Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
20-23 April 2005

Wednesday 20 April
Strategic Planning

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, David James, Jim Buerer, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Sharon Harzenski-Deutsch, Saul Alvarado and Tom McCall.

Piet De Boer arrives today (Wednesday) after 12:00 pm, Daniel Schuessler will be present Thursday morning, Ron Miller will be present on Friday morning and Giovanna Ghisays is unable to attend this board meeting.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Uschi Mueller, Freddie Aquino, Bob Stewart, Eileen Perez-Evans, Fatia Birault, Travis Koplow, Jane Nickels, De Jenkins, Elaine Wickham, Carrie Ray, Jeff Gershoff, Johnny Lamprea, Kim Young, Mike Polin, Nancy Schenck, Stephan Lantos and Tom Rush

Full day spent on the first Strategic Plan Update for the 2006-2008 cycle with Jim DeLizia. Notes for this session are at the end of the minutes titled "April 2005 Update on Objectives."

9:00am: Prior to starting Strategic Planning Update the Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity Prayer. This was followed by discussing the recent insistences to access the Concierge level.

> All workgroup point persons asked to covey to workgroup members that Concierge level access is not part of NAWS contract with the Marriott.

Thursday 21 April
Key Result Area: Leadership Development

9:00am: Joining Leadership Development discussions along with the World Board, staff are the HRP members; Tali McCall, Mindy Hersh, Francine Bluteau, Sergio Rojas and additional staff; Roberta Tolkan, Sara Jo Glade and Steve Rusch.

Notes for this session are at the end of the minutes titled "NAWS Leadership Development Session 1."

Friday 22 April

Action Group

9:00am: The Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Michael C. led the board in an action group on "what piece of literature impacted you the most when you first came to NA and how; and what piece of literature inspires you today."

PR Handbook Project - Review of Chapters 3 and 4

Chapters 3 World Board Input

- Page 35, lines 13 & 14 – would prefer another term other than steps utilized.

- Pages 36 & 37 – would suggest a using a word to convey the broader ideal of inventory.

someone to understand.

Jane responded that there is an illustration or diagram in the front and in the addendum, there will also be another simple piece. Also believe the synopsis, index, and table of contents will help, but think the communities will have to use what they need, etc.

Financial Resources – page 39

- Questioned the practicality of adding the idea of including picnics and other events, e.g. fund raisers.

Bob added that the board has not discussed the principle of fund raising and so the body's thoughts and ideas regarding issue requested.

- Since it's contrary to what's in our literature would not support the idea of fund raising being included as a principle.

- Two opposite experiences shared; the first being that every time a fundraising event occurred in region it had a positive and tremendous effect. The other was that in region, committees started to have fund raisers on their own and of the opinion that the handbook should focus on PR events. PR committees need to focus on how to effectively use resources and not on how to create fundraisers to generate funds.

- Two other members of the board feel and stated having no objection to including the principle of fundraising; however have difficulty with saying things that are not true as well as believe fundraising should be done through some mechanism of a committee it serves.

The board agreed by consensus to support the ideal of fundraising in the chapter with supporting text stating something to the effect of the area or regional committee sustaining the function of all subcommittees which would include PR efforts.

Page 41, First Bullet – Schools

- Has had personal experience with addressing kids (schools) and is bit apprehensive for a couple of reasons, e.g. the possibility of kids thinking that it's okay to use because panel presenters look good-kids not realizing the *recovery* process the members had to go through, also some kids are not addicts and just use drugs casually. Feels there are just too may aspects to addressing kids in schools. Committee members in his area did not want to be held responsible for this and decided to stop.

Jane stated that wording could be added to be more specific and geared towards addressing teachers, administrators, etc., not students.

- Along the same lines, in his region they discovered that panels in schools, etc., were not an effective way to use resources furthermore can't say that he's ever heard someone come into a meeting because he/she heard a "speaker" at school.

    Also remembers this topic being discussed by the board before but not sure of the end result. Also asks of our knowledge / experience in this area.

Bob recounted the old WSC PI Committee resulting in the agreement that this would only be done in limited situations, would be age appropriate—allowing kids to relate in order to be effective in high schools. Kim added that the chapter tries to indicate that this be done solely based on need.

- Some research concerning recovering addicts addressing kids recalled and although it was thought to be good-at the same time research also showed that it seemed to create a type of intrigue for kids. Not aware of any recent research done.

Anthony stated at this point this may be one of those areas that the board may not have the capacity to come to an informed decision on. The reality is there is no time for more discussion on this topic. This body has to consider what is here and see if there something else that needs to be stated.

- Does not want to make a blanket statement saying we are not effective in high schools-throwing out the idea when high schools could be positively impacted. Perhaps it's the way it's said sharing a "drug-a-log." Maybe it would be better to approach from the aspect of recovery and literature. Set up a plan – saying something more about the approach for all the areas for PR to address.

Becky pointed out that workgroup members have more experience with book content than the board and at this point would hope this body does not take too much out of the draft and suggesting focusing on conceptual content.

The board advised that the no matter what is done the handbook states a yearly environmental scan be done.

Per the workgroup schools are visited a lot. However the board asked if they preferred the section regarding schools be removed or if qualifying information would be enough.

<u>There was no decision made to change, however the board will be interested in the fellowship input on this subject.</u>

- Suggestion to add an assessment example (as an addendum); personally would not know how to carry one out.

- An overall desire to see more information about what chapters will include expressed-for example each chapter having information as a type of set up to information that follows. Only because he is of the opinion that the context seems to be too linear.

Some of the format is purposeful; premise for format was to have a digest for translations, there are lots of possibilities for format however no one knows what those are yet. The board should think about formats, sound bites, etc. after the first round of input.

- Page 42, line 10-question asked if this is a contingency plan; if so don't comprehend the flow.

Response is that this was not articulated clearly and may need better written steps; it was meant to define corrective steps.

- Page 47, line 8-sentence "A group or area may decide to develop..." suggest that more text be added to better explain ideal.

- Page 47, Line 9-10-Communications with groups is essential... feels sentence seems to elude that groups can do PR on their own.

- Page 51-point made that the items; planning tool, form letter, area inventory, etc will be included.

Point of information: the items currently being reviewed and decided are items that this body has not yet had definite board discussions/decisions on. Therefore the board needs to keep in mind that as this body goes through this document; giving input it will be added and sent out to the fellowship for approval-viewed as the board's position.

Chapters 4 World Board Input

- Page 54, lines 11 and 12-sentences difficult to understand.

- Page 59, lines 9-10-speak clearly and directly; would like the text in the parenthesis

removed.

- Page 62, lines 10-15 stated that people always want the steps explained as well as what NA means. We should remember to write in ways for all to understand.

Point of information: the workgroup added an FAQ that contains a statement regarding harm minimization.

- Page 63, line 21-prefer the sentence to indicate ways for professionals to reinforce the positive aspects of meetings.

- Page 67, restate the guidelines of presenters.

- Don't make promises we can't keep.

- The issue of anonymity asked; and the board reminded that this was addressed and approved in Chapter 2, Kim added that it spoke to when it would and would not be okay to use names

- Page 63 line 12 and 17 should be more related, e.g. add the word spiritual to line 17.

Discussion of email input process for Chapters 5 and 6 – Ron Miller and Jane

Ron M thanked staff, board and workgroup for support and input on the chapters, and then highlighted point in PR report.

Conceptual input to the letter must be received by April 28th. The letter is going out to the fellowship; will also include the email address where input is to be sent. The chapters to the fellowship will be mailed during the first week in May 1st.

- Jane further added that the letter will include a return deadline dates.

- The board will be emailed additional chapters and the input deadline is May 9.

    o It is very important that the input is received on noted deadline dates.

After some discussion on the chapters the board agreed the Executive Committee would be the final sign off on the letter and additional material.

NA Way Editorial Board – Muk and Nancy

Muk reported that the workgroup members and staff are marvelous and that everything presented was a cooperative effort between the two.

Page 88, Revised Article Submission...

Second bullet; proposal for a Presentation Tool Kit: there was no objection in principle—however proceeding forward will be based on the evaluation on value/cost benefit which will researched be reported to the board.

- Various board members voiced positive comments and look forward to a new look for the magazine.

- Is of the opinion that many members don't know what the magazine is therefore don't sign up for it. Questions if there is an inexpensive way to create a poster or something on how to subscribe to the NA Way (informational poster).

Muk responded that that the workgroup has not discussed creating an informational poster and Nancy added that the subscription form has been modified to state how to receive the NA Way either via mail or e-subscriptions.

Point of Information: at some point during this conference cycle the board needs to have a dialog regarding the publication versus production cost. NAWS currently spends at least

$290,000 and up to $400,000 for its intended purpose. Issue to be looked at:

- o This is NAWS biggest communications and message vehicle but believe some of the non-English versions of this publication need further evaluation, e.g. cost for translations versus the amount ratio.

- o Postage for US mailing is major cost incurrence.

- o Some things are working for this magazine and some are not.

- When traveling world services really needs to encourage members to sign up for E-subscriptions.

Other than what has been noted on the evaluation concerning the cost and value for packet, etc. there was no objection to NA Way Editorial workgroup proposal as stated in the report.

Key Result Are: Communications

PR Strategy Project

Discussion of current project plan status

David highlighting points in the memo, noting that input/direction on the presented material and direction for the future of the workgroup is needed from the board.

A brief description given of each page pointing out that the presented material is still in draft form. The workgroup thought the PR Strategy report style being the same as the Strategic Plan would work well within draft.

Goals on page 78 split into key results areas, followed by objectives.

Page 81 expands on the objectives, noting approaches needed to accomplish objectives. The objectives are not in any particular order as the workgroup thought to focus on content first and work out the order at a later time.

- Handout passed out should have been page 85 in book 1.

Discussion Points

- The workgroup praised for their work; material is more tangible and is an enormous move forward.

- Suggestion given to reorganize the Long Term Goals and Key Result Areas.

Response was that the goals were meant to make up the Key Result Areas, but will review.

- Page 81, Pubic Image key result area, objective 1: seems all approaches dance around the issue of the NA name—should directly address.

- Anthony added that the PR draft now has to fit into the overall World Board Strategic Plan structure. It seems the PR Strategy draft items will correspond with one objective and key result area of the current Strategic Plan-form may change to fit current plan and will make a difference when the next budget is drafted. This is really being stated to forewarn everyone that the objectives in the draft will change, but not lost.

The workgroups task was to create this document in this conference cycle followed by extracting what is important for the next conference cycle. Then when the priority of the complete plan came into place what is extracted would become a part of plan prioritization.

- Wants to state that this document makes sense for a PR strategy and would hope the key information does not get lost once it becomes a part of the World Board Strategic Plan.

- It was asked if the workgroup thought about the current strategy, the PR Policy, the principles in *It Works How and Way* and how everything relates. Wonders if the 6 principles from literature could fit into this document in order to be consistent with other literature. Also applauds the work accomplished.

The body then discussed the work to be done, expectations for workgroup, World Board responsibilities and the upcoming meeting. Essentially the workgroup is done with timeline for given task. Jim DeLizia is facilitating a portion of the next meeting to present work accomplished in April and functioning on a timeline so the board's planning process does not fall behind. It seems that there may be components of the workgroup that may be reshaped for future tasks of this PR work but this will depend on resources and the board's priorities.

The overarching task for this project is virtually completed but if the workgroup has some undeveloped ideas, etc., this should be a part of a report to the board. The board must look at the PR Strategy draft plan, the WB Strategic Plan and as a whole and figure out what goes where, establishing what is to be done with the product; and that them becomes a different approach to get accomplished.

In summary; not hearing any objection or any conceptual input being voiced this workgroup project should be completed soon and essentially the next PR Strategy meeting would be to clean up draft, create a draft report and possibly that last PR Strategy meeting would be in June.

There were no objections to the presented PR Strategy draft; the board praise the work achieved on document.

Future of the PR Strategy project: May and possibly June meeting will be the end of the project since presented material is approved by the board and the charge statement will be concluded. After May's meeting what's noted in the draft will be incorporated into the World Boards Strategic Plan-the information will not be lost.

The board ended the meeting at 5:30pm with a sharing session that is not a recorded session of the board.

Saturday 23 April

Key Result Area: Resources – Leadership

9:00am: The Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity prayer, followed by a few announcements. Giovanna Ghisays and Jim Buerer were not present.

Nominations

Are we still committed to doing this? How does this fit with leadership cultivation?

How should we gather names from the board to create an initial list? What information or criteria is needed?

How to discuss possible candidates and how to make decisions about candidates as a board? Does this apply to seated board members seeking a second term?

The discussion began with recapping the motion adopted at WSC 2004 that now affords regions, zones and the World Board the opportunity to submit names to the HRP after the blind review process as well as the board's decision to create a nominations process to try for this cycle (experiment to be evaluated)—now need to discuss what that actually means. This discussion is to begin outlining what the board will do between now and October to prepare for this.

The Exec Report page 2 contains and highlights the Executive Committees discussions on the subject.

- Deadline for the board to submit names for consideration is May 31.

  o These names will contain background information (clean time, basic service experience, team work [do well or not], and what talents/skills what individual bring to the board).

- Board members seeking re-election need to state their willingness in order to be considered by May 31.

Currently there are four board members eligible for re-election.

  o For the record; Saul A stated that he would not seek re-election.

  o Any board member seeking re-elections will be considered via a different method-not the same process or session.

July

- Discussion on skills/talents needed on the board will begin, however the names with background information will be provided to the board before the meeting to review, followed by a discussion on each individual.

- Depending on the number of names submitted, this body may need to have an initial indication of whether there is a majority to see if individual moves to the next level. Process to show majority and could be done by a show of hands, dots or some other process.

- This is to be an open process that demonstrates the board position on each candidate.

Should conference participants know who was forwarded by regions, zones, WB?

- Only those that make it all the way through the HRP process should be included in the information provided by the HRP when their list published.

Nominations Discussion

- Decisions on forwarding names should be reached by consensus; if that cannot be accomplished then the issue preventing consensus needs to be discussed.

- The board can not block anything; all this body does is forward name(s) into the HRP process, what occurs after is beyond this body's control.

- As conference participants each individual world board member still has the ability to forward a name at the conference although it is believed that most candidates will most likely already be in the process.

- Although the leadership process is still in its early stages does believe how this body is proceeding is more conservative, better and part of what we are striving for in a leadership development program.

  This is not a process where the board is taking the place of the HRP, but about having access to individuals and including them into the World Pool. Not trying to circumvent the process in place only trying to add because paper alone does not speak to individuals. Think conference participants want a way to differentiate nominees which only would create another level of confidence and a larger pool.

- The HRP criteria is different than the board process however all names have to go through the HRP. As far as motion 58; it is still not clear how motion will impact the

process as a whole. However the EC is proposing that if the individual does make the final HRP list the HRP would make submitters names available (WB, region, zones) when they report. This lends itself to transparency. Also added was that the deadline for regions and zones is October therefore, individuals should know if they are in the process or not.

- Scenario posed regarding someone being forwarded by the board, the board deciding to not forward name to final slate, and the name still making it to the HRP final list.

Response was that it's really important to clearly state what this board only trying by forwarding a slate of names is to hopefully give conference participants a level of confidence for the individual(s) sitting on the board.

- The goal is to have qualified individuals serving on the board of NA and hopefully this leadership level system will produce that. This is about keeping the focus on the goal for this conference.

  One of the things the Executive Committee talked was that previously references were sponsors, sponsees, etc., and people being unsettled by this, wondering if they are really qualified.

- This is a new process and asking about an individual is human nature and maybe this practice needs to stop. The underlying principle is to do what we are saying, say what we do and inform the conference.

Anthony shared that we seem to aspire to act like something we are not; there is no such thing as an objective election. It seems unconceivable that a body would forward a name that they would not elect. The process of transparency is something that has to be dealt with. This should be as simple as electing people with confidence.

At the same time candidates are disadvantaged all the time due to for example troubling damaging emails regarding John Doe being sent to many and if it's not an email its another type of communication. There will always be someone whom believes they were treated unfairly or disadvantaged in some way if they don't make the list –which again he believes is human nature.

There were no objections to moving forward in the manner as presented in the Executive Report; also stating that individual names will not be disclosed if the person does not make the final HRP list.

Evaluation Form

The current process is that a workgroup point person evaluates a workgroup member's performance based on six general questions at the end of a project or conference cycle. Current questions do not give a sense of person's skills, talents, contributions, etc. Therefore recommendation is to revise form ask direct questions, be an open assessment and something real and tangible. This evaluation would also be confidential and for internal use only.

Discussion

- Executive Committee talked about doing this with the HRP and information being completely confidential. Otherwise a development system cannot be created.

- A point made about being cautious regarding giving someone a "black mark" without trying to correct the individual performance first. It is the point person's responsibility to bring thoughts about performance to the individual's attention.

- Anthony added that having had experience with informing someone about their

performance, it takes a particular type of person to be able to have these types of discussions. The board may want to think about investing in some training that addresses issue, therefore helping this body to cultivate leaders.

There were no objections to the EC working on revising the Evaluation Form and reporting to the board. This document will be confidential.

Anthony brought the body back to point made about point people taking on the responsibility to speak with others about their performance. The board asked to really think about what this means, e.g. training and t aking responsibility for having this type of dialog/role.

- It was suggested that a staff person be assigned due to potential harm.

- It should be the point person that moves the project and the board's responsibility to address any occurring challenges in the course of the project. At the end of the project it is the point person responsibility of with staff's collaboration to evaluate a workgroup member's performance.

  Don't know that all workgroup members will want to be moved into the HRP stream of World Services but an evaluation does have value.

- There is already a lack of clear expectations when people come onto projects and would feel real uncomfortable being put into a position of having to 'coach' an individual and informing someone of their performance.

- Suggest a self evaluation tool that asked if individual wanted to move forward in the system. This allows individual the ability to affect the score.

Anthony also agreed that all people on workgroups will not want to go into the HRP stream. However; we will want to know about their performance. There is going to be a certain percentage of people that we will have this dialog with.

The board will need to be prepared to state clear expectations, the standard of evaluation and communicate assessment. The board has to affirm the implementation of the development system.

The board agreed to move forward with a leadership development system along with what's being done with Jim; and this will be communicated to the fellowship as a new system etc.

address any occurr **Key Result Area: Recovery Literature** the end of the project

Basic Text Project

Promoting and supporting the efforts for solicitation. Ron Hofius and Travis

Ron thanked workgroup members and other involved staff for work and creative thoughts.

The board encouraged to continue to spread the word on solicitation so that members submit their experiences.

Key Messages—to communicate

- Workgroup hopes to dispel the mentality in some communities may prohibit them from contributing their experience because some do not have stories in their language; for example Spanish. Therefore we have to communicate that this is a project for the whole fellowship whether or not they have translated stories.

- Editing will occur and acknowledgment letters reviewed by the board reflect this message hopefully making it clearer.

- This project is about diversity and a different approach to world services method to creating NA literature. We are saying we want to hear your experience, want all different types and we want people to write from the "I" position not "we", showing uniqueness.

Solicitation

The solicitation form has been published, posted on the web, mailed to conference participants and included in the NA Way as well in the translated versions (French, German, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish). However, the board really needs to take a big step informing the fellowship about submitting their experiences. There is not a lot of time left for this to occur.

Solicitation Discussion

- Daniel pointed out that a story would only be submitted from Germany if requested. It's important to note that the German speaking community needs to be approached an asked—they will not self submit.

  This is why this body needs to be proactive, asking individuals to submit their experience, and really encourage and inform members about the Basic Text solicitation process when traveling. The international members of the board need to start identifying people and have them submit stories because of the different philosophies in cultures.

- Another point added was that the lack of submissions could possibly be that addicts would never think of submitting their own story for such a significant project because they don't feel worthy.

- If someone approached to submit a story, they can be asked and encouraged to do so along with the Basic Text solicitation package. This would also mean following up with the person... using positive affirmative encouragement and support.

- It was asked if a board member gave staff a name; would staff then contact person to see if they are willing to submit their experience?

Travis stated that staff can contact some people, but there is the part with the board that they need to contact the people themselves.

Becky stated e-blasting the RD is a suggestion and the more we keep it in everyone's mind the better. Believe will have to be coaxed and prompted and the shining star system will need to be used as well.

It was decided to approach communities that have their own stories, see if they want to forward those stories for the Basic Text as well as formally creating a letter that requests individuals to submit their stories to increase the solicitation of experience.

Evaluation

Looking at first level: any story getting a yes goes to the next level, second level is more qualitative-haven't really been given a definite on this level but there is some level of majority plus the numeric scoring. Basically the evaluation is 3 tiered in case many experiences were received we didn't want every member to have to read each story over again. Another point is that the workgroup is committed to responding to submissions anonymously.

Online Evaluation form/submission database

A program developed to evaluate the submissions and Ron H gave a visual presentation. When a submission is received they are put on the FTP site as well as on CD's. The

database is housed at the office but evaluations are on the internet.

A group of stories are read by three people and the rules are that if one story gets a yes; that story makes it to the next level. A numeric scoring used, however if a story gets a low rate in writing style but high score in recovery, the workgroup would discuss taking a further look at the story.

Multiple Languages

- It was clarified that if a submission is submitted in a language other than English will be translated into English.

- The workgroup will need to think about the submissions not being hand written if in another language due to the use of distinctive fonts. Ron H responded that it's the workgroups belief that this issue should be dealt with by the office.

- This is again where world service travelers really talk up the project; informing fellowship of submissions not be handwritten if not in English, the need for diversity, everyone is worth submitting a story, etc.

The board agreed to inform the fellowship that an alternate group of translators (found via Fatia) will be utilized to translate the non-English submissions into English as opposed to interrupting the work of the TEG.

Existing stories

The workgroups general thinking is to keep four or five existing stories based on it either being a historical story, written by a historical member and/or based on recovery value. Although what to do with the existing stories does not need to be decided right now, the board will need to be clear that this issue is definitely a "hot button" in the fellowship.

- Reviewing/selection of existing stories is an issue that needs prior workgroup planning, the workgroup needs to be very clear on their responsibility in this area, and need to know when the board is ready to talk about this.

Discussion

- Is there any way to organize workgroup thoughts in order for the board to review the existing stories?

- Why aren't the existing stories put through the same evaluation process as newly submitted stories?

Response was that the workgroup's fear is that via the current evaluation process none of the existing stories will make it through, therefore because the workgroup believes there is real value in keeping some of the stories they rather have board direction.

The board reminded that if an individual board member is unable to read the stories and not prepared to give their input; the ones that have not read the stories and gave no input will have to go with the consensus of the body by default. There were no objections.

- Two members of the board expressed their thoughts regarding giving the workgroup the authority to review the submitted experiences and/or the willingness to delegate their authority to the workgroup. Furthermore that as part of the Strategic Plan feels this is part of not being involved in the details.

Anthony really wanted it noted that whether or not the board decides to delegate the evaluation of the existing stories; the board is ultimately responsible for the overall project. The other question is whether or not the board wants recommendations from the workgroup on their disposition on the stories.

The disposition of the workgroup on the existing stories will be provided to the board.

Future Decisions

In regards to Bullet 1 the question concerning making a decision on changing book one and two brought up and noted was that the process agreed upon is that the World Board does not propose anything in the *CAR* that has not been discussed twice.

Also noted was that the workgroup has to forward definite responses for structure of book two, what stories are going to be kept, etc., in the upcoming *CAR*, as well as state intent, and frame issues for discussions, etc., this will give a clear indication of the fellowships support.

Future Plans

Travis will give the World Board solicitation packets.

It was agreed to have Ron H develop a brief evaluation tool for the existing stories for internal board use, the board will continue to solicit stories by communicating the need to the fellowship. Staff will also try to develop different ways to reach different communities.

The board will discuss and decide their position on the appropriateness of an active board member submitting their experience for the Basic Text.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Workshops and Fellowship Events

Becky reported on the PowerPoint presentation of fellowship events that have occurred since the January, also reported on the information gathered from events and talked about plans for the upcoming months.

Images of the Middle East Workshop shown; Siamak pointed out as the new NAWS employee living in Tehran who has been hired as an independent contractor, through WSO Europe, AISBL. He will act as an agent for the distribution of goods and for the fellowships perspective his responsibilities will be like Paul for Europe.

- Becky reported that members from Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Oman were funded to participate at the Middle East Workshop.

  o There are some women in the program in Iran and Egypt; however 50% of the fellowship in Oman is women.

- Images of the EDM in Valencia and Area convention shown.

- APF (Philippines) pictures of the meeting with Secretary Delmundo, the Ambassador and the fellowship shown. Bob shared how inspiring it was to interact with the fellowship, the Secretary and Ambassador of Philippines.

- Florida Symposium carried out a PR Roundtable and individuals that participated were grateful to have been involved. Becky further believes that a model can be developed to assist local communities have them on the own.

- Anthony reported that many members were brought in for the India Translations workshop which resulted in 11 IPs being approved by the Local Translations Committee. Drafts brought back for production.

  This trip also gave him a different perspective of what NA in India is, further opening his eyes to some of the way NAWS has minimized the distinct cultural differences in India, e.g. literature needs and challenges associated in general. With that noted occurrences in India will be dealt and reported differently to the board.

o   The fellowship in India has difficulty embracing the Twelve Concepts and in order to assist the members understand a session profile was modified and adapted to the Concepts. Workshop very helpful to members.

o   There aren't very many recovering women in India today.

o   Tried to provide keytags as well as search out manufactures to produce and/or store literature. However, it became clear that because of the extreme economic disparity the individual asked to do this gets drawn into controversy and judged by the fellowship. Anthony met with a manufacturer that can create keytags, as well as researched alternative storage space.

- Burbank; much of the received feedback from workshop participants was positive; only had some comments on having to make choices as to what session to attend in the afternoon because more than one session/at the same time was held in the afternoon.

Becky pointed out that staff continues to try and adapt profiles to every local community's needs and encourages the board to continuously input session profiles so that they keep evolving.

There are a growing number of communities requesting workshops and the board should be aware of this because Management will start proposing different ways to meet fellowship needs e.g. sending members from neighboring communities to facilitate workshops. No objections voiced.

WSC Seating

Iran, Russia, and South Africa are all interested in entering the process. We also received interest from North Carolina, Bluegrass-Appalachia, and Occidente.

As discussed at previous board meetings the Executive Committee's recommendation is to invite Iran, Russia, and South Africa to WSC 2006 as non-seated participants that would be funded, involved in small group discussion process, but have no voting privileges. It is believed this is consistent with the board's original reason and decision for reaching out to them and to connect them with NA as a whole=vision/mission statement.

Discussion

If asked to allow Iran, Russia and South Africa to be recognized at the 2006 conference the response is that although this is a departure from the seating process adopted in 1998, we are only trying this as an experiment, and the invited communities do have to follow the seating process, etc,.

Further explain that inviting the communities to the WSC provides a specific value that they would not have in their local community. It is this body's responsibility to pull isolated communities into what NA as a whole is, otherwise they, especially Iran, Russia, S. Africa have no idea "we" exist.

Discussion

- It was pointed out that all along we have reported that NAWS has bee setting the stage for being proactive; believe that including very geographically isolated communities and/or rapidly emerging/developing would benefit from the exposure.

- At some point the board will need to have a discussion on the much bigger issue of the policy that was only set up to stop US regions from being seated.

- The Seating Workgroup will provide recommendation for North Carolina, Bluegrass-

Appalachia (a break off from other regions/rural areas) and Occidente.

- Red River brought up and it was noted that the office has not received seating inquiries from them.

- Ron M further strongly suggested that the introduction of communicating the concept of the benefits of exposing geographically isolated and /or rapidly developing / emerging communities to the fellowship should be something where this body is on the same page.

- Piet added that if we don't bring Iran in now they will become something else because of their culture; they are struggling to truly understand NA and want to do things correct. If the assistance doesn't come from us for these communities then where is it going to come from?

- Daniel truly understands individuals opposing and being uncomfortable with consensus, but there is a real difference, these communities are so unique; therefore fully stands behind the decision to fund Iran, South Africa and Russia.

- Craig initially felt uncomfortable with the decision then the more it was discussed the more he understood advantages of being proactive with the communities; it's really about why we are here – are vision and mission statement.

- Believe this will provide the communities with a mind set of what the conference is and an opportunity to be a part of fellowship completely unknown to them. The communities will not vote, but will be a part of the bigger picture of NA. The other noted regions have the benefit of having surrounding communities to help them.

- Ron M and Michael C wanted it noted for the record that they are uncomfortable with choice—although not blocking the board's action as they understand the rationale, just do not agree with the majority decision.

There was consensus to bringing in Iran, Russia, and South Africa to the conference as non voting participants.

The body went on to the Seating Workgroup discussing and communicating to the fellowship the benefit of WSC exposure where/when communities are very geographically isolated and/or are rapidly developing / emerging.

The board decided to have the Talking points reflect the board conscience on the above issue as well as post to the FTP site.

Special Interest Meetings at the World Convention

The EC is recommending that common needs, special interest meetings be planned as an experiment for WCNA 31 and to inform the fellowship of intent.

Discussion

- If this departure is made now it will be like letting a horse out of its corral and there will be no going back. Believe members will want to have all different types of targeted meetings. Doesn't see where this fits in with our common welfare and the convention purpose; which is to provide a special celebration of our recovery, a reflection of our diversity, and a demonstration of our unity. Our differences should not be focused on; we already feel different and unique.

- Iran, Russia and South Africa referenced as being apart from and this body wanting to bring them in to be a part of, and now we want to show separateness at the convention by specializing in different meetings.

- This is a very tough decision and not black or white. Don't want to see us starting to break off and start having targeted meetings, etc.

- There are two issues being talked about; the first being having common interest meetings and personally does not have a problem with that. The second being common interest meetings at the convention. Feels the world convention is the one place everyone should come together and share about the common bond; asks if the inquiries in the fellowship are so great this is why it being recommended for the world convention.

- Believes the issue just needs to be discussed. Went on to share her struggle with whether or not to have special interest, common needs meetings at the world convention although believe they will no be embraced.

- Asserting this message is already out there and how some feel that having these types of meetings doesn't promote unity, this may be the argument for waiting because of the strong message it will send out to the fellowship and it's rippling effect.

- It was questioned if this issue has gone to the groups; is this policy and if yes are we going to override decision.

- Senses a certain board members being in favor and some not. Puts self in extreme caution – sees the issue being if this body is in agreement to have common needs meetings at the world convention. Understands there is a need, but that is not the issue before this body and therefore wonders if the board is really ready to make a decision about this issue for the world convention

- In his country sexuality is not an issue; however the issue here appears to be a question of the need; however what would disturb him is the inability to attend a gay meeting.

- Hawaii has had these meetings for as long as he could remember and the fellowship just viewed them as another meeting. Not sure where the interpretation of "special interest, common needs" meetings came from other than fear. When we talk about our strength being our diversity, yet we don't want to say or do anything with it. Looks at AA and this has not caused challenges.

- Understands that because of liberal exposure thinking may be somewhat naïve in what goes on in big cities but personally hopes this is an area where this body takes leadership. Recalls reading many letters where member's state they wouldn't be here if it wasn't for example a woman's meeting; this body needs to ask itself if issue would really affect our unity; doesn't believe it would.

- Part of the problem has been avoidance of the issue. The difficulty with issue is that we perceive there is a norm in NA and there is no norm. Further added personally being the biggest opponent to issue. Nonetheless recalls getting clean in a predominately single race meeting (and felt comfortable); it wasn't called a single race meeting but that is what it was and personally does not know if he would have been able to get clean in California.

- Believes once the issue is announced to the fellowship communities will explode. There are several regions that incorporate special interest, common needs meetings, many do not and that segment will be the ones to have difficulty with this. This decision will definitely bring up the fellowship thoughts on this issue and it may just be what's necessary.

- Strong advocate of special interest, common interest meetings and glad point made

about there being meetings where one can hear the message in one's own language and culture. Is assured that this will not turn into a racial issue, doesn't believe that preposterous targeted meetings will be created or that our unity will be compromised. Does feels it's time the issue is dealt with.

Has been asked by many members why a secret code has to be learned because of whom they are (gay/lesbian); e.g. can't say this, can't say that, etc., which is why they end up going to AA. People enter the fellowship feeling different anyway and if someone is able to walk into something that helps them identify; then we are only doing what we are supposed to.

If this issue is dealt with what could also come about are, for example meetings that Professionals can identify with—a doctor is a doctor and do we really think that a doctor will go to a meeting that he/she can not identify with—no. Why should we tell members or potential members that unless you get over yourself you are not welcomed?

- Shared experiences concerning a newcomer feeling distant over not being able to identify and never being able to get the program because of it. Also shared experience of being told that the death of partner was an outside issue he shared about it at meeting.

   Further shared attending a parenting meeting, but we can't have a gay and lesbian meeting (?) doesn't seem sensible. There is nothing in our tradition that prohibits this; our statement as to why we don't have special interest meetings is inconsistent with everything else we say.

- Experience shared concerning being complained to about women meetings. Believes if a common interest meeting occurs so what; does it take anything away from his recovery—no. If other meetings are started what does it take away from him—nothing. Went on to share experience at a workshop and how touched he was by speaking to a member who felt isolated because of a certain issue that this member has never really been able to talk about in a meeting because it could be a special interest...

Becky stated the EC discussed being concerned with who is missing, what's the missing piece and how to deal with it. The thought was to publicly state intentions for the world convention and talk about the reality at the conference. How do we blow the doors open, be forthcoming and get a discussion going.

- Knows there are people missing and struggles with this in personal profession all the time. For example nurses/doctors having a place to meet together. Don't believe special interest meetings will survive but common needs will.

- Thankful for this session because this is all new to him on this level. Don't fully know history but feels it's time to get rid of fear nor believes common needs will pose a threat to NA, but feel others think the issue is a threat. Feel sad that it has not been up for discussion yet and it's time. Likes discussion feels this has been hovering for years. Personally doesn't feel it matters how one finds recovery be it via a common/special interest meeting or not.

Point of information: these meetings have been prohibited since the inception of the World Convention Guidelines, in 1992 there was a motion put forth to remove that wording from the WCC Guideline. But because that motion affected policy it needed a 2/3 majority which it did not get. Then it turned into a Roberts Rules of Order gymnastics session to get the conference.

This is also why it was thought to try this at the convention as an experiment and to further engaging the fellowship in a discussion about issue.

Becky stated this has already been done with the "regardless of whatever meetings" at the last convention without engaging the fellowship. Thought was that this body would just communicate what has been done and engage the fellowship in a discussion. No one has ever brought it up for discussion at the conference.

- Daniel shared that the more that he thinks about it, he feels that more discussion needs to be had. Think it's only responsible of us to engage and tell the fellowship our position only after we have more discussion about this.

- Ron H shared that his assumption was that this discussion was our call; we make the call, and defend. Hearing something slightly different, and is hearing that we are accountable to the conference and if this is the case doesn't think he can stand behind that. Understands that this body is not trying to change the convention guidelines, but it would sound to him that this is rationalization to do what we want to do. He further stated that he would put himself behind issue only after this has been taken through the process.

After much discussion and this body still not being firm on its position is proposing that this issue be discussed at another time, and possibly be put in a form of a motion.

A straw poll called for. The chair asked; hypothetically if there was not the constraint of conference policy and there was an ability to have special interest meetings at WCNA 31 how many would be for, be opposed to and/or would need more discussion of topic:

Yes (for)—10   Opposed—1   Need more discussion—2

No action will be taken at this time and the issue will be discussed again.

Alternate Store at NAWS Events

Executive Committee recommendation is to remove the language in the agreement that restricts the sale of area, regional and past activities merchandise at the world convention. Further recommend adding information that clearly points out problems and abuses. What has been the problem are vendors brought in under an agreement with area and regions.

There were no objections to recommendation for the language removal concerning restrictions of sales of past activities, etc., as well as to clearly state the code of conduct.

Issue raised by Terry Ryan about sponsorship family tree events. He asked that the board discuss this. Details will be provided.

Craig reported the discussion had by the Executive Committee regarding concerns mentioned in Terry's email. The proposed recommendation is to thank Terry for his concerns, advise him that the question of Sponsorship is a private matter, some sponsor/sponsee families find value in supporting one another in activities and finally that NAWS wouldn't try to dictate personal behavior outside of NA meetings.

Corporate Responsibilities

Corporate

Approve January Minutes

Having no corrections; the January 2005 World Board minutes adopted as presented.

Action Item List

Report back on ASL evaluation

Anthony reported that the evaluator noted significant differences in the ASL tape and the original NA Basic Text. The proposed recommendation is to thank area for their time and commitment and advise them of evaluator's findings. We will also let them know that we are committed to obtaining an accurate ASL translation for NAWS inventory. The evaluator will be contacted regarding her availability to translate something else. There were no objections noted.

Production Items

Medallion design

Presented were samples of the existing metallic content medallion, a sample of the 260-brass content and a 230 content, which contains a higher copper content. The challenge with brass and copper is that once exposed to air both metals begin to oxidize. Proposing to will till June in order to see what the medal will look like once exposed to air. In June the EC will decide on medallions.

Medallion Numbers

FYI: Anthony reported that the Arial font looked odd therefore it was decided to change font to Times Roman, 24 point for single numbers and for double digits Times Roman; 20 point. No decision necessary and samples shown.

Silver Medallion

Since many of the current Silver medallions in inventory not sold (.999 silver/brushed); it's being proposed to cease the production of the existing silver medallion.

Proposing the change to be polished silver; font size Times Roman 24 point for single numbers and Time Roman, 20 point for double digits and price $24.00 as opposed to $30.34. A decision on the silver medallion will be made at the June EC meeting.

NA Way Bundle Cup

Anthony presented a mock copy of the NA Way bundle cup design. The body informed that we are receiving a great deal of inquiries for the cup only. Proposing to change the color of the design and make it an item of inventory item. There was no objection to moving forward with change and cup being a part of inventory.

Literature Stand

Anthony presented the proposed a literature stand that is storable and practical in cost. Currently fabricating however it may not be available in September. No objection to the stand and proceeding forward.

Acrylic Stand

A sample was presented but after price comparisons, etc. it was thought to be too expensive to have as part of inventory. No objections noted due to cost.

Sponsorship Gift Edition

Two proposals for the Sponsorship Gift Edition presented:

The first is a linen cover with a logo embossment with no color; the page pigment will be contrasted and will include a satin page marker.

The second is a leather cover with a logo embossment with no color; satin page marker; and the page pigment will be contrasted as well.

Book may retail $19.00 (discountable) production cost per copy is $6.38 – initial printing quantity will be around 3250 (2 pallets).

Pocket Size BT

Two alternative sizes of the Basic Text presented. It will be called the *Alternate version NA Basic Text*. It's being proposed to be made available at the same price of the current Basic Text. Although doing this may re-open the cost issue of the Basic Text, make no mistake that NAWS is still dependant on the sale of the book.

At the same time the board may want to review the cost of the Basic Text some time in the future.

Daniel stated that the smaller of the two formats is about the ability to carry it in small size pocket, would additionally suggest that the cost be .50 cents more to show symbolism.

The board had no objections to proceeding forward with the production of the Alternate version of the Basic Text. Price will be increased to symbolically show this book is in no way replacing the original size of the Basic Text. Current retail price is $10.25-adding .50 would make it the price $10.75. There was no objection to rounding price off to be $11.00.

CD Case

The new case passed around for everyone to see what will be produce. No decision necessary.

Step Working Guide CD

CD Rom for the *Step Working Guide* has had to be re-mastered as the previously mastered CD lost about 4 to 5 questions. What NAWS will do is to offer a correct version as long as the one with the omission is sent to us in return-no objections noted.

Poster (languages/colors)

As previously reported concerning the fellowships interest in the posters with the different languages and colors has increased, we are still researching cost, paper type, etc. Once a determination is made it will be forwarded for a decision.

Legal Update

Not a recorded session of the board. However did note that we have to start conveying to the fellowship the need to become insured.

> Bob J, chairperson of the World Board will be traveling for a short period and should a decision regarding any legal items need to be made during that time the Vice Chair; Craig R will have that authority to make such decisions.

Speaker list

The updated WCNA 31 Speaker list provide to the board as FYI.

Area Planning Guide

Area Planning Guide and referenced PR handbook tools is still being worked on. The board will need to give input.

The meeting was closed at 5:00 pm with a sharing session which is not a recorded session of the board.

These minutes were approved without objection at the July 2005 World Board Meeting

◆
April 2005 Update on Objectives

Our strategic objectives, listed below, outline what we hope to accomplish within each key result area in order to move toward achieving our long-term goals. Below is a list of our objectives, followed by a more detailed explanation of the objectives and the approaches necessary to begin accomplishing them.

SERVICE OBJECTIVES
In order to achieve our vision, we must improve the quality of service we provide.

Key Result Area: Communication

<u>Objective 1</u>: Develop and disseminate information of high value to intended NA communities and/or service bodies.

We have continued to improve the content and format of *The NA Way* and *NAWS News*. The Issue Discussion Topics (Infrastructure and Our Public Image) were framed last August and have been updated throughout this conference cycle. The discussion boards on na.org have also supported these efforts. The value seems validated by the fellowships response. There seems to be a higher level of interest and infiltration of these issues within the fellowship than we have experienced before. The Key Messages that were framed in August have also helped to support a consistent message from NAWS.

<u>Objective 2</u>: Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of world services' communication with the fellowship.

The effectiveness of our communications is covered in the response above. For efficiency, we have instituted e-subscriptions for *The NA Way* and *NAWS News*. We have increased our communication and support for web servants with the database and meeting information. We have created Product News Flashes to improve the communication with service offices and other literature customers. We created the online shopping cart and donation portal. We have become much more consistent in what we communicate and capture in face to face opportunities like workshops and zonal forums.

<u>Objective 3</u>: Raise awareness and enhance the perception of Narcotics Anonymous as a credible program of recovery.

We have increased our attendance at professional events and communication with the organizations involved. We have two projects that are following up on some of the information gathered at the PR Roundtables; the PR Strategy and the PR Handbook projects. We have continued to stress the importance of *Our Public Image*. We have partnered with local NA communities to create a presence at professional events in Egypt and Cyprus. We participate in the US national recovery month planning. Our attitude has changed overall in this area from very guarded to one that is much more open and interested in seeking ways to cooperate.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

<u>Objective 4</u>: Clarify the roles and support the work of each level of the service structure of Narcotics Anonymous.

The discussions at workshops and the Issue Topic of Infrastructure have indirectly addressed this. The area planning tool currently under development will help to support this. There has been no real focused effort specifically targeted at this objective.

<u>Objective 5</u>: Work to sustain and build all NA communities, recognizing their different levels of development.

We have made a concerted effort to support Iran, Russia, and South Africa in new and different ways this conference cycle. We have become much more proactive in our approaches; such as bringing members from Kenya to South Africa. We have had funded very different types of workshops in the Middle East and India. We have entered into experimental literature arrangements with India and Brazil. We are in the process of opening an office in Tehran, Iran. We distribute much more free or subsidized literature than we have done before. We are more prepared to try new approaches to supporting the fellowship; such as *The Just For Today* videotape being remade specifically for the Middle East.

Objective 6: Broaden availability of the Narcotics Anonymous message to a widely diverse membership and potential membership.

In addition to what is stated above, we have tried a different type of evaluation to expedite Afrikaans and Zulu literature. We just held a translations workshop in India to help break through some of the impediments to the message in that community. We distribute IP's for free in Latin America regularly. We have posted recovery literature on na.org that can be easily downloaded and printed in all available languages.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Objective 7: Build a range of literature to meet the diverse needs of members and potential members.

We created a new approach to how we address diversity with the *Sponsorship* book. We are currently working on revising the personal stories in the *Basic Text*. We have begun a discussion with the conference about this and need to continue to foster it.

Objective 8: Streamline and increase responsiveness of the literature development process to meet the needs of the fellowship.

Other than the initiating the very beginnings of a discussion with the fellowship, we have not addressed this objective.

ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES
Sound organizational management is crucial to improving those services.

Key Result Area: Leadership and Management

Objective 9: Effectively identify, cultivate, encourage, and support committed, qualified leaders for all levels of the service structure within the fellowship as a whole.

We have had discussions about leadership and its importance at the conference, published articles in two issues of *The NA Way,* and fostered this direction with workshop sessions. We have a structured discussion planned for tomorrow that includes the staff, board, and HRP. We have had several discussions about our own nominating process.

Objective 10: Refine NAWS structure to ensure it provides the foundation needed to carry out NAWS leadership and management roles and responsibilities at a high level of performance.

We have moved from a committee driven to workgroup driven system. We have exposed different staff to support functions, projects, and workshops.

Objective 11: Continue to build the systems, tools, and operating culture necessary to support strategic management of NAWS.

We have included staff in all stages of the planning process. We have provided training opportunities for both the staff and board to further world service priorities. The culture has been consistently reinforced and has changed drastically over the past several years. We continue to look at report formats, more effective ways to present information, etc.

Key Result Area: Resources

Objective 12: Ensure the long-term reliability of the NAWS income stream in order to carry out identified priorities and service.

We have increased our reserves primarily through increased sales and decreased discounts. We have looked and are looking at better, less expensive, and more effective ways to print and distribute literature, increase sales, and retain income.

Objective 13: Raise awareness and a sense of responsibility on the part of the fellowship for the need to adequately fund the cost of NAWS services.

We have tried to improve the message of why the fellowship should care about what NA World Services does on their behalf at workshops and in the annual report. We have also tried to make the information about where the funds come from and where they go more digestible and easier to understand. No active campaign has really been initiated.

Objective 14: Build and align the focus of staff with the capacity to support identified priorities.

We have increased the number of staff for fellowship services, information technology, and translations. We are still unable to fill the open positions for writers and/or project managers.

NOTES
NAWS Leadership Development Session 1
April 21, 2005 – WB, HRP, staff management team

Foundation for Leadership Development System

NAWS Leadership Principles	Leadership Cultivation Factors

◆ leaders are accountable to the fellowship
◆ leaders have a commitment to further the purpose and goals of NA
◆ leaders are trusted servants; leaders lead by serving others and giving back
◆ NA leadership qualities include:
  − honesty in words and actions
  − integrity
  − vision
  − willing to take risks (trailblazer); courage
  − humility
  − good listener
  − clear understanding of their role and boundaries
  − consistency, follow-through
  − passion for NA
  − willing to share; desire to delegate/empower
◆ leaders embody the values of those they lead and they help to shape those values
◆ leadership is not a solo effort
◆ leaders are living examples of principle-based recovery
◆ leaders have faith in the group process
◆ leaders have power rooted in humility
	◆ everyone can contribute and has something to offer
	◆ increased involvement relates to increased use of individual potential
	◆ for many, interest and perceived value in getting involved must be cultivated
	◆ individuals have varying degrees of confidence, comfort and ability:
	  − some are ready for more responsibility but don't have the confidence
	  − some take on tasks they are not ready for
	  − some are put into role they are not right for
	◆ system of cultivation is not necessarily automatic (individuals often need to be cultivated to rise in responsibility)
	◆ the system operates at multiple levels; integrated strategies are needed to develop leadership through all levels of service
	◆ the system must start earlier than you might think
	◆ it takes a range of strategies, passive and active, to sustain a vibrant leadership development system

Levels of Involvement in NA/Service Structure

Level 1: Passive/Attendee

Examples:
◆ goes to a meeting
◆ has a desire to stay clean

Level 2: Participant

Examples:
◆ shares at a meeting
◆ is a sponsee
◆ puts money in the basket
◆ is willing to contribute at some level
◆ welcomes newcomers at meetings

Note: critical turning point in involvement occurs between the *participant* and *active contributor* levels

Level 3: Active Contributor

Examples:
♦ is a speaker or a sponsor
♦ is growing in commitment
♦ demonstrates a passion for NA
♦ is a committee member or project participant
♦ sits in on a business meeting

Level 4: Leader

Examples:
♦ is a workgroup chair
♦ is a WB member
♦ takes more risk
♦ is a secretary, treasurer, GSR
♦ is an Area Administrative Chair
♦ is an RCM, RD
♦ is a sponsor
♦ holds non-titular leadership roles

Level 5: Past Leader

Examples:
♦ continues to sponsor
♦ looks at service as a career (lifelong service to fellowship)
♦ was a board member, chair, etc.

Leadership Structure in NA

[graphic to come]

Goals of the NAWS Leadership Development System

Desired Outcomes
♦ a replenishable pool of qualified leaders at all levels of service
♦ the ability to identify leaders based on specific needs (as they change)
♦ leaders who feel valued and supported
♦ leaders who are stewards of NA
♦ effective utilization of past leaders
♦ smooth transition between leaders
♦ a broad understanding of leadership in NA
♦ the right person for the right job at the right time
♦ a shift in NA culture about leadership (universal acceptance and understanding of the term 'leadership' in NA; fellowship embraces the concept of leadership cultivation)
♦ an atmosphere of opportunity to serve; getting involved is seen as desirable, high sense of value
♦ a leadership development process that is understandable and accessible

Criteria: Ideal NAWS Leadership Development System

♦ accessible
♦ clear, understandable
♦ has impact at multiple levels of the service structure
♦ is dynamic (changes with needs for leadership)
♦ connects to personal recovery
♦ measurable
♦ matches talent to task
♦ sets reasonable expectations and supports success
♦ is a system of cultivation
♦ includes personal contact
♦ is based on NA principles and accepted standards

Current Strategies for NAWS Leadership Development

Events and Fellowship Interaction	*Workgroups and Volunteer Opportunities*
♦ Group and Area Events ♦ Zonal Forums ♦ World Wide Workshops ♦ WSC ♦ World Convention ♦ Regional events ♦ Area events ♦ Other special events ♦ Fellowship development trips ♦ Shining star identification system and other referrals	♦ Project groups ♦ Fixed workgroups (e.g., *NA Way* Editorial workgroup, Business Plan Group, etc) ♦ WCNA pool members and support committees ♦ Local representation at professional events (e.g., ICAA) ♦ Follow-up travel opportunities to developing communities ♦ Participation in forums ♦ Write articles ♦ Be a speaker ♦ Be a sponsor
Training and Orientation	*Systems*
♦ Workshops (in general) ♦ World Board orientation and training ♦ Zonal Forums programs ♦ WSC programs ♦ World Convention programs	♦ HRP ♦ World Pool and interview process ♦ Self nomination ♦ New nominating process
One-on-One ♦ personal contact by Board and sponsors at events, etc. ♦ mentoring others	

Preliminary Assessment of NAWS Leadership Development System

General

Organizational Environment	Opportunities for Involvement
Strengths ◆ plan driven base is permeating the culture ◆ language sets the tone for recovery ◆ lot of encouragement to get involved, despite deficiencies ◆ leaders are visible and can be role models ◆ service structure lends a sense of community **Weaknesses** ◆ leadership is too anonymous ◆ lack of consistency in leadership experience group to group ◆ the tone, messages about leadership can be negative or dispassionate ◆ Conference based – exclusive, electable source of leadership ◆ slow to change attitudes and perceptions ◆ democratic culture slows down progress ◆ weak layer of sponsorship that doesn't see that service equals recovery ◆ don't deal well with non-performance or poor performance in leadership ◆ hard time striking a balance between holding leaders accountable and 'beating them up' (criticism seen as 'bad'; get burned for your mistakes; confuse criticism with judgment) ◆ environment is male dominated ◆ messages about past leadership are generally negative ◆ lack of clear leadership standards	**Strengths** ◆ opportunities can be transformative (personal/professional growth) ◆ there are many opportunities to contribute ◆ allow people to develop a sense of ownership (but don't often let go) ◆ opportunities are varied ◆ very few requirements for some opportunities ◆ opportunities to get involved make a difference; bring results ◆ opening up opportunities globally ◆ some mechanisms in place to organize opportunities **Weaknesses** ◆ connection between position and contribution to large NA goals and vision is not clear ◆ choose leaders without regard to ability to do the job ◆ not nearly enough opportunities given the size and potential of the fellowship ◆ sometimes the focus is on clean time requirements and not other requirements or on the value of getting involved (focus is wrong – assumption that some amount of clean time equals a certain degree of recovery) ◆ many jobs require an inordinate amount of time and dollar commitment, etc. ◆ requirements can be inaccurate ◆ lack of clear requirements, role, qualifications, level of needed commitment, etc. ◆ lack of support tools ◆ lack of orientation/support in certain positions and at certain levels ◆ sometimes set people up to fail ◆ lack of clear delegated authority

Specific Strategy

Step	Barriers	Current Strategies	Strengths/Weaknesses
Moving From **Passive** **to** **Participant**	♦ recovery issues ♦ low self-esteem ♦ fear of commitment ♦ struggles with being a member of the community ♦ non-welcoming atmosphere	♦ some structured welcoming (key tag) ♦ atmosphere of recovery ♦ newcomer support and resources ♦ steps/sponsorship ♦ literature	*Strengths* ♦ reading the readings ♦ acknowledgement of clean time *Weaknesses* ♦ inconsistency ♦ cliques ♦ language barriers ♦ lack of targeted literature ♦ group-level leadership
Step	**Barriers**	**Current Strategies**	**Strengths/Weaknesses**
Moving From **Participant** **to** **Active Contributor**	♦ takes more time and commitment ♦ scary – "everyone else knows but me" ♦ lack of awareness ♦ political – perception of the system ♦ lack of motivation ♦ lack of information ♦ lack of courage ♦ not seen as fun ♦ lack of perceived value ♦ no training/direction/orientation ♦ no sponsor culture to promote	♦ personally inviting ♦ announcements (bland) ♦ learning days/flyers/workshops/ conventions ♦ orientations ♦ combined with fun events ♦ support person/mentor ♦ sponsorship ♦ personal sharing	*Strength* ♦ drafting people ♦ personal role works when done *Weaknesses* ♦ not focused or planned or non-existent ♦ not integrated ♦ don't evaluate effectiveness ♦ no consistency ♦ chaos
Step	**Barriers**	**Current Strategies**	**Strengths/Weaknesses**
Moving From **Active Contributor** **to** **Leader**	♦ limited opportunities ♦ strategy not designed to provide clear pathways/ladder ♦ user resource not comfortable with giving people a chance ♦ World Pool can set up false expectations of being used – creates void ♦ we don't nurture the journey ♦ fragmentation lends itself to apathy (World Pool) ♦ inadequate tools/resources	♦ one-on-one mentoring ♦ sponsorship ♦ World Pool ♦ trickle up effect ♦ Worldwide Workshops (for identification) ♦ strategic partnership with local communities ♦ speakers ♦ support committees ♦ shining star ♦ workgroup structure	*Strengths* ♦ one-to-one mentoring ♦ use of publications to inform fellowship ♦ beginning to make service look attractive ♦ sponsorship ♦ workgroup structure (creates a training/testing ground) *Weakness* ♦ making leadership attractive ♦ no orientation/tools/guidance ♦ environment in which some leaders are treated (hostile) ♦ need benchmark to help evaluate

Step	Barriers	Current Strategies	Strengths/Weaknesses
Moving From **Leader** **to** **Past Leader**	◆ burnout ◆ unwillingness to let go ◆ no appreciation or recognition/perceived value ◆ new regime dismissed ◆ don't show past leaders we want them to stay around ◆ disenchantment ◆ old regime is disconnected ◆ many past leaders aren't in World Pool ◆ World Pool resume/process ◆ 'grieving process' following end of service term	◆ certificate of appreciation (NAWS) ◆ World Pool ◆ use of 'proven' past leaders based on their professional background ◆ inconsistent contact with past leaders based on their relationships	*Weaknesses* ◆ past leaders out of the loop ◆ culture feels it's weak to ask past leaders for help ◆ past leaders don't think they should have to complete World Pool forms

Preliminary Areas for Improvement in NAWS Leadership Development System

◆ expectations and measurements for leadership
◆ messages about leadership/the environment (culture conflicts; connection between service and recovery, etc.)

Other:

◆ 6