

Please read this information regarding work related to the complaint filed against members of the Green party of Colorado in July, 2017, by the group calling themselves the Caucus (sometimes called Committee) to Restore Green Values.

The Accreditation Committee subcommittee tasked with continuing work on the matter completed reviewing and organizing documents related to our findings and response in late August 2018. This response involves a proposal, about which there was some difference of opinion: since the proposal, should it become necessary, had already been agreed upon by the AC in July of 2017, some believe that is what should stand now. Others feel that the subcommittee should present this to the current AC for approval first, along with both parties involved in the issue, before sending it further to the NC.

We are going with the second option, and strongly encourage those who were recruited to this committee to take a specific position be willing to review and documents with an open mind; and possibly offer responsible and fair suggestions for resolution.

Upon committee approval, the proposal's timeline goes into effect. Respondents have 30 days in which to resolve issues or be making good progress toward that goal. If that happens, the proposal is withdrawn. If not, a disaffiliation proposal goes to the NC.

#### TIMELINE for AC DELIBERATION

Due to the number of documents involved and need to read and review carefully we ask that a week be given for AC members to \*read the reports and documents\* before discussion. Questions, corrections etc, can be noted. This would be followed by a week for discussion, then a week for a vote. Members of the AC as of today, who are not part of a side in the dispute, are eligible to vote.

Documents have been uploaded to a web page created for them. **There are some important points readers must be aware of.**

1) The original group that reviewed, discussed and formed a general assessment and plan of action regarding the complaint were unfamiliar with the parties and matters involved. None of the Accreditation Committee knew any of the Restore Green Values (RGV) group. Almost no one knew any of the group from the Green Party of Colorado, here called Respondents. The AC co-chairs had worked with one member, with some positive and some not so positive experience, but nothing noteworthy. It did later become known that two of the committee had had positive interaction with at least one of the Respondents, or a supporter of that group.

Due to the size of the complaint and documentation submitted, the original plan was to refer this to a subcommittee of the AC to review and report back to the full committee. However, all members of the committee took on the task, so the full committee was involved.

The one initial exception was AC co-chair Tamar Yager. She received updates from the committee, but was not otherwise involved, due to her work with the then-upcoming ANM.

The other co-chair, myself, agreed to facilitate the committee discussion. I deliberately withheld all comments and opinions until the rest had reviewed, discussed and come to general conclusions about the nature of the complaint as it relates to the committee's work; how to proceed; and, importantly, what steps to take depending on various contingencies. This was to ensure that the complaint and documentation would get as neutral and unbiased a review and possible.

It is important to be aware that the initial review comprised a group that came in "cold," that is, neutral, and unbiased.\* Findings and Report achieved Consensus minus 1. (Between the time the complaint review was begun and the first report and findings issued, two new members were appointed to the AC. Both reviewed and agreed with the findings to start with. One began to oppose the rest, not based on dissent over issues (which would be their right) but accusing others of bias and lying. This individual later disclosed he had been called by someone and asked to do this. Otherwise, the AC had consensus on the report, findings, and action.)

The same claims of neutrality cannot be said of the AC now. Shortly after the AC's first report was issued, one side of the dispute appointed members to the committee "to represent [their] interests," even though the AC is not the court in which "interests" are worked out. Others joined as a counter; to be fair, these individuals were not necessarily pre-disposed toward the RGV, but were opposed to one side making use of the AC for their side in a dispute that should be worked out elsewhere, and who did not want to see the committee become politicized.

2) It is important to know that the AC agreed at the time of the first report (July 12-14, 2017) on what steps to take, depending on how the report was received, whether conditions improved, etc. This has not changed.

3) In considering a complaint, the AC looks at state party functionality: how it works, whether it works, or not. The committee's task is to establish facts. The AC does not deal with individuals or personalities. The parts of the complaint considered involved instances of bylaws infractions, patterns of exclusion and actions detrimental to a state party's function.

The AC took into account Respondents' input. Even without that input, the committee did not engage every point made by RGV.

The initial plan was to interview representatives from both sides. After a teleconference

with each side and one follow up, the AC felt that there was enough data to confirm several concerns. The group decided to go forward with a report and recommendations rather than continue to go back and forth with each side, which the committee felt would not be productive, as well as being outside the scope of this committee's purview.

4) Issues are NOT worked out in or by the AC, although the committee provides recommendations to address concerns. The Dispute Resolution Committee is one place that could offer help, but the main work needs to be done in the particular state or caucus.

5) Going through the complaint and documentation is not easy reading. Some AC members were initially more inclined to skepticism regarding the complaint, as the actual documentation is lengthy and takes time to review. The link to the website where the RGV provided their documentation should be reviewed - take the time to do this before trying to pick and choose which points to find relevant. The AC found that some points did not rise to the level of insurmountable problems or consideration of disaffiliation. The AC did establish documentation of the problems noted in its first report (July 14, 2017). Based on the escalation that followed instead of what could and should have been easy remedies, the committee proceeded with the next steps.

The first of those steps was to refer the parties involved to the DRC. Although neither side was happy with the idea, the RGV group eventually agreed to seek mediation with no pre-conditions. The Respondents either didn't respond, or they declined. The AC was eventually informed by the DRC that they were not going to follow up.

Therefore, the complaint reverted back to the AC. Shortly thereafter, two additions to the original grievance were submitted. The AC agreed that both are of concern, but only one would involve party functioning: the series of member and chapter "revocation of participation" on the basis of having filed a complaint regarding ethics and bylaws violations (which were confirmed by the AC).

6) An Addendum was submitted, marking the second new concern. The AC subcommittee chose not to include that as part of the findings, as it involves an ethics complaint regarding an individual, not the functioning of the state party as a whole.

The AC Subcommittee Report will include a Link to the Report; General Table of Contents (TOC); and links to an outline with documentation for specific concerns. Each "Folder" includes its own TOC. Reviewers should start either with the report and TOC; or start with the Folders, and use the TOC's included in each.

7) Documentation included with the intent to clarify AC subcommittee's findings. Further documentation mirrors what is included here, but will be provided if needed.

Holly Hart, Co-chair, on behalf of the GPUS Accreditation Committee Grievance Subcommittee

Questions may be redirected to [acc-chairs@gp.org](mailto:acc-chairs@gp.org)