

**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.

## 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.

## **SEPTEMBER 18, 1993**

### **Tape 9, Side 1**

Leah H. opened the meeting at 9:15 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 announced that the first item of our agenda is the finalization of the surveys.

Barbara asked for feedback on what happened yesterday afternoon and how we can avoid that today. She reminded the group about the curve and productivity which was discussed at the June meeting. She asked for any other comments and none was given.

Susan was quite impressed with the end results of the surveys.

Barbara asked if there was anything missing in the group surveys which was decided upon yesterday. She asked if there was going to be a question on "trust."

Leah asked if anyone had a problem with the group survey. She stated that the silence of the group means that the survey is okay.

Steve reminded the Composite Group that this is the group survey which will go out to 10,000 groups and, therefore, probably needs some action to be reflected in the record of the meeting. The Composite Group was in unanimous agreement that the group survey was completed.

Susan had a question concerning #10 in the area survey. Doesn't seem that responsibility is a product. Was changed to product development/distribution. The group was unanimous in favor of the change and therefore, the area survey was completed.

The regional survey had the same change as the area survey. Also, it was decided to move the definition of zonal forum from the second page to the first page. Agreement was reached that this is the finalized regional survey.

Susan asked what the current process is for the surveys. It was decided that it could be discussed under time lines.

A question and answer period took place regarding Part I of the self-assessment tools and changes were made. After the discussion, a vote was taken and Part I of the self-assessment tools was passed unanimously.

Next, a discussion was held regarding Part II of the self-assessment tools. Questions were answered and changes made.

After a break, Lee informed the Composite Group that flight departure times were needed so transportation to the airport could be arranged for on Sunday.

**Tape 9, Side 2**

Steve told the group that they would see the changes on Part I and Part II by the end of the day. He also announced that there should be a discussion period on how the self-assessment tools will be administered before approval of the tools.

Bob suggested that Parts I and II be sent out to the committees first.

Steve explained possible options--send out both Parts 1 and 2 or just Part 1. Cover memo discussing what occurred this weekend, will receive background information and when. Leadership of committee/board will contact WSO. A recommendation for boards/committees to funnel input to WSO.

Bob suggested that the office give Part 1 to the chairs and vice chairs of the boards/committees first since it is their responsibility to organize it.

It was agreed that the WSO will mail these out by October 1.

Some concerns were brought up regarding the possibility of not reaching a consensus in Part 1, and if a consensus is not reached, how would that affect Part II?

Barbara also suggested to include why this is being done one more time. She then asked to revisit the surveys for a short period of time.

Barbara asked the group if Part II should be sent out in advance?

Leah was not in agreement with this and gave her reasons.

Mandy agreed with Leah. Foresees some possibilities of members using the time as a way of justifying. Wonders if members could be objective.

John would like to see the administration get a copy of Part II because they might want to plan their agenda before their meeting.

Mandy reminds the group that this is a group activity. Feels if everyone has done their own inventory that they should have a good idea of what is involved. Does not recommend that it go out in advance.

Steve asked how are these self-assessments going to be administered?

Jane is unsure whether or not Part II should go out in advance. What's the harm in it if it goes out a week ahead of time. Needs to know the harm.

Rogan doesn't see the harm in it going out early. He believes that the members should have as much awareness as possible on Part II. He is in favor of it going out early.

Ron reiterated that there are a number of boards and committees who will not be doing this task at the WS meeting.

### **Tape 10, Side 1**

(con't) Ron feels they should have it in advance in order to be prepared.

The vote showed that Part II should be mailed two weeks in advance.

Interim, NA Way, Translations, BOD, WCC, and Tape Review are the boards/committees not meeting at the WS meeting.

It was agreed that Part II will be mailed out two weeks before their inventory meeting to the above members.

Paul requested one or two of the composite group members, before the end of today, to get together with him and explain how he is going to go about this because of his role as translations committee liaison.

Steve reminded the group that a decision was made at the June meeting that each committee/board would have a member of the composite group assigned to them.

It was pointed out that various members of the Composite group will be present at the World services meeting.

Barbara asked if there was a need to have a Composite Group member present for each committee or board at the WS meeting.

Jane is con to the idea because she doesn't see the rational with one of the Composite Group members being a facilitator.

Rogan is pro to the idea because of the possibility of the boards or committees getting bogged down with Part II.

Mandy is con to the idea. Feels that the Composite Group doesn't give the boards or committees credit for understanding.

Ron is con to having one member of the Composite Group present at the WS meeting for each conference board/committee.

The Composite Group voted on whether or not every conference committee/board at the WS meeting will have one member of the Composite Group present for the purpose of conducting their self-assessment.

Jeff proposed an alternative which would involve a roving member of the Composite Group attending WS meeting to answer questions upon request. The group defeated this alternative.

Next option was to have a Composite Group member serve as facilitator available for every committee and board across the board at the WS. Defeated. A member of the Composite Group to serve as a resource member available across the board to answer all questions. Defeated by the group. Group broke for lunch at 12:50 pm.

Group reconvened at 2:20 pm, and the revised self-assessment tools were passed out.

Part I is to be mailed out by October 1. Part II mailed out two weeks before the WS meeting or whenever a committee or board is having their inventory meeting.

Lee read off the departure times for the shuttle on Sunday.

Barbara asked the group to read the cover letter memo (instructions). After the group was done, a few members voiced their recommended changes on the cover memo.

The group then went over Part I of the self-assessment tools and gave their final approval which included the additional changes.

Bob voiced his concern with approving Part II too quickly. Doesn't want it approved at this meeting. Suggested that the group approve it at the next meeting or on the next conference call.

M/C Tom "to approve Part II of the self-assessment tools" yes- 7. Part II approved.

Leah announced that the next item up for discussion was the time line.

The following flow chart was displayed on the wall for the group to review.

### **September**

1. Composite Group Meeting (Atlanta)
  - Completes surveys
  - Forward for translation
  - Data analysis team begins

- Recommendation for evaluation procedures
- Complete committee/board assessment tools (small group #1)
- Comprehensive history defined
- Begin evaluation plan for committee/board assessments
- Complete time line for conference year (small group #2)
- Budget consideration to support group
- World Service meeting decided
- Small group for WSC self-assessment (small group #1)
- Small group for 1994-1995 plan revision (small group #2)

*(Approved budget for September \$20,665)*

### **October**

1. Full Composite Group conference call
2. Surveys translated and mailed
3. WSO compiling histories
4. Small group meeting (group #1)
  - WSC assessment tools
5. Small group meeting (group #2)
  - '94-'95 Inventory Plan
6. Data analysis team working
7. Committee/board liaisons to contact committee/board regarding world service meeting
8. Inventory update mailed
9. Full committee report mailed

*(Approved \$5,000 - Unapproved \$4,000 (\$2,000 x 2))*

### **November**

1. Composite Group meeting
  - Review WSC assessment tools (small group #1)
  - Finalize 1994-1995 Inventory Plan for conference agenda (small group #2)
  - Finalize committee/board data analysis procedures
  - Finalize survey data analysis procedure
  - Meeting with Conference Admin. Committee
  - Plan for inventory activities WSC 1994
2. Advise committee/boards not meeting at WS meeting to complete inventory by end of January
3. Comprehensive histories mailed to committee/boards
4. Survey reminder notices mailed
5. Inventory update mailed

*(Approved \$1,600 - Unapproved - Comp. Group \$7,700)*

### **December**

1. Full Composite Group conference call
  - Reporting plan to WSC '94 on inventory results (*Conference Agenda Report*)
  - Finalization of world service meeting
2. Small Group meeting (group #I)
  - WSO assessment tools
3. Small group meeting (group #II)
  - Local service forums
4. Inventory update mailed
5. Full Composite Group report mailed

*(Approved \$1,600 - Unapproved for the quarter on small working groups \$4,000 = \$2,000 x 2)*

### **January**

1. World Service meeting
  - Complete committee/board assessments
  - Committee/boards not meeting at WS meeting submit inventory
2. Small group #1 continues
  - WSO assessment tools
3. Small group # continues
  - Local service forums
4. WSC 1994 prep continues
5. Begin implementation of data entry and analysis procedures for surveys and committee/board assessments
6. Inventory update mailed

*(WSC approved in the budget - WS meeting \$34,600 and WS Admin. \$3,500 (+ \$800))*

### **February**

1. Full Composite Group conference call
  - Considerations related to survey data and assessment data
  - Considerations regarding reporting at WSC 1994
2. Data entry for survey completed
3. Data entry for self-assessments completed
4. Begin review process of data results
5. Small group #1 continues
  - WSO assessment tools
6. Small Group #2 continues
  - Local forums
7. Inventory update mailed

*(WSC approved in the budget - \$1,600 (+\$900))*

### **March**

1. Full Composite Group meeting
  - Completion of survey evaluation
  - Completion of committee/board assessment evaluation
  - Finalization of WSC 1994 report
  - Finalize WSO assessment tools (Small group #I)
  - Finalize local service forms (Small group #II)
  - Finalize WSC assessment activities
2. Inventory update mailed

*(Approved \$7,700 for Composite Group and \$400 for Admin. (+\$800)*

#### **April**

1. Completion of committee report for March
2. WSC 1994

*(Approved \$5,120 and \$1,140 (\$2,500 for additional 2 members of the Composite Group)*

Stu, acting as spokesperson for the small working group (Tom, Stu, John, and Ron) discussed the flow chart for the time line.

In regards to the flow chart the following questions were asked:

- Whether or not a consultant was included in the budget.

#### **Tape 11, Side A**

- Is there money allotted for data analysis.
- Value of local forum
- Whole Composite Group at WSC '94
- Data analysis person for the November meeting
- Facilitators for the November and March meeting
- Length and location of November and March meeting
- Second survey

A question and answer period followed. The Composite Group had a discussion on the further need of a consultant. Barbara O. left at 4:05 pm.

The group asked whether or not the person providing input on the statistical analysis for the survey would need to be a professional consultant such as Barbara.

Steve feels that whether the person is in the fellowship or not, they have to have a statistical background in order to do a data analysis, but they do not have to be a "paid, professional, non-member consultant."

**Tape 11, Side B**

The group then voted on the plan for in-house resources to complete the data analysis. Approved.

Next question discussed was the whole Composite Group attending WSC 1994. Composite Group approved the proposal.

Data member to attend November meeting--it will be up to John to determine whether he will deliver the report himself or have another member (who'd need to be present and have expenses paid) of this small group do it. Approved

Facilitator for the November meeting. Not approved

Length of the November and March meeting. Three days was approved for both months.

Meeting location for November and March. It was agreed that the November meeting will be held wherever the conference will be held. The March meeting will be held in Van Nuys.

The next question discussed was the second survey. Deferred to the 1994/1995 plan.

Stu asked for a vote on the approval of the plan. Approved unanimously.

The next discussion was in regards to the November meeting--whether only the core group would attend or the entire Composite Group would be involved. The decision was made to have the whole Composite Group in attendance at the November meeting.

Leah questioned the validity of the Interim Committee's memo since the Interim Committee is only responsible for the budget end of the Composite Group.

The next item to deal with were the items on the issue bin. **Tape 11, side 2, near the end (Jamie's letter)**

*The NA Way Magazine* articles regarding the inventory and the magazine's editorial policy were then discussed. Paul proposed that when a member of the Composite Group gives an individual interview to the *NA Way Magazine* that whether or not they want to remain anonymous be left up to the individual member. Jeff's proposal for the *NA Way* is that when members of our group give an interview it is suggested that they do it anonymously. Jeff's proposal was agreed upon.

Bob expressed a concern regarding the position it would put staff in if asked not to release Part II of the Self-Assessment Tools until two weeks before the inventory meeting. Some members asked Steve how he would handle the situation.

A vote was taken on not mailing Part II of the assessment tools to anyone other than the Composite Group, Support Team, and senior WSO management until two weeks before the inventory meeting. Approved.

Ron praised the Composite Group for the amount of work completed at this meeting. Since he was not able to attend the meeting in June and feels like he has been working in the dark, he believes that it is important for a support team member to be present during these meetings.

Bob agreed that having a support team member be present may be very helpful in communicating with the support team. He also stated that he does not, however, believe that it is the purview of the composite group to make any decisions about whether or not a member of the support team should be present.

Steve suggested that for future conference calls, there is some mechanism insuring that decisions are made. Agreed.

Plan revision to go to conference participants and committee/board members.

Composition and assignments of the two small working groups are as follows for the period through the November meeting.

Group #1 (Conference tools)

Jane N.  
Rogan A.  
Susan B.  
Jeff B.  
Paul T.

Group #2 (Time line plan)

Tom R.  
Mandy F.  
Stu T.  
Leah H.  
Ron S.

Group #3 (Data analysis)

John H.  
members appointed by Bob S.  
Patti R. to be on mailing list

The last item of business discussed was the November meeting, which is scheduled for November 18, 19, and 20.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm

c:\cg993not.doc