

SEPTEMBER 17, 1993

Tape 4, Side B (continuation)

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.

The surveys were worked on by staff following the previous day's meeting and distributed at the start of the meeting. Barbara asked the Composite Group to read through the updated surveys and make any corrections. She asked the group for some global comments or reactions to the surveys. A brief discussion followed, and the following changes were agreed upon:

Tape 5, Side A and B, Tape 6, Side A and B

Group Survey changes

- Change question #16 to question #1.
- Change question #28 to question #9.
- Change original question #9 to read "World services may begin new projects without the fellowship's approval."
- Move current questions #25, 26, 27 to follow current question #18. Move current #19 to follow at then end of the "money group."
- Questions #2 and 4 - add three sub questions to the main questions; a) through the service structure, b) directly, and c) doesn't provide useful information.

- Question #7 change to read as follows; "When our group asks world services a question, either directly or through the service structure, we get an answer."
- Question #1 change the word "emerging" to "new."

ASC Survey changes

- Add opening statement defining "World Services" from the Group Survey to the beginning of the Area Survey.
- Replace question #21 with #21 from the Group Survey.
- Add questions #32 and #33 from the Group Survey to the Area Survey.
- Question #10 change to read "Rank the importance of the following three responsibilities of NA world services; 1) is the most important, 2) is next most important, 3) is least important."
- Question #9 - delete.
- Question #12 add "check all that apply."
- Question #16 change "readily stocked" to "readily available."
- Question #16 change "delivered in two weeks" to "delivered in a timely manner."
- Questions #2 and #3 - delete.
- Question #18 change to read "Our ASC passes money on to the NA service Structure."
- Question #19 change to read "Our area is satisfied with the way world services uses money."

RSC Survey changes

- Add question #1 from the Group Survey to the RSC Survey.
- Delete question #3.
- Add opening statement defining "World Services" from the Group Survey to the beginning of the Regional Survey.
- Replace question #25 with #21 from the Group Survey.
- Add questions #28, #32, and #33 from the Group Survey to the Regional Survey.
- Question #4 change to read "Our region is satisfied with the way world services uses money."
- Questions #19 and #20 replace with ranking question (question #10 on the Area Survey).
- Question #21 delete.

The group broke for lunch at 1:00 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 2:35 pm with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer.

Barbara announced that this session would start the discussion of the self-assessment tools.

Susan asked Barbara if she had any suggestions on which direction would be best to follow.

Barbara suggested that in Part II of the Self-Assessment Tools that the group could look at key organizational areas. She then asked the group if there were any other areas they might like to bring up with the exception of definitions. A general discussion period followed with some questions/suggestions listed below.

Jane felt there was a two-fold process. She stated that boards and committees look at the state of purpose in the TWGSS. Wants questions answered in relation to the four areas.

John asked if we could have an overall statement (question)?

Jeff suggested a general direction be put on the cover sheet.

Ron stated that there have been difficulties which have been identified throughout the structure. Where do we get to address those specific problems that have already been identified?

Steve asked the group what it says in their proposal. He explained that whoever is going to evaluate would be responsible. He asked the group to also consider discussing the evaluation of the completed assessments before the end of the weekend.

Barbara asked if the group wanted to close out this issue or defer it until later?

The group decided to defer the issue until later.

Paul asked if Barbara could make a list of questions that aren't there. They are as follows:

- Services provided are usable for non-English speaking.
- New (undeveloped) developing groups.
- Amount of time spent on self-generate work (work going into keeping committee happy).
- Proactive/reactive.
- Resource section - how the committee works.
- Participation of non-English speaking trusted servants on committees or boards.
- Problems of protocol.
- Locations where committees and boards meet.
- Amount of personal money spent by trusted servants.
- Definition of; communication, coordination, information, and guidance.

Susan asked if the questions listed are out of the scope which was agreed upon at the conference. Is it okay to add to the scope?

John doesn't think it will fly very well.

Mandy feels that if the group discovers additional information that needs to be added, don't hesitate.

Steve doesn't feel that there are any questions listed on the board that aren't covered in the scope of the inventory.

Tape 7, Side A

Ron feels that communications seems to run into protocol problems. There seems to be a missing link somewhere. How do we follow a protocol that we don't understand?

Steve read off the protocol questions.

Paul would like to see an awareness question in the tools.

Jeff personally doesn't believe that this question is covered. Might be effective to ask a cleaner question which would be #17 under part D.

Paul wondered if the material they're producing is appropriate for young areas which are developing.

Jeff doesn't understand the distinction between the two questions in which Paul is asking. He asked if both questions had to do with usability?

Jane stated that in literature they always looked at whether or not sentences could be translated. Adaptability.

Tom compared a member's statement to proactive/reactive when it comes to English versus non-English languages.

Leah read a section from TWGSS regarding the WSC.

Barbara stated that two or three questions still needed to be addressed, and that the group would split up into small working groups in order to tackle these questions.

Jeff believes that active/proactive will be a fruitful avenue to proceed with. He also believes that the question of the amount of time spent on self-generated work in keep committees happy is partially represented.

Paul asked the group where this question fits in.

Leah asked how much time is spent on this (special workers, committee members, etc.). Was there a way to track the time of staff?

Steve explained the break down of special worker's time cards at the WSO.

Leah asked Rogan how many hours he has spent on this project, and if he could break down his time.

Jeff believes that mostly everyone would be able to estimate time spent on the inventory project.

Leah asked about #1 under the instructions--whether or not bringing awareness to committees would help in reality to what they do?

Susan asked for clarification on where we are in the questions.

Ron stated that, in terms of human resources, there is also a huge amount of financial resource that comes out of an individual's pocket.

Jeff suggested that we move on, and that the original four people who put this together, get together, and complete the assigned task to clarify everything.

Leah feels that proactive/reactive needs to be addressed. What work comes from the conference and what comes from the committees?

Jane has a concern with how are we going to use this information.

Leah feels we should know which committees are proactive and which are reactive and why.

Steve feels they need a good definition of proactive/reactive.

Tape 7, Side B

Tom feels that coming up with ideas to work on, without being specifically asked, is a proactive stance. If we stand on proactive/reactive, there should be something in there to measure it. Need clearer definition.

Stu stated that this inventory plan is an example of proactive.

Barbara closed this portion of the discussion, and asked the four people who were working on it to do some further work. She then suggested the following areas to look at and determine the strengths and weaknesses of each area.

- composition of the committee

- recruitment of the committee
- orientation/training
- structure
- work climate
- decision making
- functioning
- planning
- board/staff relationships
- fiscal responsibility
- financial development
- meetings
- recognition
- boards looking at their relationship to the committees

Ron believes that if it was better organized it might be easier to find the "real stuff."

Stu believes we will have to evaluate on the same format. There is a difference between an assessment and an evaluation.

Jeff said we will be assessing the information in Part I. He feels that the above list is more complicated.

Mandy feels that we are in an inventory process because of our position right now. Stated that large corporations are also looking inward for answers.

Barbara gave an example of how to work with the above list. Feels that listing a lot of weaknesses is a threat to people--that you want this to be as positive as possible. Asked the group to ponder what the next steps are during break.

Leah announced that the revised surveys were being passed out, but not to be read just yet.

Barbara informed the group that the four people who are going to deal with the questions will be going out of the room.

Jeff suggested that the items on the list be subcategories in Part II.

Paul feels that one member of the four who put together the self-assessment tools be left behind to help with Part I and to send out another member of the Composite Group. It was further determined that the additional members would split into two additional small working groups with assigned tasks.

Timeline group

John
Tom
Stu
Ron

Part II group

Jeff
Mandy
Leah
Bob

Part I group

Paul
Susan
Rogan
Jane

Before breaking into small working groups, Leah brought up World Services meeting for discussion. She then asked for pros and cons.

Following some discussion, Jeff feels that since we are financially in a position to pay for non-US members (DF item on discretionary list), there should be a WS meeting.

Ron gave his opinion on this matter. Feels it is not this group's decision whether or not we can finance members. Will not speak for Interim Committee. We are standing at 94% of monthly to meet our budget.

Leah asked the group to reach a decision.

Susan asked for clarification from Bob regarding his letter in regards to why we should not have this.

Bob explained why he feels it is appropriate for the group to be discussing this. Doesn't see why any component is any more sacred than another. Feels it is up to the Composite Group to express which is more important in the inventory process.

Ron states that this is his personal opinion. Decision made on September call whether or not to fund the DF. It has nothing to do with the realities of the Interim Committee. It is strictly a personal opinion.

Paul asked Bob to explain the figures in his letter.

Tape 8, Side A

Bob explained the different figures to Paul.

Leah asked the group if they are able to make a decision on whether or not we would have a WS meeting. yes-8, no-1, ab-2.

Steve informed the group which committees or boards would meet at the WS meeting and why.

John stated that we would have to decide who would administer and be the liaison for and the self-assessment tools.

Leah then moved on to the comprehensive history portion.

Tom stated that one portion of the WSO proposal is the catalogue which was sent out and that boards and committees could request them. According to estimates, the total amount of available staff in this time period, less the time spent on providing basic services, and this project leaves a shortage of 200+ hours. There may be several ways of making up the shortage of hours for the WSO staff. Some committee's or board's request may have to be deferred. Possibly services transferred that are currently being performed.

Steve provided additional information regarding possible ways to reduce such a deficit.

John asked how the committees as a whole would make a decision on what they need.

Steve read John the basic information. Explained to John that he could send to every member of his committee (for example) all minutes from the last ten years.

Jeff has a problem in removing the portion of the history that has to do with communications.

Jane asked if most chairs or vice chairs of committees and boards have this communication? Can we shorten it up in order to help the time frame?

The following was accepted as a definition of comprehensive histories. "A comprehensive history of each conference committee and board is to be developed in an overview or synopsis format. This synopsis is to include a history of guideline changes and a history of decisions made during the past five years or, more specifically, since the beginning of the 1988-1989 conference year. Additionally, copies of communications from the fellowship detailing their questions or concerns, and responses to the fellowship regarding those

questions or concerns, since the beginning of the 1990-1991 conference year be forwarded to each conference committee and board."

Steve shared information with the group that the Translations Committee has requested to be left out of the inventory process due to the volume of their workload and their newness. He also reported about some voiced concerns regarding the Outreach Committee going through this process.

Mandy would like to hear more information before making a decision. Also, since no one is here from the Translations Committee, she doesn't feel it is right to eliminate them.

Steve explained that it was at the Translations Committee's request to the Interim Committee to be eliminated.

David (Outreach Committee) spoke in regards to their request for participation even though they have only been in existence for a short time.

Jeff feels that it is important for all boards and committees to inventory themselves.

Tom asked for someone to reiterate the motion which was passed by the conference. Doesn't feel the Composite Group has the authority to excuse a group or committee from the inventory.

Mandy doesn't want to be a part of anything that says one group is different from another.

The group had a discussion about the inclusion or exclusion of the Outreach and Translations Committees.

Tape 8, Side B

(con't) The group was asked to vote on sending a letter stating not to exclude the Translations Committee from the inventory process.

Jane voiced her concerns about acting on a situation she knew nothing about.

Steve explained that the Fellowship Services Division Director asked him to bring the committee's request to this meeting.

Paul asked if there was going to be any response to the Translations Committee's request. Has heard that they have a huge amount of work to do, and doesn't feel they should be excused because of the work.

Leah doesn't feel comfortable with giving them instructions which are different from everyone else.

Ron states that he knows Translations has a lot of work, but they have been funded for the quarterly as has everyone else.

Steve reiterated to the group his understanding of their decision--they are not willing exclude any committee from the process.

Leah informed the group that the next item to be discussed was the WSO self-assessment.

Bob recommended that the WSO do a process audit (at the expense of the WSO).

Tom stated that the process audit could not occur within the first year.

Jane stated she believes that the process audit should not take the place of the self-assessment tools.

The composite group agreed with the idea of the WSO using a "process audit" as a part of their self-assessment.

Jeff suggested that we use the small working group in developing the WSO self-assessment tools.

Tom asked when this would occur.

A question and answer period occurred in regards to the WSO inventory. A decision was made to develop the WSO self-assessment tools in a small working group.

Leah voiced her concern with delegating the same people all the time to participate in the small working groups. She is afraid of burnout. Two small working groups were established to develop self-assessment tools for the WSC and WSO. However, this was deferred until the next day.