Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

7-9 August 2003

Thursday 7 August

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Bella Blake, Lib Edmonds, David James, Ron Hofius, Jim Buerer, Tom McCall, Jane Nickels, Giovanna Ghisays, Daniel Schuessler, Tony Walters, and Susan Chess.

Not Present: Saul Alvarado

Staff: Becky Meyer, Donna Smylie, Kim Young, Steve Rusch, and Anthony Edmondson

Action Group

Giovanna read the meditation from *Just For Today: Daily Mediations for Recovering Addicts.* Then the board had an action group about the list of board values. Each member expressed their thoughts on their favorite value.

Key Result Area: Leadership & Management

HRP, Nominations and Elections Issues

Jane gave the following overview of the WB meeting with the HRP:

o The idea of involving a former board member into their process

o The board being proactive in identifying nominations or assistance in identifying nominations (see page 78 & 79 of Book Two).

o The board asked the HRP if this is the best system for world services.

There were questions about the HRP selection procedures and an overview of the current HRP process was given.

Anthony mentioned the importance in understanding the timeframe of this process: deadline for resumes to be included in pool is 31 August; 12 September — they pull everyone with the appropriate clean time and send them a letter; those that are interested get additional information about what the position requires; the evaluation process then begins; followed by interviews and selections; applicants either decline or accept the nomination, then the HRP makes their final nominations.

There was some board discussion regarding the HRP in which the following points were raised:

o The HRP was originally created out of fear.

o This is a perceived process — the HRP asks members of the fellowship to be elected to positions the HRP does not understand.

o The HRP should be eliminated. Some things need to be preserved; but having an autonomous entity is a problem. The nominating group should have some independence but be part of the board. World Pool is part of the problem too. One thing that is missing is a nominations process that would include a well-defined role to include regional nominations. The way people carry themselves vs. how they looks on a resume is more important.

o Blind CPR process does not work. Most non-profits do not have this type of nomination process. A well-written resume might get you elected but does not include the person with less education that may be better qualified for the position.

- o Leadership development would help the process. If you haven't had experience at world level and no one knows you at the WSC, then how could you have confidence in that person and why would you vote for him/her.

- o The HRP is experiencing frustration regarding structural changes. Charlotte and Garth will roll off at WSC 2004. If the HRP works closer with the WBEC, it would take up half of the EC's time each time they meet.

- o Board is concerned with the process, the independence of the workgroup to make nominations, and regions having some part in putting forward nominees.

- o What would happen if everyone at the conference could nominate someone (it would include the board) and submit the resumes prior to the conference? This would take energy from the WB to be this involved in this type of process.

- o The current HRP process is not an option because it is not working.

- o It is too soon to have this discussion with the HRP.

- o The process is not the only problem. Everyone involved believes that something is wrong with the HRP and the different groups are focusing on the different problems. The two groups will try to work together and not come up with any sup rises

Four options were presented regarding the HRP and the following results were taken from a straw poll:

Option One: Leave HRP as is.   0 in favor

Option Two: Change HRP to allow WB recommendations on nominations   1in favor; 7 against

Option Three: Change current system-- involve WB in nominations/selection   2 in favor; 4 against

Option Four: Eliminate the HRP system and reassign the nomination system with or without external assistance   8 in favor; 0 against

More discussion regarding the HRP continued in which the following points were raised:

- o The HRP doesn't understand the WB's Strategic Framework of Leadership Development and haven't had the time to develop a Strategic Framework for the HRP.

- o How would have the HRP been different if they had had the support of the WB and had they developed themselves as the WB. And what system is best for the fellowship.

- o The WB will meet with the HRP about what the next step will be. Communicate to conference participants what has developed since May. For WSC 2004, nothing will change.

- o The fellowship should be involved in these discussions.

- o If conclusive discussion topics regarding the HRP get to narrow then the conference won't understand the board's thinking.

- o Nothing much has changed since the discussions first began in February.

- o The idea of eliminating the HRP was presented to the Western States Zonal Forum. The members were initially closed to the idea, however, after further discussion they became open to the idea.

2004 Elections and nominations from the World Board/ Future of the nominating and World Pool system

- o The HRP wants them to remove "Have confidence in"

- o Put a specific number of candidates

o Consider having mock elections prior to the elections with voting patterns so the participants would actually know what there vote means.

o Put an additional sheet so applicants can provide additional information.

o The HRP asks that if they removed the blind process from the Candidate Profile, would the WB more supportive of the HRP process. The board said no.

o The HRP asked if there could be a full group discussion (WB, HRP, delegates) at WSC 2004

o The HRP asked if the WSO could offer a system of support for candidates filling out World Pool resumes

o The HRP currently has an internal appeal process if they weren't nominated but they don't have an external process for this issue.

o Although the board is putting forth a motion to have up-to 18 World Board members, the HRP will still provide the existing number of nominations that have been required.

o General discussion about the board's hand-offs approach that has been in effect the past two years and changing that and how just recently the HRP and WB have had more discussions.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

CAR 2004

WB Motions

o To approve the Sponsorship Book (Replacement page 102 will be sent to everyone that received it; and the corrected copy will be in the *CAR* – 2nd paragraph).

o To approve the Sponsorship IP to replace the existing IP 11

o Changes to *Just for Today*

o Changes to the *Introductory Guide*

The World Board will present four motions in the 2004 *CAR*: Motion #1: "To adopt the Sponsorship Book." Motion #2: "To replace the current IP #11 *Sponsorship* with the new IP #11 *Sponsorship*." Motion #3: "To revise *Just for Today: Daily Meditations for Recovery Addict* to be in line with the new *Sponsorship* informational pamphlet. Motion #4: There will also be a housekeeping motion offered to make changes to the *Introductory Guide.*

The Board accepted all the motions as proposed regarding the *Sponsorship Book, IP #11, Sponsorship, Changes to Just for Today: Daily Meditations for Recovery Addict,* and changes to the *Introductory Guide,* and no changes to the *Institutional Group Guide* at this time.

There was a lengthy discussion about the recommendations the board is presenting as a motion for the *Basic Text* in the *CAR.*

The final decision about the recommendations for updating the personal stories section to the Basic Text (e.g., keeping some of the original stories, adding new stories, etc.), possibly adding an additional Preface, moving "The Symbol" section to the back of the Basic Text, no changes to Chapters One through Ten will be made on Saturday. The board is not recommending any changes to the Little White Book.

Discussion ensued about the way changes to the Basic Text should be presented. Concern was expressed about changing the BT just to move "The Symbol" section to back of the book.

Anthony reminded the board that those who will be doing *CAR* workshops are going to have to be well versed in what discussions have taken place in the past four board meetings regarding this subject.

Structural Recommendations in the CAR

o Size of the WB, Committees, WSC Cofacilitator description

Motions regarding Size of the WB, Committees, WSC will be presented to the fellowship in approval form.   In the future this type of material would be presented as service material and be included in the Conference Approval Track vs. *CAR.*

Anthony introduced De Jenkins, the latest edition to NAWS staff, and then the board introduced themselves to De.

Anthony notified the staff of Eileen's illness and the board expressed their desire to get a card and flowers to send to Eileen.

Regional Motions

Motion A: Recommendation is not to adopt.

Motion B: Recommendation is not to adopt. It was noted that the region's Intent doesn't speak to the motion; this needs to be included in the board's recommendation.   Board only votes on new business and that strikes a balance.

Several members of the board felt that the recommendation by the board should be to adopt the motion.

Philosophical discussion ensued about the nature of the board's participation, particularly on the issue of voting. The issue of the board voting in new business vs. old business is that everyone has a vote in their home group. However, if the conference has enough trust and confidence to elect a board member then it makes more sense that a board member would get a vote in new business. It was suggested that a report should be distributed about this issue since it keeps coming up year after year. Some board members choose not to vote on every motion in new business but they would like to have the opportunity.

The outcome of this discussion is that the board is going to keep the same recommendation but will revise it to reflect the above discussion.

Motion C: Recommendation is not to adopt.

Discussion ensued about equal representation. The real issue is that most of the help for the non-US fellowship has been to help the non-US fellowship. The board needs to be more up front with this issue and how we can best serve the fellowship. Does Resolution A provide solutions to the needs of the today's service structure?

The board was reminded that Resolution A was passed at WSC '96. We have taken action to get to the real issues of Resolution A, (some action that has been taken is creating the WSC Seating Workgroup). The US fellowship has always supported the international fellowship and has helped them with their continuation and growth. Most of the non-US fellowship is not in favor of Resolution A. Resolution A has been addressed in other ways these past six years.

Mention objective four in the Strategic Framework. Believe this motion is not a solution because of several reasons: no transition, will take proactive approach to move toward the principle of this motion. Make a recommendation and then expand upon it in an introduction to the *CAR.* Point made that financial information may be inaccurate.

Motion D: Recommendation is to not adopt

Motion contingent upon motion C

Motion E: Recommendation is to not adopt

Not sure this motion is necessary because of the board's prior decision regarding not changing book one of the Basic Text. Looks like an attempt to tie conference's hands.

Motion F: Recommendation is to not adopt

The board discussed how the rationale of this motion does not support the actual motion. Why would

groups, committees and service boards need to print literature in order to carry the message of Narcotics Anonymous? The real issue of the motion is regarding the use of NA literature on homepages. The board has tried to compromise on this issue in support of groups, committees and service boards by providing links to the NAWS website's posted literature. NAWS has applied the FIPT differently to Internet use than that of paper reproduction. Furthermore, the FIPT's reproduction guidelines indicate that the reproduction of literature should be on an as needed basis. Anthony posed the question of why shouldn't we publish all our books online?

Possible Motion by the Show-Me region regarding not changing the HRP

Possible Motion by the Carolina Region which would create a policy regarding guidelines and procedures for changing colors and styles of key tags.

Fall *Conference Report* will include a regional report from Minnesota. Minnesota has requested that their position paper be printed in the next Conference Report.

Proposed theme for WSC 2004—*In Pursuit of Our Vision*

Revised WSC theme: Moving Forward...Toward Our Vision. The board also supported an artist's rendition of the proposed drawing

Conference participant orientation area on the web

There was no opposition to the proposed CP orientation area on the web.

Anthony and Becky requested participation in the formation of these types of services on the web. Anthony asked everyone with ideas to forward web orientation information to Eileen.

Jane requested WB members to let her know of any dates that might conflict with attending CAR workshops.

The board ended their meeting for the day and went into a sharing session that is not a recorded portion of the board record.

Friday, 8 August

Strategic Plan

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Bella Blake, Lib Edmonds, David James, Ron Hofius, Jim Buerer, Tom McCall, Jane Nickels, Giovanna Ghisays, Daniel Schuessler, Tony Walters, Saul Alvarado, and Susan Chess.

Facilitator: Jim DeLizia

Staff: Becky Meyer, Donna Smylie, Kim Young, Steve Rusch, and Anthony Edmondson

Jim Buerer read the meditation from *Just For Today: Daily Mediations for Recovering Addicts.* Jane turned the meeting over to Jim DeLizia who summarized how the board will spend its time this morning reviewing the Environmental Scan and Strategic Framework.

The group reviewed issues and objectives for the 2004-2006 cycle that arose from the previous discussion on the Environmental Scan and Strategic Framework. Jim began this session by having the board and staff break into five groups to discuss the Strategic Plan keeping in mind the following guiding principles:

- ✓ Clear
- ✓ Representative
- ✓ Prioritized

The following points are the board and staff's collective input regarding each Objective and Milestone:

Internal Communication

Objective 1: Develop and disseminate information of high value to intended audiences.

Milestones

1. Identify an issue of current concern to the fellowship, and provide leadership in supporting its resolution (e.g., frame the issue, provide information, facilitate dialogue, recommend action).
2. Evaluate and strengthen the effectiveness of the "input-feedback-reporting" loop to provide sound information and exchange between world services and the fellowship.

> ➤ High value to the audience
> ➤ Are they clear? No
> ➤ Is this something you want to have done by WSC 2006?
> ➤ Contact (Facilitate dialogue)
> ➤ It's not clearly written because a milestone is a moving measuring point.
> ➤ Language needs to be very resulted oriented.
> ➤ To achieve a milestone you need some type of tool.
> ➤ The milestone is the point you want to get to; how do you get to that milestone. Have we made it stronger? Have we made it better?
> ➤ The milestone was to streamline the conference. This milestone was met by changing the format of the conference.
> ➤ In 2004-2006, we may not be able to complete the loop but you can report.
> ➤ Have the feedback loop in place
> ➤ What kind of reporting do you need to do your job?
> ➤ Define what work can be accomplished by 2004-2006; then you develop a project plan; and then you see where you are in the strategic plan.

Jim posed the following question to the board: "Do you think that by the end of 2006, the input feedback reporting loop will be assessed and that one or two components will be strengthened?

> ➤ Is it possible that only milestone one can be accomplished? Jim suggested leaving all options on the table and that this may need to be re-evaluated.
> ➤ Option Two should come first.
> ➤ In order for the board and staff to move forward there needs to be clarity on the value of this objective.

Add diagram "World Board Work Process" somewhere in the Strategic Framework.

Objective 2: Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the process of communication within the fellowship.

Milestones
1. Improve accessibility of existing publications to the fellowship.
2. Improve interaction with delegates through more effective use of technology.
3. Consider the value of a new vehicle to more effectively and efficiently communicate with the fellowship.

> ➤ Do the milestones reflect increased effectiveness? Consider issues of accessibility— effectiveness and accessibility are intertwined.
> ➤ Change number three to encompass the concept of doing an *evaluation* of NAWS publications. Milestone one encompasses the opportunity to try new ways of improving accessibility. The word 'vehicle' in milestone number three means the new publication created

in milestone number one.

➢ Are the milestones inclusive of all NAWS communication? For example, other means of communication with the fellowship. The process includes more than publications.

➢ These three milestones were specified and prioritized for completion in the next conference cycle.

External Communication

Objective 3: Raise awareness and enhance perception of Narcotics Anonymous as a credible program of recovery.

Milestones
1. Geographically broaden the assessment of the perception of NA.
2. Create a PR strategy.
3. Develop a set of PR tools for use by the fellowship.

➢ Milestone one is unclear—the meaning is fine but the way it is stated is confusing.

➢ The word 'Geographically' in milestone one is too narrow. More than just geographically broadened (also broadened to include more than just geographic parameters).

➢ World Services is not going to do more roundtables but provide more material for other PI efforts.

➢ Can these milestones be accomplished in a conference cycle?

➢ Do we need a PR vision? Does the board have a clear vision for PR?

Fellowship Support

Objective 4: To enhance access to Narcotics Anonymous worldwide, clarify and support the role of each level of the service structure, and work to sustain and grow NA communities operating at different levels of development.

Milestones
1. Define the role and value of the service structure in accomplishing the overall vision and goals of the organization.
2. Standardize an assessment of the service structure and use it to raise awareness of the importance of local service.
3. Build an accessible set of tools and support strategies to effectively strengthen the service structure (e.g., manuals, training/orientation at zonal forums, facilitation of exchanges between leaders, technology tools, etc.).

➢ Because we try to serve everybody we don't serve anybody.

➢ Two separate issues-- service structure vs. community development

➢ Delete "To enhance access to NA worldwide'

➢ Milestones 2 and 3 relate to service structure

➢ In milestone 2 the word 'inventory' will be used

➢ In milestone 1 the word 'important' needs to be used

➢ Discussion about the confusion of using the word 'it' in milestone 2. Is 'it' the assessment process or the results?

➢ Areas and regions could also share resources and information—not only NAWS providing resources (see milestone 3).

➢ Milestone 3 speaks to building new tools instead of improving what we have.

➢ Add to milestone 3 before parenthesis—'and impart core principles and philosophies.'

➢ Will create a separate category called 4A and move objective 5's milestones 2-4 under this new category.

➢ Idea to create a development model for new NA communities describing stages of a new

community's growth. It was mentioned that this might be realistically accomplished in the present conference cycle.

Member Development

Objective 5: More effectively carry the Narcotics Anonymous message to a widely diverse membership and potential membership.

Milestones
1. Frame the issue of inclusiveness for dialogue within the service structure.
2. Assess and anticipate potential growth of NA and related issues (include elements such as world population, existing NA presence, translations, etc.).
3. Anticipate staff resource needs to parallel potential growth.
4. Utilize assessment information to help direct and prioritize activity (e.g., travel, attendance at certain events, etc.).

> Discussion about member development vs. member support—development implies something different then support
> Milestones 2-4 are moved to 4A
> Rephrase Objective 5's language from 'more effectively' to 'better support to'
> Is this objective the same as the group's primary purpose? Or are we talking about potential members that the groups may not interact with or have the responsibility to provide for.
> Change Objective 5 to: More effectively make the Narcotics Anonymous message available to a widely diverse...
> Milestone 1 presents issues of inclusivity—which members are we speaking of? How does the issue of exclusiveness relate to milestone 1? What are we talking about with 'inclusiveness'? Special interests meetings, Ventura judge sending women to AA because of men in NA praying on young women, racial divides in big metropolitan areas etc. ...
> Rewrite milestone one to state something like 'frame the issue of inclusiveness for dialogue within the fellowship.
> Add a parenthesis after the word 'inclusion' to identify what issues of inclusion this objective is pointing to.
> Another milestone would be to begin Dialogue
> Creating a tool to convey the benefits of service of members recovery
> Tools to address members with long term clean time—something that attains and attracts members with long term recovery

Literature Content

Objective 6: Build a range of literature to meet the diverse needs of members and potential members.

Milestones
1. Identify an initial list of targeted populations.
2. Discuss the development of literature with conference participants.

> Milestone 2 should include "targeted audience'
> Milestone 1 should be worded as "develop an initial list..."
> Should we include the solicitation of personal experience for the upcoming Basic Text project?
> What about the issue of international members in need of a Basic Text in their own language? We are discussing special interest but what about language needs? Pure recovery focused literature vs. targeted literature. One aspect of diverse needs is the translation issue.

Literature Process

<u>Objective 7</u>: Streamline and increase responsiveness of the literature development process to meet the needs of the fellowship.

Milestones
1. Determine the fellowship's willingness to change the literature development and approval process by presenting options for change.
2. Modify the literature review, input, and approval process in order to increase responsiveness.

> ➤ There may be a need to get a piece of literature out to a community in a shorter period of time (China). Discussion about the length of time it takes to get a new piece of literature approved.

> ➤ Look at what needs changing—see milestone 1. For example, the Sponsorship book took as long as it did because of the lengthy time span in gathering fellowship input.

> ➤ The wording of milestone 1 could possibly tie the hands of the board—rephrase as 'frame something around the fellowship's willingness'

Leadership Development

<u>Objective 8</u>: Define leadership requirements and build a leadership development system to effectively identify, cultivate, encourage, and support an ongoing stream of committed, qualified leaders at all levels of the service structure.

Milestones
1. Define leadership requirements in NA, being sensitive to cultural differences regarding principles and practice of leadership.
2. Define and evaluate the current leadership development system to identify strengths and weaknesses.

> ➤ Restate objective 8 so it doesn't contain milestones, remove the first section and begin with, 'Effectively identify, cultivate...at all levels.'

> ➤ Discussion regarding identifying vs. cultivating leaders. The word 'development' in the milestone implies cultivating leaders—do we develop leaders or do we screen for leaders. Are we identifying or are we cultivating potential leader? If we are cultivating leaders then the milestone should include training. Point was made that leader development is a natural process and that cultivating leaders might be an over ambitious endeavor. Is leadership development an organic process? Does the organization unwittingly put up barriers in that could inhibit that process? Furthermore, do potential leaders perhaps need extra support to rise in that organic process? As of now there are only workgroups to provide visible leaders.

> ➤ This objective is here in the first place because the organization initially sensed a problem.

> ➤ This objective directly applies to NAWS in this conference cycle but will also influence other service bodies. The long-term objective is in all service bodies.

> ➤ Omit 'cultural' in the first milestone.

> ➤ Another milestone could be to review our current strategies and then to build a system. The HRP is included in the current strategies because that is a current issue for developing leaders.

Structure

<u>Objective 9</u>: Continue to refine and maximize the use of NAWS structure as a means to encourage substantive and meaningful participation and ensure accomplishment of goals and priorities.
Milestones
1. Develop the role of the delegate as a more effective partner with NAWS and as a more effective leader in the regions.
2. Better access and utilize the expertise within the fellowship to achieve NAWS goals and priorities.

> ➤ Rephrase the objective to include the stated paragraph from page 9 of the Strategic

Framework.

➢ Revise milestone 1 and put a period after the word 'leader.'

➢ How can we clarify and guide the direction we are heading in with milestone 2? Does the milestone point to the current structure and if so should we focus on structure as a starting point.

➢ How do you better utilize the things we are already doing? For example, using Worldwide Workshops to identify leaders and use that information better.

➢ Revise milestone 2 to reflect the next step of improving our utilization or expertise.

Operating Processes
<u>Objective 10</u>: Continue to build the systems, tools, and operating culture to support strategic management of the organization.
Milestones
1. Advance the concept of a *plan-driven* organizational model consistently in NAWS outreach.
2. Take the next steps in strategic management process and tool development (see prioritized list).
3. Identify, plan, and implement training needs for this planning cycle, and identify and meet orientation needs of the World Board and staff in the next planning cycle.

➢ What is NAWS outreach? Where do we want to shift our focus to the delegates? If we are changing the culture, are the delegates where we go next?

➢ In milestone 1 we advance the value of plan-driven models instead of crisis prevention.

➢ Milestone 3 to include orientation of work groups.

Financial Resources
<u>Objective 11</u>: Ensure the long-term reliability of the NAWS income stream in order to carry out identified priorities and service. Agreed to these milestones as presented.
Milestones
1. Implement member donation portal and on line shopping cart
2. Reevaluate the current financial reserve limits and policies
3. Continue marketing activities to treatment and corrections with increased focus on measurement
4. Pursue printing alternate formats in those communities where literature is currently provided at little to no cost.
5. Hold 5% price increase scheduled for January 2003 in abeyance. Review all projected costs and shipping for 2004 & make price increase recommendations.

6. Revise financial management policies to better meet the needs of the organization

<u>Objective 12</u>: Raise awareness and a sense of responsibility on the part of the fellowship for the need to adequately fund the cost of NAWS services. Agreed to these milestones as presented

Milestones
1. Develop message for articles revolving around donations paying for services e.g. building value, the need, How can I help?, and existing economic challenges

2. Develop new tools to make the message of self support relevant to members

Staff Capacity
<u>Objective 13</u>: Build and align the focus of staff with the capacity to support identified priorities. Agreed to these milestones as presented
Milestones
1. More effectively recruit competent staff and fill the current open positions.
2. Create training and orientation modules for staff.

The session ended with Jim stating that the staff will create a project list. Next time the board and staff will revisit this list for further refining. The cycle will then proceed as outlined.

The board ended their meeting for the day and went into a sharing session that is not a recorded

portion of the board record.

Saturday, 9 August

Corporate Responsibilities

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Bella Blake, Lib Edmonds, David James, Ron Hofius, Jim Buerer, Tom McCall, Jane Nickels, Giovanna Ghisays, Daniel Schuessler, Tony Walters, Saul Alvarado, and Susan Chess.

Staff: Becky Meyer, Kim Young, Steve Rusch, and Anthony Edmondson

Lib Edmonds read the meditation from *Just For Today: Daily Mediations for Recovering Addicts* and the board conducted the following business:

Reaffirm Officers

Adopted Corporate Resolutions

➢ Adopted 2003-2004 corporate resolutions without change

➢ The board confirmed without objection Jane Nickels as chair, Craig Robertson as Treasurer, Susan Chess as Secretary, and Bob Jordan as Vice Chair for another year.

Financial Update

➢ Anthony discussed the donation report and requested it not be circulated as presently formatted. NAWS has seen an increased donation of 130,000 dollars. The board discussed the nature of the donation increase and a point was made that a large percentage of the increase came from one region. There is still a large gap in donations funding NAWS. The donation portal was discussed in terms of non-US countries donating to NAWS. The possibility of opening a donation account in Germany, or another non-US country, was discussed.

➢ The board discussed the language of donation vs. contribution.

The October meeting will be a four-day meeting (October 22-25).

The board discussed the HRP's request that the cofacilitator position be allowed more than two terms. The issue was looked at in relation to continuity at the conference. The current weakness of the present cofacilitator training and standardization were also mentioned.

The board discussed scheduling a group activity on the night of Jim DeLizia's session.

Adopt May Minutes

➢ No corrections to May's minutes, they were adopted without objection.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Travis facilitated a discussion regarding the current Basic Text project.

Recap of previous decisions:

➢ Revise personal stories

➢ Intended audience—a book that speaks to a diverse membership—the entire scope of membership

➢ Story format may differ

➢ No decision on an organizing principle of Book Two

➢ Create a new preface to the entire book

➢ Discussion about possibly adding a preface to Book Two as well

➢ No decision about moving the symbol

➢ Process: definitely more than one cycle, timeline needs to be developed

The content of today's discussion involved providing input on the following topics:

Symbol: Decision on symbol/symbol text: Whether or not to move symbol and/or text about symbol

➢ Some members of the fellowship expressed passion about the symbol at the WCNA30

➢ Move the symbol: to somewhere in the front, after preface, or to an appendix, revise text?

➢ Possibly give options for fellowship to choose

➢ Travis recapped the board's previous discussion about the symbol in which some board members expressed concern that the first thing in the book mentions the "occult"

➢ Three options were presented: 1. Four were in favor of moving the symbol 2. Five were in favor of revising 3.Nine were in favor of making no recommendation—leaving it as is

➢ Could the issue of the symbol be presented to the conference for the fellowship to express concern and guidance on this issue? This idea then created a discussion regarding why some decisions would be given to the fellowship and some issues not.

➢ Discussion regarding how the Basic Text motion(s) will be formatted—all one motion to avoid a 6th edition for minor changes? Or many motions?

➢ No recommendation regarding the symbol—will report in NAWS News that it wasn't that the board couldn't come to consensus but that this issue isn't crucial enough to get bogged down in lengthy discussions

Revised Book Two:

Personal experience, not personal stories

➢ The motivation is that the language change would broaden the input (in order to avoid the old format—what it was like, what happened & what it's like now)

➢ Decision regarding personal stories vs. personal experience deferred until after content discussion later today.

Length of Book two

➢ The length will be at least as long as Book Two is now (possibly longer—30% longer?)

➢ Recommendation could be that the size will be approximately the same—maybe 20% shorter or longer

Organizing principle(s): sections?

➢ The EC recommended 3 sections with the dividing principles of *Getting Clean*, *Staying Clean*, and *Living Clean*. This motivation is geared for the reader to have a diverse range and broad vision available. There was discussion opposing this idea—Book Two's content is collective experience and it should reflect that without dividing it into sections. The point was also made that the member may need sections to locate specific material pertaining to what they are going through.   A vote was taken regarding sections (number of votes for and against changed throughout the discussion and with the final vote): 9 in favor of sections, 4 not in favor of sections. This issue was tabled until after lunch.

The meeting resumed with a discussion regarding this morning's dialogue. The board was asked to clarify if they intend to move forward or if their vision for the Basic Text has changed. It was asked if the decision regarding sections could be confirmed at a later date. Does the vision of the Basic Text project need to be clarified in order to frame a timeline and process? There was some confusion about whether or not these decisions had already been made or if the EC, not the entire board, had

made them. The board affirmed their willingness to move on with the Basic Text project.

International vs. English only vs. US stories

> ➤ A collection of fellowship wide stories—not just US. The translation policy would stay the same (it's up to the language group to either translate or not translate Book Two).

Process:

Timeframe

> ➤ The EC proposed a choice between a two and three cycle timeline. A discussion was had regarding the review and input process. The collecting, revision and development process of stories in the Basic Text would require review and input because the stories would not simply be addicts sharing their experience. A two-cycle project was favored and some board members preferred to defer the decisions about the timeline of the project to the EC.

Final Discussion Points:

> ➤ It was confirmed that the board had not reached a decision regarding removing and/or adding stories to Book Two.

> ➤ The following handout regarding the preface was discussed—there were no objections (updating fellowship statistics with each printing was suggested).

Preface ideas
These are ideas you thought you probably wanted to see in a new preface to a sixth edition Basic Text

- ◆ *Preface should speak to newcomers and make them feel welcome.*

- ◆ *Written by addicts, for addicts.*

- ◆ *Could provide an updated understanding of NA: that is, our name can be misleading. The preface should dispel the notion that NA is a fellowship exclusively comprised of low-bottom heroin addicts. The preface should speak to our diversity and the wide span of our membership. At the same time, the new preface should take into account what is already written in the Basic Text and not contradict the text.*

- ◆ *Could talk about the role of the text in fellowship development with some historical statistics.*

- ◆ *New front material could have statistics on NA today (e.g., number of countries, number of meetings). Addressing the diversity and growth of NA. Could reference that these numbers are as of this particular moment in time.*

- ◆ *Preface could give an encapsulated publication and revision history of the Basic Text. Could touch on why we are not revising chapters one-ten at this time. (We love it—"warts and all")*

The board discussed creating a separate preface, or introduction rather, for Book Two. There was also discussion regarding recasting the names of Book One and Two to create more continuity. This would be a good place to introduce the idea that the book is so good that communities would want to translate the entire thing—not necessarily change the translation policy, but provide a piece of literature that would move toward the vision of quality literature for all languages. There were some questions regarding if changing Book One and Two to Section One and Two would be changing the first ten chapters. It was then noted that in the board's dialogue with the fellowship it was only promised that there would be no changes in chapters one through ten—all other material is subject to change. This issue can be placed in the board's description of the Basic Text project's current vision and not necessarily in a motion form.

How to solicit material

> ➤ No objections to publishing in the CAR the use of Newsflash(s), interviews, contacts in the community, and tapes to determine who we want to solicit stories from (frame it for

members who would have trouble submitting something in written form).

There were no objections to using abstracts in the Table of Contents.

Discussion regarding the relationship between staff team/ workgroup and members with stories—idea about removing barriers between member's input and staff/workgroups.

Recap of discussion regarding the Basic Text:

- o   No recommendation about symbol—report conversation
- o   Size will be roughly the same
- o   Current vision will include sections rather that parts and will possibly include an intro for part or section two
- o   Fellowship wide stories
- o   Two-conference cycle project
- o   Stories will be abstracted
- o   Description of how they will solicit material—collaborative efforts

Anthony asked the board for input regarding the World Convention—what about WCNA 30 would we want to maintain? (NAWS did not set a precedent for all World Conventions to come with WCNA 30)

The board ended their meeting for the day and went into a sharing session that is not a recorded portion of the board record.