

Grievances Lodged Against the SNAP Board of Directors by the SNAP Reform Caucus

Chronicle of Events and Allegations: August 2024–Present

Introduction

The SNAP Reform Caucus (SRC), formerly known as the Group of 12, has articulated a series of grievances against the Board of Directors of SNAP (Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests), stemming from events initiated at the August 2024 Annual SNAP Conference in Houston, Texas, and continuing to the present. The SRC's concerns center on issues of leadership, transparency, and the welfare of survivors, culminating in persistent requests for collegial dialogue that have been consistently rebuffed by the Board.

A. The Genesis of Conflict: August 2024 Annual SNAP Conference

The seeds of the current discord were sown during the August 2024 Annual SNAP Conference. Several leaders within SNAP, many of whom would become members of the Group of 12, witnessed behaviors and decisions by key members of the Board that raised serious concerns.

- **Controversy at the Hotel Bar:**
- Eduardo Lopez de Casas, Vice-President of SNAP and chief organizer of the conference, held an official SNAP event in the hotel bar. This was approved by the Board of Directors of SNAP as is witnessed by the President of SNAP, Shaun Dougherty, buying shots of liquor for attendees at the event. Objections were raised by leaders, citing that many SNAP members are in recovery from substance abuse and may be triggered by proximity to alcohol. Instead of constructive dialogue, leaders were met with anger and derision from Lopez de Casas, further escalating tensions.
- **Lack of Survivor Support:**
- At the conference, the absence of dedicated support group meetings for both men and women survivors was felt acutely. Compounding this, the planned “quiet room,” a sanctuary designed for survivors needing solitude, was removed from the agenda. These omissions were seen as not only insensitive but detrimental to the well-being of attendees, many of whom are vulnerable to triggers and retraumatization within such settings. These support mechanisms have been in place in ALL previous conferences.

- Among other things noticeably absent from this conference were the evaluation sheets for attendees to provide comments and rate events, speeches, and other conference activities. This is a layer of accountability that has been part of SNAP's conference agenda to provide members a democratic voice and input into the conference so that future conferences could be improved.
- **Failed Dialogue with Leadership:**
- Several leaders sought direct conversation with Shaun Dougherty, President of the Board of Directors, at the conference. Despite his willingness to schedule two meetings, Dougherty cancelled both appointments at the last minute, leaving would-be participants unsatisfied and feeling dismissed. This episode set the tone for subsequent frustrations with the Board's approach to leadership and transparency.

B. Escalation: Seeking Accountability and Organizational Reform

Following the conference, the group of concerned leaders grew, eventually numbering approximately twelve—hence the moniker “Group of 12.” Recognizing the potential for widespread unrest in SNAP, they initially chose to keep their communications and concerns within a tight circle. It should be noted here that the Group chose to address any and all correspondence with the Board through one spokesperson, David Lorenz. . This strategy of a single spokesperson conveying the Group's consensus has proven the key to the current strength of the SRC.

- **Drafting the Letter:**
- On September 19, 2024, after weeks of discussion, the Group of 12 composed a detailed letter outlining their grievances and concerns and submitted it to the Board. This letter included strategies for addressing those concerns and offers to help in any way that we could. Unfortunately, an earlier draft was circulated inadvertently, prompting the Board to fixate on its contents, perceived disparagements, and tone, largely ignoring the substance of the finalized communication. This misdirected attention has persisted, with the Board remaining focused on the draft rather than addressing the legitimate concerns expressed in the final version.
- Indeed, in July/August 2025, a newly-appointed Executive Director would emphasize to Leaders the “hurt feelings” of the Board, an astonishing fact given the all-encompassing power held by the Board of Directors and the “thick skin” they have told potential new board members that one has to have as a member of the Board.
- **Hostility from the Board:**
- Daniel McNevin, Board Treasurer, emerged as a particularly antagonistic figure. His emails with the Group of 12 grew increasingly vitriolic—ranging from condescending advice on how the group “should have” written their letter, to demands for content removal, and demeaning treatment of the group as though they were miscreant children rather than qualified SNAP leaders with valid concerns. Emails from McNevin included threats of legal

action against the group, references to California “hate speech” law, and comparisons of the group to the Ku Klux Klan and Nazi sympathizers, particularly in the context of their perceived support for a leader dismissed at the conference.

- **Dismissed leader**
- The members of the Group of 12 who knew the inside story of this dismissal, expressed concern for this person’s unfair treatment by the board, but rejected any retribution aimed at board members or others by this person. Several Zoom meetings were held by a number of the Group of 12 with this former leader to strongly protest any abusive postings to social media. Despite assurances from David Lorenz, Group of 12 spokesperson, that they had attempted to curb any abusive behavior by this dismissed leader, McNevin and Dougherty persisted and would not believe the Group. McNevin and Dougherty ultimately demanded that each member of the Group of 12 meet individually with them and pledge that they had not supported this behavior. The Group of 12 would not be intimidated by this bullying by McNevin and Dougherty and refused to comply. Such treatment of volunteers as adolescent miscreants is unconscionable. This further intensified the negative image of the Board of Directors.
- **Lack of Intervention:**
- McNevin’s vitriolic emails continued for at least two months, unimpeded by the rest of the Board. Not a single member among the remaining five Directors stepped in to halt the harassment.
- At one point, one of the Group engaged in discussions with a board member who appeared to be understanding. However, when action was required of this Board member, there was acquiescence to Board leadership’s wishes and this Board member fell silent. The Group of 12 experienced this throat-hold on Board members as a profound failure of accountability and collegiality. David Lorenz’s communications continued with no cooperative response from the Board. Still no requested meeting occurred.
- A collection of the emails can be found at the website RemembertheSurvivors.com under the title ***Timeline and Correspondence***.

C. Mediation: An Attempt Thwarted

Efforts to resolve the impasse took a new turn in late January 2025 when spokesperson David Lorenz was informed that mediation would be organized between the Board and the group. The Group was puzzled as to why mediation was a path to be taken when not one word had been exchanged in a requested face-to-face meeting with the Board. Why did we not simply have the requested meeting? The Center for Conflict Resolution based in Chicago, Illinois, was contracted by the Board. The plan was for two Saturdays of mediation, each session lasting four hours. An obvious question was why 8 hours of mediation when the 1-hour to 1-1/2 hour Zoom meeting had not even been tried.

- **Mediation Breakdown – the mediation that never happened:**

- On March 1, 2025, all twelve members of the Group of 12 arrived on the Zoom meeting, checked in with mediators and waited for the first scheduled mediation. Only four of the six Board members were present. The group and the Board were placed in separate Zoom rooms, with mediators shuttling between them. Early into the process, it became clear that the Board was not in agreement with the proposed agenda. The Group had always adhered to the concept that their September 19, 2024, letter to the Board WAS their agenda. This had been categorically rejected by the Board.
- **Board won't talk to 8 out of the 12 Leaders**
- The list of attendees gave the Board its next way to object and block the mediation. Three and a half hours into the mediation, without the Group having seen even one board member, the mediators announced that the Board would only speak with four of the twelve participants—those it deemed “ratified” leaders. The Board refused to engage in discussion with the remaining eight, claiming they lacked formal vetting. This move was deeply offensive to the group and led to a collapse of the mediation attempt. This would prove a fatal move by the Board and would spur the Group of 12 to move ahead with a wider phase of involvement of more leaders.
- **No Actual Mediation Occurred:**
- The Board's behavior—leaving the Group waiting for hours only to reject most—was seen as unconscionable. When the Board began making plans for a second session for March 8, the Group of 12 refused, unwilling to expose themselves to further humiliation and continued manipulation by the Board.
- In the subsequent months, Shaun Dougherty consistently described the process publicly as a “failed mediation,” although, based on the facts, no mediation had actually occurred. This gaslighting by Dougherty has become the pattern of discourse by the Board and will lead to eventual breakdown of SNAP.
- **Persistent Obfuscation:**
- The Board's actions were seen by the Group as willful obstruction, designed to avoid the meeting and real discussions that had been sought since August 2024. The Board's refusal to communicate the truth about mediation to the broader SNAP community was described as gaslighting, a behavior the group considered typical of current Board leadership. A move forward with involvement of more leaders was seen as absolutely the only path forward for the Group.

D. Formation and Growth of the SNAP Reform Caucus

After the mediation debacle, the Group of 12 recognized the necessity of expanding their circle of leaders. Due to Board intransigence, it became clear to the Group of 12 that there was no good will on the part of the Board and the Group's desire to circumscribe the possible harm to the organization was not respected by the Board. The Group became the SNAP Reform Caucus and actively solicited more leaders who may share their concerns. Weekly meetings were replaced by bimonthly gatherings open to any leaders interested in engaging in reform of the SNAP Board.

- Evolution to the SNAP Reform Caucus:
- Between March and August 2025, the SNAP Reform Caucus (SRC) undertook a series of determined initiatives aimed at reforming the SNAP organization and fostering transparency within its leadership. These months were marked by persistent outreach, innovative communication strategies, and a growing collective of advocates deeply invested in the future of SNAP. The period, spanning from the formation of the SRC to the Annual SNAP Conference in August to the present day, reveals a tale of unwavering dedication, missed opportunities, and the complexities inherent in organizational change. The modeling of positive advocacy by the SRC has not been reciprocated or respected by the Board.
- The SRC now includes between 25 and 35 leaders and is officially called the SNAP Reform Caucus. The SRC welcomes all leaders willing to participate in efforts toward organizational improvement and restoring SNAP to its founding principles and reputation. The SRC is united by a conviction that meaningful reform is urgently needed. The SRC represents leaders that have hundreds of years of service to CSA survivors and to SNAP. At least one of them is a founding member.

E. The 2025 SNAP Annual Conference and Ongoing Issues

The period leading up to the 2025 SNAP Annual Conference has been marked by continued friction between the Board and the SRC. Nothing has occurred that prompts the SRC to think that the Board is either listening nor intending to listen to the concerned Leaders any more than they did in 2024

F. Advocacy in the Absence of Dialogue

- The SRC's core mission during this timeframe was straightforward: to secure a meeting with the SNAP Board and champion reforms that would restore trust and accountability. Despite repeated requests, the SRC found itself stonewalled, prompting the coalition to explore alternative avenues of influence. Rather than allow the impasse to breed inertia, SRC members turned to technology and grassroots activism to make their voices heard.

Development of RemembertheSurvivors.com

- A central initiative was the creation of the website RemembertheSurvivors.com. Conceived as both a platform for education and a model of transparency, the site became an essential tool for informing leaders and the public about SRC's ongoing work. Through regular postings and updates, the SRC demonstrated the type of openness and accountability it hoped to see from the SNAP Board.
- The website also became a rallying point for advocacy, serving not merely as an information hub but as an interactive venue for activism. Calls to Action were prominently featured, encouraging leaders to participate actively in organizational reform and to pressure the Board for greater transparency and responsiveness.

Calls to Action: Mobilizing Leadership and Accountability

- The Calls to Action on RemembertheSurvivors.com were designed to do more than raise awareness; they invited direct involvement from leaders. These calls enabled members to volunteer for many positive improvements and to voice concerns.
- Call to Action #5 gave Leaders a chance to volunteer to be on the Board to potentially expand the Board beyond its minimal number of six. We also advocated that board members represent a cross section of the survivor community (e.g. geographical, ethnic, and religious diversity) The process underscored the SRC's commitment to inclusivity and democratic engagement, contrasting sharply with the Board's apparent apathy.
- Another significant Call to Action (#4) encouraged the reinstitution of the SNAP Helpline, an integral part of the mission statement of SNAP. The results of the Helpline Call to Action were reported to the Board in mid-June 2025. After prolonged inactivity, leaders had volunteered to restore this vital service, reflecting a broader movement within the SRC to revive neglected aspects of SNAP's support infrastructure. The Board has yet to resolve the Helpline failure, signaling not only operational inertia but lethargy and lack of purpose within the SNAP Board.
- Immediately after the bogus mediation of March 1st, many leaders sought validation and legitimacy through Call to Action #2. They requested clarification on their own status within the organization, asking whether they had been "vetted" or "ratified." The urgency of these requests came after the shunning of leaders at the first attempted mediation where the Board rejected 8 out of 12 leaders. Hence the Call to Action #2 to demand answers was initiated. Sent to the Board in mid-June, these requests remain unanswered, highlighting a persistent lack of communication from the Board and fueling ongoing frustration within the SRC ranks. With the Board's ongoing bias against anyone "not vetted/" and refusal to even speak to the unratified leaders, this situation is untenable, creating divisiveness in SNAP where none need exist. This rests solely on the shoulders of the Board of Directors.

G. Leadership at the top of SNAP: Confusing and confused, mixed messages

- The website's Calls to Action also weighed in on leadership, offering recommendations for the position of Executive Director. For months, Shaun Dougherty had fulfilled this role while simultaneously serving as SNAP's president—a situation that raised serious questions about governance and conflict of interest and is in direct violation of the SNAP bylaws. SRC members submitted recommendations with the intent of separating these responsibilities and promoting organizational efficiency. This concern was raised during the August 2024 conference but was dismissed as irrelevant for almost a year.
- Angela Walker began her role as Executive Director on July 14, 2025. The Board's choice of Ms. Walker was apparently done after the engagement of a larger search company.

Communication with the SRC by both the Board and Ms. Walker has been inconsistent as is notably seen in the following.

- Upon the hiring of Ms. Walker, Shaun Dougherty addressed an email to all SNAP Leaders emphasizing that Angela Walker had been hired to “oversee” the Leaders of SNAP. However, a subsequent letter from Dan McNevin (August 28th), ostensibly approved by Shaun Dougherty, apparently wrenched that oversight from Ms. Walker as McNevin clearly chastised and berated Leaders. He again emphasized the division between “vetted” or “ratified leaders” and those who are not, per the Board’s opinion. However, in prior All-Leader meetings online, Ms. Walker had assured all leaders to consider themselves leaders with further “certification” being planned as ongoing education for all. This welcome reassurance by Walker was snatched away by McNevin’s and Dougherty’s heavy-handed treatment of the Leaders in this August email.
- Shaun Dougherty is on record as insisting that Ms. Walker is a survivor of childhood sexual abuse. The SRC has at least two times heard Ms. Walker say at Leader meetings that she is NOT a sexual abuse survivor but is a survivor, nonetheless. However, Dougherty’s false claims were inexcusable. How can someone in Dougherty’s leadership position get this so wrong? Would this not be a top question in the hiring process of SNAP? If even basic information is not transmitted correctly to members, how can there be any confidence in the Board of Directors? This casts doubt once again on the competency of the Board.
- or complete transparency, the complete list of Calls to Action are found in the attachments to this Grievance or at RemembertheSurvivors.com.

H. Bylaw Engagement and the Special Meeting Request

- One of the most dramatic moments of this period revolved around the SRC’s formal request for a “special meeting” of the Board, as outlined in Article IV, Section 7 of SNAP’s bylaws. Supported by the signatures of 35 leaders/members now, the request was intended as a direct exercise of organizational procedure—a demonstration of the SRC’s commitment to due process and constructive dialogue.
- The SRC went above and beyond, submitting two formal petitions for the meeting. However, the Board remained silent, failing to respond until after the conclusion of the 2025 Annual SNAP Conference. This silence was finally broken when Dan McNevin, acting at the behest of Dougherty, sent the August 28th email declaring the matter of a “special meeting: null and void on the grounds that the July 25th Leaders meeting at the conference satisfied the procedural requirement. This response left the SRC stunned at the Board’s reluctance to engage directly and transparently.
- In the August 28th email addressed to David Lorenz, McNevin argued that the “special meeting” per the Bylaws was fulfilled by the Leader’s meeting on July 25,

2025 at the SNAP Annual Conference. McNevin claimed that the Dougherty email of July 3rd (See page 13 of this document) spelled this out. It did not. Shaun Dougherty “invited” leaders in the email to come to the Leader’s meeting on July 25th. This was simply a courtesy or encouragement invitation as the Annual Conference is open to every SNAP member and requires no special invitation. McNevin was doing nothing more than gaslighting the SRC once again. The Annual Leaders meeting at the Conference is in no way a “special meeting” as outlined in the Bylaws. No one in the SRC interpreted the Dougherty July 3rd email as being the “special meeting” asked for since August 2024. Dougherty never even came close to writing those words. Is this simple cowardice on the part of McNevin and Dougherty and the rest of the Board? Rather than discourage the SRC, the McNevin/Dougherty email has spurred new confidence that the SRC is on the right track. The abuse of power by the Board is now more apparent than ever.

I. What the two emails of July 3 and August 28 signal for the SRC

The impact of the July 3rd Dougherty email and the August 28th McNevin email on the SRC cannot be emphasized enough.

- **July 3rd email from Shaun Dougherty**
 - The SRC took seriously the directive of Dougherty that concerns, comments and questions should be sent in and these concerns would be taken up at the Leader’s meeting.
 - Because no special email was indicated in the email as the proper place to send this, Call to Action #7 can be found on RemembertheSurvivors.com. This assured that everyone’s voice would be heard by making a center where these could be sent.
 - On July 22, 2025, the SRC sent in all of the responses to Call to Action #7 to the Board and to the Executive Director.
 - For transparency, the responses were also posted during the run up to the Leader’s meeting on RemembertheSurvivors.com. CTA 7 Form Responses on RemembertheSurvivors.com.

Other documents were also prepared and made available to the Board and the Executive Director. At the request of the Executive Director top 10 issues were submitted (“Top 10 issues | Remember The Survivors” - see page 11 below).

 - Another document was also prepared entitled “Three points for discussion” – see page 14 below. (See also page 19 of this document)
- **RESULT:** SNAP Leaders and members present either online or in person left the 2025 Leaders discouraged because there was very little if anything addressed of

their concerns, comments and questions. One of the SRC members handed a list to the Executive Director and she immediately pushed it aside and never reviewed it. At the conclusion of the annual leaders meeting, the ED declared that all of the concerns had been addressed when, in fact, almost none of them had. The Board and the Executive Director did not have any intention of fulfilling the requests of the SRC.

- **August 28th email from Daniel McNevin (See page 11 of this document)**
- As noted in Sections G and H above, this email was caustic and demoralizing to the SRC. Being told that, without proper notice, the Board presumed to declare null and void any request for the “special meeting” was another gaslighting maneuver. With this one single email of August 28th, (See page 11 of this document). McNevin and Dougherty have done the following:
- Again caused division and confusion by bringing up the “vetted” Leader issue in contradiction to the words of Angela Walker.
- Dismissed Leader concerns and declared the “special meeting” fulfilled, despite no evidence of that being true.’
- Dan McNevin brought up Angela Walker’s meeting with the SRC and the Board. Why is this going to be done when we have asked for this beginning in August 2024? Is the SRC truly supposed to believe this will happen when the Board has had no intention of meeting with the SRC now or at any time. If they would do this in October 2025? Why not in October 2024? This is a bait and switch and the SRC has no confidence that this will occur.
- **RESULT:** There are so many things that insult and demean the SRC in this email by **McNevin** that it is almost impossible to list all. Suffice it to say, the SRC is not appeased but insulted and more determined than ever to be heard, if not by the Board then by others in the public domain.

Conclusions

Board’s lack of responsiveness throughout these months became a defining feature of SRC’s relationship with SNAP. Each unanswered request and unaddressed concern contributed to a growing rift, intensifying the coalition’s resolve rather than diminishing its enthusiasm. The avoidance strategy adopted by the Board was read by many within the SRC as a tactic to outlast or discourage reformers, yet the opposite occurred—the SRC’s numbers grew, its voice became louder, and its activism more sophisticated.

- The mystifying lack of accountability from the Board, especially in the lead-up to the conference, was a source of considerable frustration. Many within the SRC lamented that a single open conversation in August 2024 could have precluded a year of conflict and division. Instead, the Board’s refusal to engage compounded the organization’s challenges, leaving the SRC convinced that transformation was not only necessary but inevitable

- Communications from Board members, notably Shaun Dougherty and Daniel McNevin, have remained, in equal parts confusing and contentious. Other members of the 6-person Board have remained noticeably silent. If silence gives consent, then observers must assume there is universal Board approval of these actions. This further entrenched divisions within the organization. The grievances set forth by the SRC continue to revolve around demands for transparency, accountability, and survivor support, all of which they feel are being neglected by the current Board leadership.
- The ongoing conflict between the SNAP Reform Caucus and the Board of Directors is rooted in the Board's steadfast refusal to engage in open, collegial dialogue, compounded by repeated instances of dismissiveness, intimidation, and a lack of meaningful support for survivors. The SRC's grievances reflect broader concerns about leadership style, organizational culture, and the welfare of SNAP's members. As the group continues to grow and organize, the demand for reform and restoration of SNAP's original values remains at the forefront of their advocacy.

Recommendations

- Remove all current members of the Board and replace immediately with SNAP Leaders who have an understanding of how to run this organization.
- Do a forensic audit of the books of SNAP to make sure that compliance with all laws governing a 501(c)3 are being followed especially as it pertains to two lengthy trips to Rome taken by the acting executive director (Shaun Dougherty) as approved by the president of the board (also Shaun Dougherty). There are other financial concerns that can be discussed as necessary.

Top Ten Issues

1. Communication (or lack thereof)

1. Notice of board meetings must be published ahead of time
2. Leaders should be encouraged to listen into board meetings with some mechanism for making comments/suggestions prior to and during the meeting
3. All board minutes must be published and made available
4. Regional leaders meetings need to be reinstated and encouraged
5. Newsletters (emailed and posted) would be a great
6. Calendar of events (This is necessarily very difficult and impossible to be comprehensive given that 'emergencies' pop up all of the time but it should be done on a best effort basis
7. Act as a communications center where groups from around the country can provide help to regional issues (eg SOL reform)

2. Transparency (similar to communication but not the same)

1. Audits – While not required, making audit reports available is considered best practice
2. P&L reports – leadership wants (and should understand what the money is being spent on as well as how much
3. When the board chooses to spend money and resources on any program, leaders should be informed as to what that is, why and how much it costs.

3. Accountability. The last 10 months has revealed that the board is not accountable to anyone and the leaders and members simply have no say in how things are done. There is not even a proper mechanism for making suggestions. Many in our group have made suggestions and volunteered to assist only to be told that the board will get back to them. After months and sometimes years, no one got back to them. There also needs to be a mechanism whereby the leaders can hold the board to account. We understand that this would have to have some significant limitations but it needs to be able to happen.
4. Vitriol – Since September, board members (primarily Dan) have sent vitriolic and threatening emails that are based on erroneous information or simply unfounded assumptions. The rest of the board was copied on these emails and did not take any action to stop these egregious accusations, insults and threats. This group demands that an apology be forthcoming from those hurling the accusations and insults and the board members who ignored them either out of ignorance, indifference or some other reason. It is believed that many of the horrible emails were based on the false assumption that we were encouraging Curtis. No proof of that encouragement exists because we did not encourage him. In fact, just the opposite is true.

5. Houston Conference issues must be addressed. In our initial letter we mentioned a number of issues with the Houston conference. They included issues with the conference itself (break out sessions, evaluation forms, entertainment...) and with the accommodations (again one of the vitriolic emails from Dan took aim at this based on a false assumption. This was done rather than just talking with us.)
6. Leaders meeting should include training on how to deal with survivor issues and self-help rather than a legal rehash of bylaws and leaders' manual. Training can include:
 1. Responding to a first time survivor phone call
 2. Peer Counseling
 3. Media contacts
 4. Legislative reform
 5. Outreach

It may behoove the board to read the bylaws so that, as a minimum, they know the following:

1. Who is on the executive committee
2. ED cannot be related to a board member (you are related to yourself)
3. SNAP's mission is NOT to just survivors' of religious CSA but "...for victims of religious and institutional sexual abuse and their family members through various means..." (Article II section 2 of the bylaws)
7. Media – SNAP's media presence is antiquated and needs to be updated. Many of our leaders have offered help in this area only to be rebuffed or ignored.
8. Helpline – this needs to be put back the way that it was. (NB This was not a hotline but a helpline)
9. Outreach and collaboration with other groups. When SNAP started, we were almost the only game in town. That is no longer true and collaboration is a must.
10. Increase the number of board members with emphasis on recruiting board members from other countries, from specialized groups (eg LGBTQ+, foreign speaking). Since we are international, it is incumbent on the board to be international.

Some of the issues in our original letter have been addressed. For example – “Establish a search committee including Leaders for an executive director” and updating the web site. These were all symptoms of a bigger issue and that is that the board was not being responsive to it's membership (yes, I know that technically does not have any members) nor to it's leaders. To have a contact on the web site of someone who has had dementia for the last 2 years and only correct it when they happen to get meeting notes from our group only shows that the current board has serious issues. I could site example after example of where the board failed in its mission to carry out SNAP's

mission (eg helpline issue took many months – it should have taken days and they never reached out to ask for help).

SNAP Reform Caucus

Points of Discussion

July 24, 2025

Preamble

Thirty SNAP leaders have assembled over the last several months to address issues of concern, suggesting improvements and reforms. Previous efforts to engage the Board have failed due to the Board's resistance to reply. This group submits the following points of discussion to bring respect, accountability, and reform for Leaders and members of SNAP. It is our perception and experience that the Board refuses to address issues of concern.

Three Areas of Discussion

Connection, Communication, Community, and Inclusion

- ~celebrate inclusion and participation of SNAP Leaders with the Board and build a mechanism for the involvement of Leaders with the Board; solicit the involvement and participation of Leaders with Board decisions (survey, polls, etc.)
- ~timely notice of Board meetings and calendar of events to involve Leaders in Board meetings, with an open invitation to Board meetings
- ~build more connections and community with each other—for example, reinstate annual February Leaders training; reinstate regional meetings

Respect and dignity

- ~respect is due to the SNAP leaders and our Caucus members who do the work of survivor contact and monthly support group meetings; acknowledge the peer leadership of SNAP, powered by volunteer Leaders
- ~we expect accountability and transparency re finances, major initiatives,
- ~we demand mutual respect of Leaders by the Board—end the practice of dismissing the issues of Leaders and the Reform Caucus

Call to action

- ~engage and involve, rather than ignore and dismiss, the participation of volunteers, SNAP Leaders, and this Reform Caucus; value the initiatives, as we have the experience and skills to make positive actions; we are the activists and advocates
- ~promote the engagement with all of our communities, including institutional allies, and engagement with the overseas Leaders of our worldwide movement of survivors
- ~censor and remove those Board members who are abusive, those who insult, disrespect, demean, disregard, devalue, and dismiss SNAP Leaders
- ~we call for ongoing reformation of the SNAP Board