

**ATLANTA, GEORGIA**  
**INVENTORY COMPOSITE GROUP MEETING**  
**SEPTEMBER 16, 1993**

Leah H. opened the meeting at 9:20 am with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer. Those present for the meeting were: Leah H., Rogan A., Paul T., Bob S., Tom R., Mandy F., Susan B., Jeff B., John H., Stu T., Jane N., and Ron S. Also present were Steve L., Marilyn S., Lee M. (WSO Staff), and Barbara O., Consultant.

Leah asked if anyone had any revisions or additions to the agenda.

Steve asked the group if the agenda was doable, and if the topics on the agenda could be completed.

Susan and Rogan thought the agenda was fine.

Tom wasn't sure about item number four on the agenda. He feels it should be moved to Saturday's agenda.

Leah suggested just doing items two and three first. She then turned the meeting over to Barbara O.

Barbara went over the "Group Protocol" list and then pointed out the issue bin to the Composite Group. She stated that the yellow stickers represented previous items and blue stickers are new. She asked if everyone was comfortable with the Group Protocol list.

Paul asked for clarification on "maintaining confidentiality," and Barbara and Leah clarified the meaning.

Barbara asked if it was necessary for the group to revisit why everyone was here. No member thought that this was necessary. She then distributed group, area, and regional surveys so the Composite Group members could study them and be ready for a discussion period. Barbara asked if everyone was finished with reviewing the surveys. Before asking the group what their reactions were to the group survey, she announced that Steve would be absent for a short while.

Rogan said there seemed to be a wide variety of responses, therefore, the surveys weren't clearly understood.

Jeff asked if we could reduce the number of responses--eliminate a neutral response. He said it seems the groups want more questions regarding money. Jeff asked if it was possible to redesign the survey in order to reduce suspicion.

Susan asked that because of the number of responses, could we assume that the groups just didn't understand? She stated that we received much more input from the groups than from regions.

Leah informed the group that a back copy of the regional survey wasn't copied.

Mandy informed the Composite Group that her region wants the form simplified, that there are trick questions in the survey, and World Services just wants a pat on the back. She was surprised by this last response.

Barbara asked for just a gut reaction on the group survey only.

Leah stated that when it comes to world services, groups have no idea what world services does.

Barbara then asked for discussion on the area survey.

Tom stated that the answers were more concentrated. The "don't know" answers were used much more.

Rogan felt that the area surveys had truer responses to the questions. It seems that there is a clearer view to what was asked.

Paul is much happier with the area survey than the group survey. He expresses that we have to be more specific on the group survey. He doesn't know how to react to what he read.

Jeff feels we need a major revision on the surveys, but feels it would be wrong to reinvent the surveys.

Tom feels that half the questions on the regional surveys had different responses. Feels they were scattered.

Barbara says they did not copy every single response, but tried to get the essence of the responses.

A discussion ensued regarding the ratio of answers versus the number of groups, areas, and regions.

The group broke at 10:10 am. for a ten minute break.

The meeting resumed at 10:20 am.

Barbara passed out a "survey" observation list for the composite group to go over and identify areas which need improvement. A short question and answer period ensued regarding the "group survey" observation list.

The group then went on to clarify and discuss the observation list of the "area survey." Again a short question and answer period ensued.

The "regional survey" observation list was next up for clarification and discussion.

Barbara asked the group to keep in mind, "How are you going to use this information?"

Paul asked if the questions and responses to the questions are going to be able to be used in World Services?

Jeff feels that the responses have already been useful, and that they contain valuable information.

Stu feels that groups not being aware of World Services is valuable information.

Paul feels that, if we can be more specific, a lot of the "I don't know" responses will be gone.

Stu stated that if you ask groups about PI stuff they're fine, but it doesn't relate to World Services.

Jane feels we can do something if the groups aren't familiar with World Services.

Tom wondered about the responses from the surveys and the usefulness of the surveys. If the groups indicate that the groups are the functional level for the institution of the development of services--who initiates World Service projects?

Bob feels the questions are very general, and that we have to focus in. He suggested a possible follow-up survey.

Paul suggested to use the survey to ask the groups what they want World Services to do.

Jeff reminded the group that the decision was made during the June meeting to ask generic questions.

Jane discussed the lack of information the groups have regarding World Services.

Leah asked if the group would mind moving on.

Paul stated that he has some very strong opinions regarding the surveys.

Barbara brought the group's attention to her opinion regarding cuts in the surveys (26).

- Number
- Literature: Step, basic text, tape, videos, translations, costs, history,
- Financial acct./responsibility
- Communication
- Purpose of world services
- Products
- Org issues
- External PR

Group/Area #27 concerns region

- Fiscal responsibility
- Communication
- Literature
- Who is world services
- Survey
- Org issues - voting decision making - board function

John asked Barbara how she differentiated who is world services versus decision making.

Barbara then asked the Composite Group how they would like to work on these issues.

Jeff feels we need to stick with the basics which we got from TWGSS. Identify areas which are problematic and then follow-up with a second survey. He feels we need to break up in small working groups with assigned categories which need to be worked on.

Jane's opinion is that we have their concerns and wants from the open-ended question. We've been told across the board about fiscal responsibilities.

Ron stated that we have enough information to change now, and not wait to hear from the fellowship at large.

Stu and Jeff feel we already have an outline for the revision.

Paul's concern is the time and energy that will be spent in doing this. He is also concerned with the fact that the survey will not work in terms of the "world" since the group is very "US." He feels it would be good to find out what services are missing for the groups. Where are groups going to get guidance from? Paul

believes there should be a question regarding where world services should be operating now.

Stu feels it could work in reverse. He believes there should be some segregation with focused questions for different areas.

Lee asked for clarification from Stu's response.

Paul is worried that the information we're getting from the surveys is useless.

Tom has a problem with trying to grasp the usefulness of the surveys.

The group took a break at 11:15 am.

The meeting resumed at 11:25 am.

Barbara recommended that the group split up into three small working groups with each group assigned areas that are problematic in the group, area, and regional surveys--definitional, redundancy, vagueness, and missing questions until 12:30 pm.

#### **Working Group #1 (Groups)**

Paul T.  
Stu T.  
Ron S.  
Susan B.

#### **Working Group #2 (Areas)**

John H.  
Jane N.  
Rogan A.  
Jeff B.

#### **Working Group #3 (Regions)**

Leah H..  
Bob S.  
Tom R.  
Mandy F.

The Composite Group broke into small working groups. The meeting broke at 12:30 pm for lunch

The meeting reconvened at 2:00 pm. Jeff's group requested additional time to complete the work assigned. The request was granted since everyone was not in attendance, and the computer had to have information downloaded on it. (computer returned at 3:10 pm)

A discussion period took place regarding the outcome of the working groups session on the group, area, and regional surveys.

Barbara asked for additional comments or questions.

Members asked about the possibility of seeing the actual changes before the end of the day?

Steve stated that the hotel doesn't have any dedicated phone lines to download information. The information was going to be Fed Ex'd and the group would receive the information either Friday afternoon or Saturday morning. Steve asked the group to tell him the absolute latest time that they needed the information.

Susan feels the sooner she has the information the better.

Leah and Jeff offered other alternatives in order to receive the hard copy. The general consensus of the group is for a hard copy of the surveys to be ready tomorrow morning for the composite group to review.

Leah emphasized the need not to rush this portion of the project. She then informed the group of the next item on the agenda.

The item chosen by the group was the topic of data entry and analysis. Steve went into a brief explanation of an alternative plan to the one proposed during the June meeting. The group then began discussing various ways of analyzing the data received.

The discussion then moved on to the ability to maintain the integrity of the information received through the data entry process. Steve outlined the various processes that would be utilized to ensure the data's integrity. This included having a separate PO box for this project, only one individual being authorized to pick up the mail, the envelopes containing the data being secured at the WSO every day, using temps to do the data entry, and spot checking the entries periodically to ensure that what is being entered reflects the information received. After the discussion, the group decided to accept the proposal to do data entry using temps hired by the WSO.

The group then decided to discuss the issue of analysis of the data received. The discussion focused on whether or not to use a consultant to develop the list of items to report on. The group, after some additional discussion, decided not to use a consultant in the analysis of the data, and to use a small group to develop such a list.

The next item addressed on the agenda was the selection of the next leader for the Composite Group. Steve asked the group to consider whether or not it wanted to continue the process, and addressed some concerns about the position the process of continually changing leadership puts staff in.

### **Tape 3, Side B.**

The question of leadership rotation was split into two separate parts, first whether or not to continue rotation and second, the length of term. The group felt strongly that it wanted to continue the process of rotation. While the group finally agreed, in principle, that the next leader should serve through WSC '94, the topic was deferred until later in the session.

The next general topic was reporting. One of the items involved providing frequent updates to conference participants. The composite group endorsed the "Inventory Update" being produced by the Support Team as long as one member of the composite group will have the opportunity to review the monthly update.

Leah asked if there were any volunteers for honcho. Bob Smith was elected as honcho to serve through WSC 1994.

Jane brought up the subject of co-honchos.

Leah announced that the group was now at the self-assessment tools and turned the meeting over to Barbara O.

Barbara asked the Composite Group how many wanted to hear how the development of the self-assessment tools came about?

Jeff gave a brief overview of the process in the development of the self-assessment tools. He stated that three filters were used to develop the questions.

Barbara asked the group if they were ready to discuss the self-assessment tools themselves, and if anyone had any questions?

### Questions about Self-Assessment Tools

- Part II: How does that fit; is that going to be measured?
- Measurement criteria, report.
- Concern about using communication, coordination, information, and guidance.
- Relevant questions.
- In World Service a lot of work in creating.
- Work directly usable to group as English-speaking.
- Non-English speaking.

- Part I: Will develop a good description - no questions are evaluative. Add what actually happens, not what we try to make.
- May trigger a lot of policy rewrite.
- Part II: need operational definitions of four areas, communications, coordination, etc.
- Part II: give questions about.
- Don't see what is wrong with what we are doing.
- Internal and external communicating and interface with other committees.
- How is it not working.
- Part II: "Weakness" more targeted.

Leah stated that we would use the self-assessment tools that were given to the Composite Group and use it as a beginning. She then asked the group about the order of topics on the agenda for tomorrow. Leah then went over the items on the issue bin before adjourning for the evening at 7:00 pm.