

INTERNAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS

All steps must be completed at least once by the offended party *before* any request for a Board of Review will be entertained.

The goal of the **Dispute Resolution Process** (“DRP”), founded on the scriptural principles in Matthew 18:15-20, is to promote cohesion and positive productivity amongst all members of the assembly. The intent is that the process must be fully completed by the claimant preceding any request for a Board of Review.

1. When a conflict is suspected, the original (‘offended’) party is to immediately, privately, draw the attention of the other member (‘the offending party’) to the matter in a way that facilitates peace and honorable conversation between the two.
2. If the offending member rejects correction and continues the offending behavior after a clear discussion is had between the two, the member who still feels there is conflict is to privately select an unbiased third party member of the assembly to mediate a second attempt at peaceful resolution by conversation giving equal time to both sides in the matter. Mediating member shall complete a *Dispute Resolution Recommendation Form* to be submitted privately to the Recording Secretary (after review by the Moderator-Foreman if action is recommended).
3. If this second attempt also fails to amicably resolve the problem behavior, the original party is to locate two additional unbiased mediating members for a third, group discussion with the offending member wherein each party is given equal time to state their position and provide proofs. Each mediating member shall complete a separate *Dispute Resolution Recommendation Form* to be submitted privately to the Recording Secretary (after review by the Moderator-Foreman if action is recommended).

Each conversation regarding the continued offending behavior is to be kept private for the protection of the morale and integrity of the membership, the cohesive continuation of the Assembly and the protection of the reputation(s) of all involved. At no time is this dispute resolution process (DRP) nor any part of it to be discussed with non-participants, the County or State membership or the public.

The burden is on the originally offended party to document each step of their compliance with this DRP prior to approaching the Grand Jury Commissioner to request a Board of Review be impaneled on the matter. No punitive actions shall be taken against any oath sworn member of the Ohio State Jural Assembly without at least three independently verifiable pieces of evidence against that member, including at least one DRP having been documented.

Refusal/Failure of the offended party to comply with a full DRP shall result in subsequent complaints about behavior of the offender to be construed as bearing false witness and engaging in inflammatory rhetoric and will be responded to with the maximum penalty within our membership: immediate one-year censorship within the Assembly.

Censorship means the member has no right to speak or submit remarks in writing, nor vote in regular, special, or emergency meetings. No equal voiced member of this assembly has the right to request or effect the removal of another lawfully oath-sworn man or woman from this group of sovereigns.

Incident Investigation Summary Report

Name, Board of Review Investigator

City, Ohio zip code

(111) 222-3333

FORMAL INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Final Report and Remarks

REMOVE ALL TEMPLATE LANGUAGE AND INSERT YOUR APPROPRIATE INFORMATION AND DETAILS.

Incident

(name of) County Ohio Committee of Safety meeting, Ohio State Jural Assembly, September 9, 2024 between several members of the (name) CoS and the Moderator-invited guest speaker(name) from the Lorain County Committee of Safety.

Introduction

The conflict being investigated was between Name, (position title), Name, (position title), Name, (position title), directed against Name, (position title). It was brought to the Board of Review on (date) by (person and manner the request was made) Details, details.

Accusations made

(Public and or private) accusations against Name, (position title), made by Name, (position title), and Name, (position title), were as follows (see witness statements, recordings and summaries of recorded interviews).

1. That Name, (position title), breached Jural Covenant of Office by (specify allegation).
2. That Name, (position title), breached Jural Covenant of Office by (specify allegation).
3. That Name, (position title), breached Jural Covenant of Office by (specify allegation).
4. That Name, (position title), breached Jural Covenant of Office by (specify allegation).
5. That Name, (position title), breached Jural Covenant of Office by (specify allegation).

Investigative process

The first step taken in the investigative process was to (step one)

Next, (time/day/mode of communication between name and name discussing pertinent information).

The final step in this investigation was (time/day/mode of communication between name and name discussing pertinent information).

Facts found

Summarize facts found, based on verifiable evidence, here.

Comments

According to OSJA Covenant of office and Bylaws, (explain the application of guidelines, thought process and extenuating circumstances that brought the particular investigator to recommend whatever is in the next paragraph). include ways that such situations could be prevented in the future.

Recommendations

Make a statement here that ensures that both sides understand their role in the problem; recommend appropriate consequences to guarantee no repeat performances by anyone at any time in the foreseeable future.

The goal is for everyone to come away from this Board of Review process with stronger ethics and guidelines towards a more peaceful, controversy free team in the future.

Concluded this _____ day of _____.

/s/ _____

(print name)

Oath-sworn member of the _____ County, Ohio, CoS