

Are you satisfied with the answers and explanations provided by the CEO, by the E&GW Commission Chair and by the President of the Board of Directors at the ONA?

Can “the truth” be stated in such a way as to make it “a lie”?

We are told that the alleged theft/ losses from the fired computer services company were reported to the insurance company. We are not told whether any reimbursement was made by the insurer. Were the losses covered by insurance? If not, why not?

Was proper insurance coverage in effect at the time of the alleged theft/ loss? Was proper bonding in effect at the time of the alleged theft/ loss? Was a service contract in place at the time of the alleged theft/ loss?

We are told that a police report was filed. We are not told whether the matter was pursued via a criminal complaint and prosecution. Were criminal charges brought and was the matter pursued criminally? If not, why not?

We are told, as a bare assertion, that there was no evidence that personal membership or business data was lost or compromised. But we are not told whether a private forensic computer analysis/audit was done to determine the extent of the compromise and breach of the system.

Is there no fever because the patient's temperature was never taken? Is there no loss, breach or compromise of information because no computer analysis or audit was ever done? If an analysis/audit were not done, why wasn't it done? Is it now too late to conduct it?

We are told that ONA legal counsel advised the CEO that it would cost more to pursue the matter in civil court than ONA would likely recover. We are not told the amount of loss; instead we are left with the impression that any losses were minor or inconsequential.

Again, what was the amount of the alleged theft/ loss? Was the theft/ loss reflected on the ONA financial statements? Where is it stated? Does the Department of Labor require reporting of such theft/ losses? If so, was the loss reported to the Department of Labor? If not, why not?

If there were no service contract, if there were no bonding, if there were no insurance coverage, if there were no “paper trail” Could these factors be the explanation as to why the CEO at ONA might have decided to not pursue the matter further – either civilly or criminally?

Since the CEO's son, Sean Meade, has taken over computer services at ONA, does the system work any better than it did before – when the fired computer services company and its owner were responsible for computer services and maintenance at ONA?

How many times in the past ten months has the e-mail been down and/or the computer system crashed? How many times have staff members been unable to access, remotely or in house, the time sheet system, computer documents and files, the calendar, etc?

Do other businesses and organizations have the same amount and type of problems with their computer systems as what is happening at ONA? If not, why not?

What is the availability and accessibility of the CEO's son, Sean Meade?

Then there is the matter of MEBS/ OHCT. We are also told that ONA's investment in MEBS/ OHCT was a "business opportunity" and that the CEO of ONA is ensuring that investment by her position as Chairperson of the MEBS/ OHCT Board of Directors. Really!

Do the CEO and/or the Board of Directors have any understanding whatsoever as to the meaning of the terms "conflict of interest" and/or "appearance of impropriety"?

Assuming a "business investment," the following questions should be asked by the membership: Was a "comprehensive business plan" done? Who was involved in creating and evaluating that business plan? If such a plan was not done, why wasn't it done?

Was proper "due diligence" conducted? Who was involved in this process? If the process of due diligence was not conducted, why wasn't it conducted?

Did MEBS/ OHCT provide accurate information to ONA as to the number of enrollees in the plan? If due diligence were conducted, were these discrepancies discovered? If not, why not? And if known, would a different decision about this "business investment" have been made by ONA?

What was the amount of ONA's initial investment in MEBS/ OHCT? Will ONA be repaid the initial investment monies with interest on the principle amount? If so, when will this happen and how much interest will ONA earn?

Has ONA made a "continuing investment" in MEBS/ OHCT? If so, what has been the amount of ONA's continuing investment – as non-reimbursed expenses, staff time and travel, and/or direct payment of additional monies?

What has been ONA's "return on investment"? How does ONA's "actual return on investment" (if any) compare to ONA's "projected return on investment"? Were these numbers run? What did they show? If they weren't run, why weren't they run?

Was the supposed "business investment" in MEBS/OHCT a solid investment and a sound use of membership dues monies? Or was this a "risky and uncertain plan" – a "gamble", so to speak?

Did ONA have an exit strategy should the "investment" in MEBS/ OHCT turn out to be not such a good deal? What are the provisions for termination of the agreement?

Is ONA now stuck with an expensive health care plan from which it cannot extract itself and for which it has lost undisclosed amounts of monies – in the initial investment, in continuing expenses and in higher than market health care premiums?

What should we conclude about the questions to which no answers were provided?

Should we conclude that our responsibility as members of the Association is to pay our membership dues and not ask any questions? Should we conclude that we are not entitled to answers – that we should not be concerned about the day-to-day (i.e., unimportant) matters?

Should we conclude that the CEO and the President of the Board of Directors think we will forget that we asked the questions we asked? In other words, if they ignore our questions by not responding or acknowledging them, that our questions will go away?

Are you happy with the leadership and direction of the Ohio Nurses Association?

What will it take for the Board of Directors to understand that it is no longer the CEO's credibility and competence that is being called into question? What will it take for the Board of Directors to understand that their own credibility and competence is at issue as well?

A Group of Very Concerned ONA Members