

## **JUNE STEPS AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Steps Ad Hoc Committee met on June 16th and 17th in Van Nuys, California. Members present were Bryce Sullivan (chairperson), Mary Jensen (vice chairperson), Terry Ott, Michael Lee, Vince Daley, Cathy Rhyne, Tom Catton, Jeri Sarracino, and Laurie Miller. WSO staff member, Lee Manchester, assisted us and George Hollahan was with us on the morning of June 16th.

### **WSO STAFF SUPPORT**

We began by discussing changes in WSO staff support for the steps project. Steve Lantos will now be our coordinator, but was unable to be here for this meeting because of a scheduling conflict with the Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service. This will be the only such conflict this conference year. Lee will be the staff team's editor. Once a writer is hired, we will have a full staff team to assist us in this project.

There was considerable discussion throughout the weekend about the change in staff assigned to us. One of the things that is vitally important to us as a group is consistency. Although WSCLC members are rotated into the group and additional people are brought in when their experience is sought, having a core of consistent participation is desirable. Mary VanEvery, the WSO Literature Coordinator, is certainly a part of that core. We believe that we can work well with Steve, but are requesting that Mary remain actively involved with this work as an ad hoc committee member. We are hopeful that Mary will choose to continue to be involved with this committee. She adds energy and balance to our discussions.

### **SUMMARY OF PROGRESS**

We reviewed last year's work in order to gain a clear picture of where we are going. We have determined the style, tone, audience, purpose and readability level of the book. The general format was selected--twelve chapters and an introduction--and an average chapter length. It was strongly suggested by this group as well as the WSCLC that the steps and traditions portions appear in one rather than two books. We continued to work out the specifics on how we can best interface with the Traditions Ad Hoc Committee.

We now have the option to release the book by chapters at the time of review. This committee was generally against doing that last year, but we will need to continue to explore this as an option.

We also created an outline for each step last year. We began by brainstorming what we thought needed to be in that step and referring to earlier step outlines as source material. We then agreed on points from the brainstormed (rough) outline to include in a more formal outline. We provided a consistent organization from chapter to chapter with our outline headings. Each chapter will include a transition from the previous chapter, identification for the reader, spiritual principles, spiritual journey and transition to the next step. These were the outlines distributed during the conference. Decisions were also made about how to use source material (Chicago, L.A., Review and Approval drafts). We will go through source material individually, then as a group, to locate concepts and language that work well. We talked about the writer being a part of

the committee, but in some ways separate from the committee. This is necessary to allow for objective review of the writer's work by the ad hoc group.

That was last year's work. In reviewing it, we feel that we have laid a strong foundation for the next logical steps.

#### STAFF TEAM APPROACH

We thoroughly discussed how we perceived the structure of the staff team which we had only discussed in the abstract last year. This is what we came up with. The staff team will be composed of a writer, editor, and coordinator. This team will work together between ad hoc committee meetings to organize working outlines, prepare a draft, and bring these materials back to the ad hoc committee for review and revisions. The writer's primary responsibility will be to prepare step drafts from outlines, source material, and notes taken during committee meetings. The draft will be revised by the editor and coordinator. Suggestions and/or additions in the form of recommendations made by the staff team will be clearly marked so that the entire Steps Ad Hoc Committee can decide whether or not that material is desirable. The ad hoc group will take full responsibility for the draft.

George H. reported that the staff team approach was first used with *The Guide to Service* project. That ad hoc committee had not done the lead work that this committee has. This created the need for more interpretation by staff than will be necessary here. While working on that project, it was found that it is best to have the primary writer's work reviewed by an editor and project manager. The ability of office staff to communicate about the project at any time greatly expedites the work. The staff team will bring recommendations for the work; those recommendations will take the form of drafts. It is important that the material is accepted by the Steps Ad Hoc Committee as our responsibility and that drafts be reviewed with an objective eye.

An applicant for the writing position was being interviewed by the office the weekend we met. A writing "test", which was a task similar to the work which will accompany this project from the writer's perspective, was administered. From amongst the applicants, it seems hopeful that we will have the final third of our staff team in the near future.

#### TRANSLATIONS

We continue to struggle with how best to involve international members and committees in our process. The WSCLC is seeking to involve the international fellowship in an advisory capacity. At this point, we know that if we avoid using slang and complexly-worded concepts, our material will be generally translatable. One suggestion was that we may choose to send out the first chapter of the draft to a number of international groups to monitor the translatability. We will continue to discuss how best to accomplish involving members of the international fellowship into the process, at the same time knowing that the WSCLC is having similar discussions.

### SOURCE MATERIAL

The major portion of the weekend was spent reviewing source material (Chicago, L.A. Review, and Approval drafts) for Steps One and Two. Discussion involved deciding on source material that will be factored into the draft. We looked for conceptual material that supported our structure for these chapters, were alert for concepts we may have overlooked during preparation of the outlines, and expanded on ideas from the outlines that needed further discussion.

### GENERAL DISCUSSION

We needed to come to closure about some of the format issues that were left unresolved last year. It begins to seem that 5,000 word chapters may be too lengthy. We may need to start with 5,000 words and delete as necessary.

We are leaning toward using subheadings within chapters of the book. They will help to organize the chapter and help the reader locate material and focus concentration.

Some discussion centered on introductory material. Will we explain the pattern represented by the outlines in the introduction? The naturalness of how one step leads to another could also be addressed in the introduction.

It is clear that care must be taken with semantics. For example, is there a difference between "power greater than myself" and "Higher Power?" Could that difference in semantics be the difference between concept and reality? In writing each step to reflect progression in recovery, it will be important to monitor use of language.

### ASSIGNMENT

For our next meeting, to be held August 18th and 19th, we will review source material for Steps Three through Six. Actual writing will probably start after that meeting. Our third (September) meeting of this conference year will focus on reviewing a first step draft developed by the staff team and reviewing additional source material.

