

ATTENDANCE: Todd Vermilya, David Cobb, John Norris, Bruce Heichelbech, Dave Baumlein, Scott Kinnamon, Jay Zedak, Chad Dworkin, Sandi Hammons, Tom Ciranna, Janet Glaeser, Kurt Tenerove, Orest Melnyk, Jim Woodrum, Carl Hilker, Bob Smith, Dan Moss, Dennis Maslar, John McGoff, Guy Day, Chris Raudabaugh, Bill Currier, Pat McCabe

The Executive Session of the Ohio Region Spring Meeting was called to order at 0915 by Bill Currier.

Chad Dworkin, Region Legal Advisor; Chris Raudabaugh, former Region Director; and Jim Woodrum, Division Director, also were asked to sit in.

Bill summarized the Senior test incident that occurred at Boston Mills on February 22, 2009. Two BMW people were found videotaping the candidates. One stopped while the other continued into the afternoon. The other eventually stopped at Tom Ciranna's request. Following that day, Bill asked a number of people, including testers and some candidates, to tell if they saw any videotaping and what, if any, effects were felt as a result. He sent a report to Jim Woodrum. Subsequent to the report, Tom responded to Bill. The Central Division Board Meeting in April discussed and gave their suggestions, as noted in the Senior Test Incident Summary.

Bill wanted this opportunity to explain what he had done and discuss a plan or approach to keep BMBW participating in future Senior evaluations. Questions were addressed. Scott Kinnamon asked if this was the first time it was ever done. Tom C. explained that the group of four decided to videotape for the benefit of their candidates and to videotape only *their* candidates. The Board and S&T people didn't know about it beforehand. Bill added a comment that he had said it was okay if the lead evaluator approved. Tom went on to say that he asked the patroller to stop, and he did. The end result was that none of the candidates indicated they were affected. Tom questioned the necessity of penalizing the videotapers and the group responsible. Bill indicated he did not feel the same action should be given to the others in the group but would be flexible, depending on the individual's role.

Dan Moss said he let his group know of the videotaping and made the correction that *all* the candidates were seen being taped. Tom said none of the candidates questioned the results. Sandi Hammons also added that the groups knew it was going on and then had to go out afterwards as it continued. Tom admitted that the patroller didn't stop and was belligerent about stopping and continued anyway. He brought up the "verbally abusive and aggressive" evaluator, who told the videotaper he was going to "kick his ass," "who are you," and "get the hell out of here." Tom felt there was a need to reprimand the evaluator for his conduct. He went on to read the last paragraph of the letter from the Region to the evaluator. He suggested removal of the camera issue and move it to direct behavior instead. He felt that four years off of S&T evaluation was excessive and an unfair ban from refreshers, etc.

Dan asked Tom if he felt that videotaping is a bad idea, adding that no one asked permission. Dan was concerned about the legal issues at question regarding liability pertaining to the NSP and the fact that it was bringing in an unnecessary dynamic to the exam.

It was noted that the lead evaluator has the power to allow it. Bob agreed that policy should be put in place.

Chad Dworkin advised that an addition was made to Chapter 6 of the PNP, page 18, addressing videotaping—there is a right to cancel it if it becomes a disruption. Key is that the Division coordinator determines it. Neither the Division nor Region has an opinion regarding the incident. Chad did not feel it was a good idea to have retrospective punishment to a new PNP policy.

Janet Glaeser said taping can be based on permission in the future. Carl Hilker said the outcome was unfortunate but the main concern should be on the behavior. Dave said the main idea is to address the situation beforehand and set policy--the code of conduct is the key issue and cannot be condoned. John agreed and felt the conduct needed addressed, especially in light of it occurring in the skiing public's eyes.

Dan commented further that it carried on despite requests to stop; it was a feeling of being "out of control," and it seemed that nothing could be done to handle it. Carl added that it was an "invasion of privacy" and, again, the process wasn't stopped when requested.

Jay Zedak's opinion covered two issues: 1) code of conduct of the two patrollers, and 2) the continuation of the videotaping after requests to stop. Videotapers had two acts—not stopping and continuing taping those not from BM, and the code of conduct. Jay felt equal discipline towards both the evaluator and videotaper is not fair. Tom refuted that it is still discipline, adding that Bill took care of one and Tom will take care of the other.

Bill acknowledged the opinions that videotaping be separated from the code of conduct and did not hear opinions to prevent BM from participating in future events or direct penalty to those involved. It was noted that the videotapes have been erased.

Sandi H. suggested that a letter come from the same level (Bill) to both videotaper and evaluator. Dave asked if BM management knew of the issue. Tom said he was reporting to BM management regarding the issues after the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 0955.