Redd, Janice Legler, Teena Horlacher, Layne Beck, Peggy Burdett, Heather Gardner, Kera Birkland, Matt Westrich, Lowell Nelson, Brady Jugler, Chris Jenkins, Jamie Munns.

The process works like this:

- 1) I file the complaint with NAP
- 2) NAP Ethics Committee reviews the complaint
- 3) Parliamentarian receives the complaint and has 60 days to consider her response.
- 4) She secretly responds in writing to the Ethics Committee
- 5) The Ethics Committee reviews her defense and makes a judgement.
- 6) No discovery – No due process
- 7) NAP hides the written response to my complaint
- 8) NAP makes ruling – no appeal process

END