

September 2, 2026

Joshua Castle, Chair, IUP Co-op Board of Directors
Members, IUP Co-op Board of Directors
319 Pratt Drive
Indiana, PA 15910

Dr. Castle and Members of the IUP Co-op Board of Directors:

In IUP SCA's current, approved Bylaws, *Article XV* confirms that *Robert's Rules of Order* govern the SCA's procedures.

With this in mind, it is important to note that:

- a. On August 20th, a motion was made, seconded, discussed, and overwhelmingly approved by voice vote. According to the SCAs Bylaws and *Robert's Rules*, this, and only this, can be the proposition that is distributed to the student body for a vote.
- b. If there had been a motion to either amend or to split the original motion (neither of these motions were made), it would have been necessary for someone to have:
 1. made a motion to amend (or split) the motion on the floor, (no such motion was made);
 2. seconded the suggested amendment (since there was no motion to amend, this could/did not occur);
 3. a vote of all in attendance on the amendment would have been required and IF THE AMENDMENT HAD PASSED, (no vote to amend was taken);
 4. then there would have had to be a SECOND vote on the amended motion.

But there was only one vote, and that vote was on the original motion, without amendment, that was read aloud to the assembly, with a written copy handed at the time to the meeting chair. (Copy of original, approved motion attached.)

All who attended the meeting are aware that a second, completely independent motion (to void the Millstone contract) was made, seconded, and defeated at the August 20th meeting. But, of course, a second motion cannot be construed as a revision of the first motion unless explicitly stated. The first motion calls for a halt of all tree removal; the second motion said that the Millstone contract should be voided. A reader might wish to see these motions as somehow overlapping, but they were separate motions, stating separate goals, and resulted in different outcomes (one passed; one defeated) when voted on by the assembly.

It is very good that the SCA thoughtfully included the reference to *Robert's Rules* in the Bylaws, thereby providing a clear path to the creation of the proposition provided to the students for a subsequent campus-wide vote.

The proposition, itself, should include only the information specified in the Bylaws, along with the precise, unaltered wording of the motion that was approved. This information is provided in the SCA Bylaws, Article IX, Section 5 (copied below):

Section 5

Every member shall be entitled to a notice of any proposition to be put to the vote of the Association membership. Such notice shall commence at least six (6) days prior to the proposition and consist of an advertisement, of thirty or more column inches, in no fewer than three issues of the IUP student newspaper. Included in the notice shall be:

- a. The date of the proposition;
- b. The location(s) and schedule of polling;
- c. The proposition text;
- d. This statement, *"All regular members of the Student Cooperative Association, Inc. are entitled to vote in this proposition."*
- e. The definition of a regular member.

Any introduction to the proposition should include only explanation of process. The remainder of the proposition should be only that motion that was resoundingly approved on August 20th.

Should various persons or offices wish to provide students with additional information regarding the proposition - through different channels, of course - that would be reasonable, if not important.

I thank you very much for your work.

Sincerely,



Sara King, Ph.D.

Emeritus Professor of Psychology

Saint Francis University

IUP Alumnus & Current I-Card holder

CC: Patrick Dougherty, Esquire