

APPROVED

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

13-16 July 2005

NOV 9 2005

BY: 

Wednesday 14 July

Action Group

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Daniel Schuessler, David James, Jim Buerer, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall.

Giovanna Ghisays and Saul Alvarado were unable to attend the board meeting.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, and Carrie Ray

9:00am: Bob opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity Prayer, followed by a few general announcements: Piet De Boer will arrive tomorrow morning; Eileen is on medical leave and will hopefully return in two weeks; if anyone is interested in leading the action group for the next meeting, speak with Bob. Bob asked Ron B to facilitate the action group for the day.

Ron B facilitated the action group by asking each board member to share where they're at as a board member, how they're tapping into their recovery, and what event occurred since they met last that inspired them.

World Convention

WCNA 34

Mike Polin reviewed the WCNA 34 site selection report with the board. He explained that WCNA is in an awkward growth time in regard to convention meeting space. Most convention centers are not laid out in a way that is conducive for our meeting needs. We have completely outgrown San Francisco; the most we could put there is 16,000 people. We have used arenas to get around this phenomenon but the problem with arenas is the maximum seating is 18,000 people. They've always used a concert set which eliminates the back seating. The next step up is baseball stadiums like AA; however WCNA is not quite big enough to make that transition. This issue has eliminated prospective cities. This issue is worse in Western North America. The board will see this as a repeating theme.

Mike explained the meaning of viability in the site selection report which has changed for him. He called attention to section two of the report which rates the four potential cities for WCNA 34. When we go outside of North America the rooms are more expensive and people come in on Wednesday and leave on Sunday. This has forced him to look at Wednesday differently. We have already changed the logistics for Wednesday and Thursday at world conventions. Members make vacations out of the world convention which was the case in Hawaii and San Diego.

Q: Is Vancouver knocked off because of the narrow passage way?

A: Attendee numbers will drop in Canada because they have very strict rules for entry. If someone has a DUI they will not let them into the country. The reason why Vancouver is rated as stated in the report is mostly due to facility limitations as well as the lower attendance issue. He shared he was disappointed in the rating and thinks it's a great city. The Vancouver officials made it difficult to give the board the confidence that they could handle the growing fellowship by WCNA 34. Vancouver is expensive for a Canadian location but thinks there's a place to talk about Canada but it is not for this specific convention.

Q: Most members might say we've already done San Diego; did you look at any other cities in Canada? In Alberta?

A: Nothing that can handle 15,000 people. The two cities that could are Toronto and Montreal. But for this zone Vancouver is the only city that comes close.

Q: Is there a possibility in doing something other than San Diego? The next time around it's going to be even more focused on that city.

A: He doesn't agree because there may not be two zones considering the growth. That's a discussion the board will have to have. There are cities that have future expansion but can't work right now. Los Angeles should rank in the top once their expansion is completed. Denver offered NAWS a free convention center because they knew their location is a problem. Because Los Angeles has a bad history of completing construction Mike did not feel he could make a recommendation.

Q: How many years ahead does NAWS have to reserve a facility?

A: Seven years out to hold a facility.

Q: Vancouver is not an option because they can only hold 14,000? Needs further clarification.

A: Mike explains that there were 22,000 people in San Diego and he expects and hopes to have more than 20,000 people from now on in North American locations. In Vancouver we couldn't promise a seat for everybody. In the WCNA 35 report the board will see that no one comes close to what Toronto has to offer. For a majority of our members they will have not attended San Diego in 2003; therefore, in 2011 it will be there first time. San Diego is one of the top summer destinations to visit and vacation year after year.

There were no objections to following the recommendation that WCNA 34 will be held in San Diego in 2011.

WCNA 35

Mike spent some time talking about the cities that were eliminated for the potential sites for WCNA 35. New York would be the most expensive as far as boarding and labor costs but might be offset by registration. Their bid was set to the Olympic bid which fell through. Building in New York takes too much time which is why the city was recommended to be eliminated.

Detroit's situation is they've been working to renovate the city. An option could be to put 1000 rooms across the border in Windsor, Canada however one must consider how members would feel about crossing the boarder eight times with the possibility of not being able to get across. This is why the city was recommended to be eliminated.

Saint Louis has the space and the hotel but it was the smallest attended world convention in years. Mike explained the term "viability" again. The location is at the center of the US and most attendees come from driving across country. The issue was that members couldn't find a restaurant at night; everything was closed in the evenings. The infrastructure makes the destination not work for our members. Viability includes everything from attractiveness to can the destination support the amount of people in that area which includes restaurants.

Q: Believes that it was a lack of work on our part that restaurants didn't open in Saint Louis and we should have let them know in advance.

A: Anthony responds that the restaurants all knew and were asked to create abbreviated hours but denied it because NAWS couldn't financially guarantee the revenue. Further added in the past the world convention could be anywhere and members would kill themselves to get there. But nowadays members are choosy about how they want to spend their dollars. The real criterion really isn't our

Vision Statement and the criterion is a viable site. Unfortunately, the beauty of the site is important because that will denote the attendance. This is what it's evolved to.

Q: What was the problem with Montreal? How did AA have their convention there?

A: Montreal is too small. AA used a baseball stadium for their main meeting. Montreal doesn't have main meeting space only the hockey arena which is 10 miles out of town or the stadium which is too big. AA is able to go to a city five or six years out because they have more buying power to know how many hotels they'll sell and also get the stadium for free. We can't do that unless we double our attendance.

No objections to continuing and negotiating Indianapolis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Orlando, Philadelphia, and Toronto for WCNA 35 locations.

Action Item List: board has to complete discussion on the criteria for selecting a site for WCNA prior to the development of a new rotation plan tentatively scheduled for August '06 meeting.

Hawaii update

Most of the attendees are coming in on Wednesday which means making sure there are strong speakers and adding a coffee house. There's going to be more diversity in the bands. All speakers have been confirmed and the program is being printed tomorrow. We're excited and getting great calls about the convention.

There was a brief discussion regarding travel arrangements for WCNA 31. Mike explained that as he recalls it the board will all stay in the Hilton. David mentioned that he didn't receive any communication about travel or hotel preference. Anthony stated that there will not be an opportunity to choose a specific hotel for lodging and that a memo did go out about travel arrangements. Travel dates were sent two months.

KRA: Fellowship Support and Communications

PR Handbook Project

Chapters 5-9

Ron Miller and Jane Nickels introduced the chapter and work to date. For the Healthcare chapter, several board members suggested to add more content on harm reduction. Ron B expressed that he has experience with this subject and will get with Jane to add more salient content. The fellowship needs some assistance with this issue as they get in conflict with this issue while doing Public Relations work. It was clarified that harm reduction is not in conflict with Narcotics Anonymous and can be considered an approach toward total abstinence.

Chapters 1-4 Input

Ron M briefly went over the input from the fellowship and reminded the board that the deadline for input is August 1.

Discussion

- Believes we need input from across the spectrum and suggests e-blasting to encourage members to provide input. Multiple communications including an e-blast have gone out to the fellowship. The board was encouraged to communicate to the fellowship what the project entails.
- Becky explained that historically input floods in only when members do not like the material—this was true for the Basic Text. We didn't send this specifically to literature committees but it went to all areas and anyone could obtain it online. Since most areas have one mailing address, it would mean mailing multiple copies with a color cover to try to ensure it gets routed to the right people. She doesn't think we will get more saturation.

- Asked her area if anything has been done with the PR Handbook yet as far as review and the response was that it went directly to the lit committees. Feels something may need to be communicated that it doesn't have to go to the lit committees and what to do with it. One on one she can make a difference but doesn't know how to make a broader message.
- Reiterated that the cover memo sent out to the fellowship said for members to pass the R&I material along to the different committees, not the Lit committees. Further added that sometimes the input received doesn't affect the work and sometimes it is simply good news.
- Explains there's a difference between enjoying something and liking something. He likes the approach of the writing but it would be nice to have more examples. Examples help define the difference between like and enjoy. Because these are core philosophies we're trying to convey he would like to see more background/examples because without that there is too much space for interpretation.

Jane recently received input that suggested using more examples to help emphasize issues. This would aid in having issues jump out at members. She will look at that in August.

It was asked if the workgroup has addressed the issue of following rules of institutions. Jane replied that the thought is expressed and that it's good to get real familiar with facility staff.

Ron M thanked everyone for their input and reminded them that the chapters are on the FTP site for input from the board due back by July 25.

Translations Evaluations Workgroup (TEG)

Daniel Schuessler and Uschi Mueller presented the revised evaluation forms. Uschi explained the recovery glossary and the new evaluation form. The motivation is to make the form simpler and shorter so the TEG doesn't have to work with a 40 page report. The form takes the TEG closer to the initial questions that are asked. The old form was hindering the Literature Translation Committees (LTC's) which was holding them to a very high standard. A streamlined evaluation process and report form would allow them to hire a qualified person in the country, provide them with good instructions and tools to get successful input like the Afrikaans. If approved they would need to then update the Translations Basics to reflect the changes.

Daniel explains the challenges regarding definitions. For example, the phrase "We came to believe" would have many different ideas of meaning. If you ask one hundred members you will get many different answers.

There is a lot of ambivalent language in the Basic Text; finding the balance between distinguishing ambivalence and true meaning. As the TEG finds these kinds of things they can share the challenges. He has found many communities stumbling with "no surveillance at any time." Also, "productive member of society" is also confusing.

There were no objections to adopting the reports and the recommendations forwarded by the TEG.

The glossary will go out to five Literature Translations Committees that are waiting now that it's been approved.

KRA: Communications

CAR 2006

Regional Motions

The board reviewed the document "Version 5 Possible CAR motions for WSC 2006." The EC is working with the motion makers in helping them meet the conference requirements and get across what they are trying to accomplish. The document reviewed is a living document; in years past they've had a version 15 or 16. The motion deadline is 1 August 2005 and the requirement for that is it needs to be CAR-ready by 21 August. There will probably be more motions before this deadline.

Discussion

- It was asked to what extent Craig and Jim B give and receive assistance with as far as helping the motion makers.
 - Craig responded that he assists the motion makers in formulating a CAR-ready motion and helps with the intent of their motion. The goal is to have a motion that homegroups will understand and comprehend what they are being asked to consider including the intent. To accomplish this it requires multiple phone conversations and emails.
- Becky adds that almost no one can write a motion that covers conference policy especially a new delegate. Many of the delegates don't understand the purpose of the motion. The last CAR finally came to the place of "If you can't change the motion it can't go into the CAR" and it didn't. The Ohio region was one that didn't get in the CAR last cycle and now their desire then is no longer an issue. Even though Jim B and Craig are the point people for this, the EC gets copied on all of it with any big issues forwarded to the board. Refer all inquiries to the office if regions need help writing a motion.
- Anthony adds there are some communities that don't want to play by the rules and try to manipulate getting a motion into the CAR at the last minute. The truth is there shouldn't be any regional motions in this current system. Many of the communities are only using half of the system. They don't want to send the issue in beforehand so the board can discuss it. The audio Basic Text is a great example of a community that did.
- A repetitive message to the fellowship that regional motions are last resort actions to redirect the board and other efforts. Doesn't want to see this philosophy dissipate by discontinuing a repetitive message.
- What has taken away the need for some regional motions is fellowship dialogue and issue discussion at Worldwide Workshops resulting in members feeling that they're being heard. The dialogue is part of it and the CAR isn't the means for communication. Believes these are "softball" motions. Members don't like that a project idea may be sitting for a couple of years before being considered or possibly thrown out completely. We never summarily reject something on initial contact.
- If delegates and regions want the board to consider something they can send it to the board; they don't have to fill out a form.
- Becky believes that the board needs to focus on the responses to motions and laying out what the issues are with regard to the board's part of the CAR. A discussion needs to occur on how to present the material so the delegates can workshop it. Currently, there are no board motions.
- Would like to see the top ten or 20 motions that have come up in the years with the pros and cons so members can see the history of issues. An FAQ on rejected motions.

Discussion on Responses to Regional Motions

The EC talked briefly about these motions. The process is the EC looks at these comes up with a recommendation and then brings it to the board for direction and approval.

Regional Motion A: Northern New York Region wishes to present a motion to create a recovery glossary attached to the Basic Text. The EC agreed that it doesn't correlate with the Basic Text project timeline and it's not a glossary conducive for the Basic Text. The EC recommends asking them if a recovery glossary could be considered unattached from the Basic Text. If approved separately, it would go in the stream of things to be considered for a project plan.

- Objects to this motion on a different level because it would be construed as "official NA definitions." The doctrinaire of the dogmatic doesn't serve our membership. Not in support of

idea. Also it's unfortunate that the impression isn't created that these motions are harmful to the CAR. Ron H resists any move towards making a direct definition to the term "surrender" as it inhibits the recovery process. No official way to surrender.

- Would support the idea of a recovery glossary feels members need to know more information.
- Recommends making available on the website the range of terms and/or a glossary for members.
- Some things need definitions and not all recovery terms are indigenous. There are terms in our literature that need definitions such as "Basic Text" which has a clear definition. Wouldn't mind seeing a glossary for that type of thing.

No objections to working on a response to Motion A that the board would not support a generic NA glossary for the Basic Text and to direct the board to develop a project plan for a separate recovery glossary.

Regional Motion B: Canada Atlantic Region (Paul) wishes to present a motion to create a piece of literature on "Predatory Behavior." We would suggest a similar approach: "To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2008 for the creation of a new piece of literature on the topic of Predatory Behavior." Paul's main concerns are that this issue will disappear and will not be taken seriously. He hopes that NAWS will take some sort of action without demanding a timeline. It was explained to him that NAWS has been focusing on all different types of behavior in meetings not just predatory behavior.

- Craig is hopeful that we'll create a piece on different types of behavior in the near future perhaps something on Atmosphere of Recovery which might satisfy Paul's region resulting in no motion being raised.
- Becky reminds the board that office resources are low right now to accomplish the task of writing a piece.
- Concern was expressed regarding the impression we're giving Paul and to make sure we're clear with the reality of our situation. Craig explained to Paul that it's not on the boards immediate radar screen but it's on the charge. He thinks Paul felt he was heard and if he isn't okay with this option than he will rewrite the motion to direct the board to write something on predatory behavior.
- Believes we should not support this motion.

Concurrence to move forward with what the EC recommends: To direct the WB to develop a project plan on Predatory Behavior.

Regional Motion C: Ohio Region (Michael, RD) wishes to present a motion to adopt the Identity Statement as fellowship approved literature as a reading card. The WSC history of this issue was explained to Michael, as well as all of the reading cards are currently from the Basic Text, and that the identity statement is not from any of our recovery literature. Michael (Ohio RD) said his region may settle for only the first paragraph of the identity statement which is verbatim from the Basic Text.

No objection to moving forward. The recommendation from '99 still applies and will be used again as response material.

Regional Motion D: (This motion was added and is not in Version 5) The German-speaking Region wishes to present a motion to make the approval timeframe for literature be twelve months. Daniel suggests that in our response to them we explain the die model problem which needs to be communicated to the fellowship. He questions why we should allow the Germans a twelve month review for an English version; believes it's senseless. Sigrid will understand this is not doable.

- Doesn't agree the die model applies here. The rationale is acceptable for this motion. Believes we're always in the conference cycle and are in compression between the production window

and the review and input window. It takes us so long to get this done. Although we know this is a challenge that's why we've expanded the window as much as we can. If the fellowship wanted to accept this motion then things would expand longer than a conference cycle. We propose to stay in the way it is right now.

- Clarified that Sigrid is not talking about the review and input process. If they don't like it they don't have to translate it.
- Believes we should have a world-wide basic text; therefore the dye model does not apply here.
- Sees this as a step backwards.

No objection to continue communication.

CAR Content

There was discussion regarding how to present the reporting and IDT section of the CAR. Historically speaking, members look for the motions and the cheat sheet before the reporting and IDT content. Members reportedly liked the information in the CAR last time better than before. The board has to think about how they want to focus delegates for workshopping this information. This will be framed by the October board meeting. Board members need to think about this and send input via email to Eileen.

Ideas

- Needs some content to get stimulated. Becky responds that the CAR will report generally on the ongoing projects and what the board's work has been during the last cycle and the IDT's.
- Foresees past IDT's to be discussed well after the cycle. Suggests mentioning a follow-up on these topics even after the cycle has passed.
- In the EC they discussed the CAR moving to the next evolution with the use of the CAR shifting away from motions.
- Becky explains that there is a need to frame items in the report. The members want tools and confidence to facilitate workshops so there's value and merit.
- What is it that we can do different in the CAR to support its evolution is the question to be asked here.
- Suggests Talking points. Doesn't support the idea to completely change the nature of what the CAR has been in the past.
- The board has never been in this place before of the board picking the topics rather than the conference picking them.

For example, Infrastructure, they've said what's working and what's not working does the board want to take the next step to communicate further information? Send any input to Eileen.

Thursday 14 July

Strategic Planning

A full day was spent on the Strategic Plan for the 2006-2008 cycle facilitated by Jim DeLizia. Notes for this session are at the end of the minutes titled "2006-2008 Objectives and Draft Approaches with Prioritization."

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Daniel Schuessler, David James, Jim Buerer, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall.

Piet De Boer arrives this morning (Thursday).

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Uschi Mueller, Freddie Aquino, Bob Stewart, Fatia Birault, Travis Koplou, Jane Nickels, De Jenkins, Carrie Ray, Johnny Lamprea, Kim Young, Mike Polin, Stephan Lantos, Tom Rush, and Tom Boscarelli.

9:00am: Prior to starting the Strategic Planning session, the Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity Prayer, followed by an announcement: Tom Boscarelli was introduced as the newest writer/editor at NAWS.

Friday 15 July

Key Result Area: Leadership Development

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

Notes for this session are at the end of the minutes titled "NAWS Leadership Development Session 1 & 2."

Saturday 16 July

Key Result Area: Resources – Leadership

9:00am: The Board chair began with a few announcements. He's pleased with the work that's been done over the weekend so far in regard to leadership and serving the groups in a way that's never been done before. He briefly discussed the agenda for the day. Each board member will need to sign the dissolution of NAWS Inc in Europe and we will keep WSO-Europe. The document will be circulated for each board member to sign.

Other announcements included:

- Add a legend to the calendar and the agenda for future meetings.
- Start each day with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer even when Jim DeLizia is facilitating.
- Be mindful of the van leaving the hotel. Let's all leave at 8:30 from the hotel.

Bob asked for a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Nominations

The board reviewed the list of candidates submitted. It was explained that the one page edition to what was on the original list of names was forwarded by the EC from their meeting this week. He explained the process in which they arrived at these names. The EC reviewed all of the current and past cycle workgroups. The board previously decided to review the list names, followed by one member speaking on behalf of the person, followed by a show of hands.

Discussion

David expressed his discomfort with a show of hands and would prefer printing out a list of the names putting a tick mark next to them to tally up. This is an election process and it's not a general practice to do a show of hands. He's not sure why he feels this way; he's just not comfortable. It was explained that if they stand for them in public they should be able to use a show of hands process. Not sure if the show of hands would generate more discussion; if not, there's no difference in the process of doing it silently.

- Recalls the board discussing this process; that it should be transparent and a show of hands would denote that transparency. When we elect officers for the board we don't ask them to leave the room so why do this silently for members who aren't present.
- It's beneficial for if one person is not in favor of a possible candidate others can ask that person why they didn't vote for them.
- Anthony explains that because the board has never done this before they can create it however they choose. At this meeting however he understands that the process of submitting names is over, the EC went over names and forwarded some, the next step of the process is to determine what happens next to the completed list of names. The issue of how we go from where we go today to the final list is in the air because there's no model to follow. What the EC did is if there wasn't support of a name by a show of hands they could inquire why and facilitated that dialogue. The board is not at the final selection point at this meeting.
- David's rationale might not be very strong and doesn't feel he needs to explain why he may not vote for someone. His reasons for not voting for someone may not be rational therefore he doesn't feel he needs to be questioned or explained why he's done that and have someone inquire later why he didn't. He may vote for non-North American folks with no other reason than that and doesn't feel comfortable explaining why. At a later time he feels he could do this in more of an open process but at this time he's not ok with it. He doesn't want to be lobbied or questioned about why he didn't support someone.
- Doesn't want to get into talking negatively about someone during this process—agrees with David.
- Didn't envision swaying someone's vote one way or the other. He does however want to hear members of the board speak on behalf of a candidate. Thinks it's impossible for everyone to know each person on the list. This is an opportunity for people that might have slipped through to get added to the list.
- Craig reiterated on the lobbying issue that when the EC did this earlier this week they moved along with the show of hands and there wasn't any lobbying going on. He personally didn't get asked or didn't ask anyone.
- Becky believes this is about the leadership discussion. The board has to find a way to have open discussions about people or else you can't have a leadership cultivation system. Secret ballots have been harmful in the past. This isn't how you're going to vote at the conference—this is just about people you worked with in workgroups and cultivated and identifying them as potential nominees with support of this board. It is very difficult to talk about people.
- Trusts the board members; therefore, he doesn't know why he wouldn't show a hand for each name simply based on the fact that board members forwarded them.
- Ron H is uncomfortable in general on who do you like and know and voting based on that. He would rather see candidates from the board only coming out of our leadership cultivation system. He would prefer to not have more than 1 or 2 candidates from workgroups and not a world board popularity contest. Because the system doesn't exist yet he'd like to say he's not very supportive in forwarding candidates that looks similar to a board popularity contest.
- Anthony explains that every name that was discussed at the EC meeting was a workgroup member from six years past; therefore it was easy. He would hope the board would not forward any name that this body would not be willing to support as a board member for six years. This body needs to settle on the underlying philosophical premise of what's going on at this meeting.
- Bob explains the process that if they are nominated by the HRP it will illustrate if they were nominated by the world board, region, or zone. It will be public. Some of these people may already be in the HRP process. This process is to insert a candidate after the blind candidate profile

review. They have to survive the remaining processes to be a nominee. The regions and zones also have the opportunity to insert names as well.

- David believes the reason they have the HRP is to rule out personalities before principles. This process today cautions this. He's got two so far he would vote for at this point.
- Will need to rely on one another to talk about, assess, and input each candidate on how they're doing on the workgroup.

Bob moved the process along and moved forward.

It was noted that some names had been forwarded to Eileen who are not on the list. They can be added at this point.

In April the board discussed that in the beginning stages of the cultivation process they wouldn't inhibit members that weren't on workgroups to be a part of this process. They would be considered.

- Ron H thinks his standards are higher so that he can support the cultivation system. If the board sees a shining star that's currently not in a workgroup perhaps they should start in a workgroup and not go straight to the board.
- Some people may work well on a workgroup but may not be good for the board. Further added that of the 6-8 people that are elected it wouldn't look good that two of them are x-board members and four are people that the board nominated. That won't look good.
- Bob reminds that a board nomination might be looked at as the kiss of death.

The final list after 27 candidates were discussed are:

- 1) Mark Hersh
- 2) Jeff Bronson
- 3) Conor Horgan
- 4) Gregory Williams
- 5) Mark Henson
- 6) Tonia Nikolinakou
- 7) Sigrid Biegel
- 8) Gwen Miller
- 9) Tim Smith
- 10) Peter Harris
- 11) Vivianne Ronnemann
- 12) Susan Blaue

The process to move current board members who wish to run again will be processed differently from the above. Currently, we know that Ron Hofius and Tom McCall are interested in running again. Saul has said he is not and Giovanna has not been asked.

The board will make a final decision by consensus at the October meeting.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Basic Text Project – Ron Hofius and Travis Koplow

Ron explained that there are two items of substance that need to be discussed at this meeting:

1. Editing of existing stories; if a story was forwarded and it had previous language such as "clean & sober" should it be edited to the new language.
2. How to proceed with other language community stories; at the last board meeting they thought it was understood to contact the communities by sending a letter. The workgroup wanted to consider every language story that's been in the Basic Text or the Little White Book to be evaluated. The workgroup needs direction on this.

Travis commented on some of the other issues. First off, she's really excited about the project. The e-blast was internationally successful as a result. Although we're not being overwhelmed with international stories, at this point, it is safe to say that the word is getting out. People understand that they need to be active in tapping folks on the shoulder and suggesting that they submit their experience. The session profile was test-driven at the SEZF which generated enthusiasm about the project. She was a little disappointed that the session didn't generate a sense of that writing is a series of choices. She did some revisions on the profile and it will be done again at the EDM. People are downloading the profile and as of yet she hasn't received much feedback. She did a beta test of the interview process with a member that speaks English quite well but doesn't see himself as a good writer. She feels that this is the key to getting some of the stuff we wouldn't get otherwise for this project. She is infused with the spirit and is optimistic and enthusiastic at this point and is confident that it will change the face of our literature in a profound way. Reminds the board that she asked for names for potential interviewers and hasn't reviewed any as of yet. She suggests sending that information to Eileen.

There were no objections to having staff make minor changes to the session profiles based on input.

Discussion/ Comments

- Mary commented that when she and Travis revised the profile while at the SEZF she could see member's reactions on how members could take a piece of their recovery to submit; not necessarily having to send a story on how it was, what it was like, etc. She received a lot of positive feedback.
- Bob mentioned that it was helpful to see the submissions report that was submitted to see who (anonymously) has submitted and from where.
- Becky started soliciting people for interviews and it started to become real for her. That's the test. That's what it's going to have to translate to for board members. They're keeping the Japanese translators in Honolulu so Travis can interview some of the APF folks. You have to approach them and cheerlead actively.
- Travis noted that people find some comfort in knowing that their experience will be edited and that they don't have to be writers.

Ron H went over the Basic Text evaluation site to point a few things out to the board members. Reviewed the log in name and password. Ron logged in and showed how to review a story that wasn't in their queue. The workgroup will have a recommendation for the board after their next workgroup meeting in July.

- Michael found that in reviewing these stories that they shouldn't be in the Basic Text. They've been around for 20 years and are outdated. Feels they would be holding back what's going on in NA. He's open and unattached at this time emotionally today on where he's at.

One of the many options available for the board is to keep some of the existing stories and perhaps designate them separately in the new text as an option.

- A few board members commented on not seeing any stories being kept in the new edition.

Board Member Submissions

At the April meeting there were a few board members that questioned if they could submit their story and no one knew the answer. During the Basic Text's last workgroup meeting they were shocked that the board might consider submitting their story. The workgroup is not confused on who has say on this project in no way. They softened up a little bit towards the end of the conversation but did want to forward their point of view. They believe it would be a perceived conflict from the fellowship if the board were to submit their story. The following discussion involved comments on two issues; board member submissions and editing existing stories:

- Questions the editing issue and how it relates to whether a story should stay or not. She also comments that she doesn't see why it would matter if a board member were to submit because it's anonymous and the fellowship wouldn't know unless they wrote on being a board member.
- Regarding editing existing stories, if some do stay, feels they should be edited. He never imagined a board member submitting and would feel awkward if a board member did submit something and understands the conflict.
- Existing stories need to be brought up to date on NA speak if selected to stay in the text. Doesn't believe board members should be able to submit their stories and questions future board members. There will be another set of people approving the final draft.
- Board members are part of the fellowship, too, although he isn't personally interested in submitting a story. He found two stories that should stay. Suggested that NA Way gems and other language communities should be evaluated.
- Believes it's a conflict of interest personally. However if another board member wanted to submit he feels the process is sound enough.
- Agrees to utilize all other existing language stories. Would like to see the Basic Text edgy and not sterile like the NA Way. Asks how the workgroup is defining the stories and purpose. Believes existing stories should be edited; just don't take the life out of them or edginess out of them.

Ron H responds that the workgroup has had these conversations. One purpose is for the newcomer to identify (existing stories) and the second purpose is to bring more substance of experience.

- Believes its okay for board members to be included in the submission process. The board has unique experiences that could be shared. Perhaps this could be discussed at the conference. He questions if delegates and alternate delegates could send it in as well since they vote on the CAR. There is no logical reason to exclude anyone in this process.
- Tom M believes the board defines their own ethics. Would hate to see his contributions to the project not be in the new Basic Text. He resents the fact that he has no anonymity as a board member and in this process. It's a privileged from the fellowship to be a board member but doesn't know if that means he should give up other opportunities as a member. Thinks he has a right to participate as a member in the fellowship. He'll be disappointed if he doesn't get reelected for another board term and can't participate in the Basic Text submission process. Thinks these things should be explained to a board member before they get elected so they are aware of these issues. He would recuse himself from voting if his story was in front him and the same would go for a relative as a code of ethics. Thinks this really rests with the principle of participation.
- Ron H commented on the wife and sponsor issue Tom raised in that the workgroup will let staff know if they know someone or have a special interest in it to be moved to another queue.
- It was noted that staff should not be able to submit their experience.
- It's a question of personal ethics; staff and board have the right to participate. Suggests a discussion about board ethics needs to be put on a future board agenda. There are no clear ethics on this. That's the bigger issue—no common view.

- Doesn't understand that if the board was to create an IP why a board member's contribution is okay for that but not ok for a submission. The same bar isn't there and a member making a contribution is a member making a contribution.

Becky states if you create the party you don't get to play in the party. It's not the membership stuff. HRP members can't play in the board arena as a nominee. It's important to make a decision as a body.

Ron H summarized some of the comments: There was one person that had reservations to not edit an existing story therefore it seemed as though the board was strongly in favor of editing existing stories. Regarding board members submitting their experience to the project, there was a distinction between ethics and personal ethics; two board members said no and the rest said it should be okay if they want to do that. Further added he reminds that they can't guarantee anonymity when evaluating a story.

No objections to report to the other language groups; no letter will be sent so that the communities won't feel it will renders a response. All other language stories in the Basic Text and the Little White Booklet will be evaluated.

Consensus that it's OK to edit existing stories at the "fix, pill or drink" level for clarity of message if selected to remain in the Sixth Edition

Further reflection and future agenda item for October '05 regarding board members submitting their experience.

The next big issue from the workgroup will be a recommendation to keep some or all the existing stories.

Key Result Area: Communications

PR Strategy Workgroup

General Announcements

Prior to the PR Strategy Report, the board chair circulated the contact list to be updated as well as get well cards for Giovanna and Eileen. Daniel and Becky will be leaving at 3:00 for the day. For those attending the world convention, one week to ten days prior to the convention they will receive their job assignment and where they will meet upon arrival. If board members have a preference to where they want to work, send Becky an email that information before the schedule is made.

Use UPS for all mailings to the world board.

Include World Board contact list in Book 1 for each board meeting.

Special Interest meetings and some corporate issues were discussed briefly while time permitted.

Special Interest: Part 1

The WCNA 31 program has been printed already so special interest meetings will not occur at the convention.

EC Elections

In prior cycles the board has adopted resolutions for the bank and affirmed leadership for a year. The board could choose to build it into the other annual actions to consider. In March of next year the board would have a discussion on the future leadership on the board.

Board unanimously affirmed the existing board leadership to continue for an additional year.

PR Strategy Workgroup – David James and De Jenkins

David began by reviewing each recommendation found in the report. Item number one was covered well during Thursday's session on the Strategic Plan; item number four was discussed in the workgroup because the language in the strategic plan was thought to be a bit confusing.

He reviewed the Public Relations Strategy as developed. The Public Relations Policy would act as an internal statement for the fellowship and the Public Relations Statement would be for external use. Briefly discussed the identified tools/strategies listed by priority ranking by the workgroup. Much of the information is listed as information that could be used at a later time and didn't want to shred it but provide it as useful information.

Discussion/ Input

- Ron H stated he's proud of this work and has some language input:
 - The third sentence under "What is Our Public Relations Strategy," he suggests it say "The world board and/or the WSC determines..."

Specific input/discussion for "The Public Relations Statement":

- Would like to see something to the affect of "recovery through the Twelve Steps is described as a spiritual awakening..."
- Delete part of the last sentence starting with "...through this valuable and viable... and end with "...a new way of life."
- Regarding the name reference found in the second paragraph, he's unsure of this terminology. He thought it implied to a certain class of drug. He would prefer something that would include "at that time."

David isn't sure what process they will be used to edit this since the PR Strategy workgroup has completed its task and has no further meetings scheduled.

Becky commented that the Public Relations Handbook (PRHB) project released an internal Public Relations statement which is being inputted by the fellowship until 1 August 2005. When the input comes back, they can put the inputted internal Public Relations Statement next to the Public Relations Strategy statement and put it together cohesively. Once they see both they can use one instead of the other or marry the two but they'll have to put them aside eachother as you don't want two "statements." Further added, the Public Relations Statement should be beta-tested by non-member professionals.

Anthony explains ideally they wanted to have the PR Strategy work two years before the PRHB; however, they knew they would come up to the challenge of having two workgroups work on similar work. They would need to marry the two.

It was clarified that this decision needs to occur by January 2006.

- It was inquired why it asterisks "as of January 2005" at the bottom of the statement. It was explained that this is not locked until the next conference. It can be updated at any time by vote of the conference.
- The first sentence of the Public Relations Statement might be too stereotypical. Perhaps taking out the "that an addict, any addict" can be softened.
- The second paragraph containing the term "narcotics" could be better said "was derived from the common use of the word narcotics which would put it in its historical use at the time."

David's concern was that the objectives in the workgroup's report did not effectively align with the NAWS Strategic Plan. He questioned whether it would be clear that there was a relationship between the workgroup's objectives and the overall Strategic Plan.

- Bob doesn't see the disconnect between the two.

Anthony explains that the environmental scan, for example, was work as a resource to the board to inform them as they moved through the Strategic Plan. He doesn't see this as any different. Now the board has to determine what pieces they want to extract from the PR Strategy that coincide with what they're currently working on in the plan. Anthony explains that the PR Strategy becomes a piece of resource material for the board for Public Relations.

- David is trying to get a sense of the board to mesh the PR strategy and the strategic plan to confirm they're going in the right direction.
- Becky states that the strategies in the PR Strategy plan are different work than the PRHB. She's trying to figure out herself how to mesh the two together. There is no neat box that this material will go to. The marriage of the two workgroups will occur by a discussion with staff first then a discussion with David and Ron.

David thanks everyone for letting him be of service.

No objection to extending the board's appreciation to the workgroup for the work that was done.

Recovery anniversaries were celebrated with a cake, candles, and song for Giovanna, Muk, Saul, Anthony, Ron H, and Ron M.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Special Interest or Common Needs Meetings

At the EC June meeting the issue of Special Interest meetings was further discussed. This issue isn't so much about policy of special interest meetings at the world convention but rather looking at the practice as a fellowship to look at demographically specific populations; who is not in the rooms and why that is. The EC wishes to continue discussion with the board on this issue.

Anthony explains that up until this point nothing has been forwarded to the fellowship that a dialogue has taken place. The NAWS News (which will go out after this board meeting) will be the vehicle to discuss this issue with the fellowship as a frame. He imagines the board will target the NA Way to discuss this issue more than once.

Further noted that this discussion today is not the "end all" and the pressure is off that they can affect WCNA. The goal is to get the message to the fellowship.

Background/ Discussion

- Anthony explains some background around the issue of special interest meetings. There is a statement in the current convention guidelines that would look to prohibit common needs meetings but more than that it's been used to stifle discussions on the issue. The Gay/Lesbian community has brought this issue up a number of times. The aforementioned guideline has been used to prevent meetings from being in conventions, world conventions, and in some places, meeting directories. There have been two attempts at the WSC to change the guidelines. There's been avoidance with this topic for at least the last ten years. At the world convention, special interest groups have had to put up a sign to denote that the meeting was self put together.
- Ron H believes it's an issue of identification as an addict, before identifying as special interest (i.e. gay, lesbian, youth, etc.). We're not looking at what we have in common but what we don't have in common. Personally believes that this has become the tired old lie keeping NA from missing the boat and excluding members from membership by not feeling welcome. Doesn't believe it's about homophobia.
- Would like to be in the middle of the argument and not opposed to common needs meetings.
- Piet suggests having more discussion with the fellowship on the issue—perhaps as an IDT.
- Mary suggests an IDT. Likes the fact that the board is not only looking at women, gay/lesbian, youths but also lawyers, doctors, dentists and other professionals. Gets asked "where do the professionals go?" At SEZF they asked her to do the infrastructure topic specifically on conventions and events. The issue of diversity came up and a young group concluded that NAWS refusal to have common needs meetings has caused disunity as apposed to unity.

- Jim believes it won't affect his world but will affect somebody else's world to better hear the message of recovery. A place for youths to go and a place for professionals to go--these are things missing where he's from.
- Craig believes people need other forms of identification.
- Ron M is in support of framing the issue for the fellowship and is open-minded to where the board goes with this.
- Muk is concerned about the professional groups. Her experience has been that they don't give up their "stuff". Believes people may cling to identities that don't serve them to cling to and keeps them from recovering. Personally, she wouldn't had stayed clean if she went to professional meetings. She was forced to become a human being. She is for keeping the doors open for all.
- Tom M reminds that NA is a result of a special interest meeting from AA. Believes that this may not be a fix for the fellowship; but an awareness. Is glad the board is slowing down on this issue.
- Bob reminds that if the board wants to make this issue an IDT it will need to be framed by the board. The issue of predators came up as a result of the PR roundtables and not sending youths to meetings. This is a personal issue and allows each board member to share.
- Anthony recalls that he thinks he wrote that paragraph in the convention guidelines. He feels deeper about this issue more than any other. People are either tied to the first tradition or the fifth tradition. He was able to get clean in an environment that was similar to a special interest meeting. He was allowed to get clean in an environment where most people looked like him. The issue is about who we are as a fellowship. Most things are in the vein of homogeneity is a good thing and anything outside of that vein was looked at as dangerous. Suggests getting right up front on the energy on the issue. Would imagine framing a discussion at the conference. It's going to require the board to be cautious. The board should think about how to effectively frame the issue so the fellowship can discuss it effectively.

Post on the FTP site for the board the conference actions on this issue along with the current language in the convention guidelines.

Corporate Responsibilities

It was suggested to make business cards for board members with the board's email address on it. Anthony agreed and explained that we make business cards for professional events.

Action item list: Business cards will be made for board members.

Corporate

Investment Policy

Anthony presented the Investment Policy and explained that for the last two years the Business Plan Group (BPG) has focused on a written policy and felt it was much needed. Some might feel the policy is too complex but it's more than adequate to meet the needs of NAWS. The policy can be changed at any time and is a fluid document. The BPG may come back to the board with some revisions.

- It was inquired if Anthony sensed any philosophical booby traps by the fellowship about investing money. Anthony explained that just because the policy allows for investments, doesn't mean that it would occur. Further added that they would get professional advice and there was no resistance from the WSC to use a brokerage house.

Anthony will edit the numbering in the Investment Policy

The Investment Policy was unanimously adopted with corrections.

Reserves

The new reserves policy would change from 90 days operations to one year WSC support and fellowship development.

No objections noted for changing the reserve policy to one year WSC support and fellowship development; which is 3.6 million dollars.

No objections to agreeing with the BPG's recommendations to hold off for another year to 5% increase pricing.

Corporate Resolutions

Anthony pointed out a few differences from last years corporate resolutions. First is the name "Becky Meyer" as it appears anywhere in the document will change to "Rebecca Meyer" in the new version of the corporate resolutions. Second difference from last year is you will see optional language such as "may up to;" this is to keep from being bound to having a number of accounts in institutions.

Unanimously no objections to adopt corporate resolutions with corrections noted.

Donations

Anthony explained that in the BPG meeting they discussed the possibility of e-blasting the WCNA 31 pre-registrants alerting them of the donations portal. He wanted a straw poll on this issue and realizes this may result in more discussion. In effect, it would be a solicitation even though the email would simply say it's there. It would be an informational email. The BPG believes that if there is no aggressive approach, nothing will change. An attempt of something will be better than nothing.

It was noted that the donations portal has been communicated to the fellowship in NAWS News, etc but hasn't been a consistent campaign. Also noted, the online shopping cart has become the most used vehicle to order literature.

- David suggests putting a cover saying this is an experiment to perhaps 100 members. Personally, he donates for his group and it's been so much simpler for him to use the portal.
- Anthony shared that if you're going to piss folks off you might as well ask them to donate.
- Jim suggests a "did you know" approach.

Anthony noted that they're working on EFT and ACH as well as credit cards.

Future agenda item: more aggressive approach regarding donations

Iran

It was noted that the Iranian banks are not specifically noted in the Corporate Resolutions for reasons discussed. The wording purposely is so, so that the responsibility falls on Anthony and not on the board members. Has chosen not to broadcast the specific details in Iran. Siamek has been denied into the US a number of times. They're working to get him to Hawaii but he's not very hopeful. He's thinking about a follow up visit to Iran toward the end of the year. More will be revealed.

Legal Update

Both lawsuits are still in existence.

Approve April Minutes

Bob had several correction edits:

Page 9

Page 19 it would be either on or off the internet.

Page 26: June add EC meeting both times

No objections to adopting the April minutes as corrected.

Review Action Item List

There were no project ideas submitted. Item number 22 is in progress to contract her for an ASL translation.

- Ron H asked how the Action Item List needs to be regarded. Anthony replied that it should be looked at in between board meetings and to remain in front of the board members. This is the reference for the EC and staff to frame future agendas. It's completely appropriate if board members inquire when they notice a date that is near or passed.
- Business cards will be added to this list.

At the October meeting will provide board members with Emergency contact cards that staff receive.

David will do an action group for the October meeting.

2006-2008 NAWS Strategic Plan OBJECTIVES and DRAFT APPROACHES With Prioritization

SERVICE OBJECTIVES

Key Result Area: Communication

Issue: Issue Management/NA Philosophy

Objective 1: Identify, frame and better facilitate a dialog with members around current issues and NA philosophy. [Priority rating: 4.0]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Follow up on the 2004-2006 Issue Topics
- ◆ Framing and promoting Fellowship Issue Discussions for 2006-08 (explain the origin of the issue, the context and intended use of the input)
- ◆ Fellowship interactions at zonal forums and workshops
- ◆ Alter CAR to become more of a discussion-based document

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Develop a process and tools for consistent, efficient synthesis and reporting of issue discussions.
2. Ensure concrete follow-up to issue discussions as appropriate (e.g., a report, a set of recommendations or suggested next steps, or a definitive position on the issue).

Issue: Communication Infrastructure

Objective 2: Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of world service communication, using techniques that will resonate with diverse audiences. [Priority rating: 3.8]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Redesign of www.na.org (including making information more accessible through the website, such as sharing results of workshops, information on issues, an improved Bulletin Board, etc.)
- ◆ Maximize current travel opportunities for improved communication

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Maximize contact with Regional Delegates to improve their effectiveness as a NAWS communication link.
2. Maximize conventions as a learning opportunity.
3. Branch out beyond traditional communication tools (e.g., DVD, cartoon IPs, etc.)
4. Develop on-line live workshops.

Issue: PR/Outreach

Objective 3: Enhance perception of NA as a credible program of recovery through implementation of a PR strategy and strengthening of relationships with others with mutual interests. [Priority rating: 4.0]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Finalize the PR Handbook
- ◆ NAWS presence at professional events

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Create new tools for use by NAWS and for the fellowship at the local level (e.g., videos, PSAs, training materials).
2. Expand outreach and pro-active approach with targeted professionals, media, government officials, NGOs, etc.
3. Periodically gather a broader range of input to assess perceptions of NA (assess at the NAWS level, and provide tools other levels can use to gather data).
4. Better follow-up with and maintain relationships with related organizations (e.g., NAR ANON).

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Issue: Service Structure Effectiveness

Objective 4: Increase the effectiveness of the service structure at all levels by instilling a greater sense of purpose, plan, role, accountability and responsibility. [Priority rating: 4.4]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Facilitate implementation of PR Handbook and Area Planning Tool

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Create basic tools for group and area and region.
2. Have a more holistic discussion about the service structure as a system.

Issue: Support to Developing Communities

Objective 5: Help build and sustain all NA communities, recognizing their differing levels of development and need. [Priority rating: 4.1]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Continue to develop partnerships with regions and zones
- ◆ Increase level of registrations and intellectual property management in developing communities
- ◆ Workshops

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Pro-actively identify communities in unique developmental situations. Create mechanisms for follow-up (e.g., develop a model for differing levels of developing communities to assess need, etc.)

Issue: Diversity

Objective 6: Make the NA message available and relevant to a widely diverse membership and potential membership. [Priority rating: 4.0]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Basic Text project
- ◆ Streamlined approach to evaluate existing translations

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Produce targeted literature already identified and approved.
2. Structure discussion around broadening access to the NA message and fostering an atmosphere of recovery for a diversifying membership (stress First Tradition unity along with the needs of demographically specific populations).
3. Engage in a discussion and begin a process to meet the needs of diverse populations in a more timely manner.
4. Develop an ongoing outcomes assessment to identify targeted populations.

ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Key Result Area: Leadership and Management

Issue: Delivery System

Objective 7: Re-evaluate and refine the delivery (and follow-up) system for products and services to a global fellowship. [Priority rating: 3.3]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ◆ Reevaluation of the literature distribution system by the Business Plan Group.
- ◆ Increased promotion of the 'shopping cart' and 'contribution portal' of the website.
- ◆ Target workshop focus to development needs of the area/region and ensure 'take away' value to reinforce concepts and techniques discussed.

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Evaluate the literature distribution system.
2. Provide a component of the website for groups, areas, and regions to post and share tools, techniques, best practices, etc.
3. Compile a list of currently available services.

Issue: Leadership Development

Objective 8: Cultivate, encourage and support leaders for all levels of the service structure. [Priority rating: 4.1]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle
[NONE]

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)
[TO COME]

Key Result Area: Resources

Issue: Financial Capacity

Priority One is in Blue

Priority Two is in Green

Priority Three is in Yellow

Objective 9: Ensure the long-term financial stability of NAWS, and the reliability of the income stream, in order to carry out priorities and service. [Priority rating: 3.8]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ♦ Business Plan Workgroup and their work on pricing, literature distribution system, etc.
- ♦ Redefine and expand donation portal (e.g., to include automatic deduction, etc.)
- ♦ Implement the investment policy on how to manage reserve funds.

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Develop a strategy to increase reserves to one year of operating expenses.
2. Develop a plan to ensure the World Convention breaks even (including allocated overhead).

Objective 10: Raise awareness and a sense of responsibility on the part of the fellowship to adequately fund the cost of NAWS services. [Priority rating: 3.7]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle
[NONE]

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Initiate an active campaign to solicit contributions and to encourage use of the on line donations link (include creating a column in *NA Way* with factoids communicating the source and distribution of funds).
2. Review both IPs on self support to see if they are relevant to today's member (include updates on technology and a strong sense of member responsibility).

Issue: Staff Capacity

Objective 11: Build and align the focus and capacity of staff to support identified priorities. [Priority rating: 4.1]

Existing Approaches to be carried over into the 2006-08 Planning Cycle

- ♦ Hiring and increased training of staff.
- ♦ Increase awareness and appreciation of office-wide priorities at all-staff meetings.
- ♦ Increase cross-training.

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)

1. Schedule adequate time on conference cycle calendar for staff training, teambuilding and planning.

Note: averaged priority ratings for Objectives were based on a scale of '5' high and '1' low, according to the strategic importance of pursuing the Objective in the coming planning cycle.

NAWS Strategic Planning, 2006-2008 RESULTS OF ROUND 1 and ROUND 2 PRIORITIZING

| 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----|--------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | SECOND | THIRD | SECOND | | SECOND | FIRST | | | FIRST | |
| 5.1 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| SECOND | FIRST | SECOND | | | | THIRD | | | | | |
| 9.1 | 9.2 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 11.1 | | | | | | | |
| THIRD | | FIRST | | FIRST | | | | | | | |

NOTES

NAWS Leadership Development Session 1 and Session 2

April 21, 2005 – WB, HRP, staff management team

July 15, 2005 – WB, HRP, staff management team

Foundation for Leadership Development System

| NAWS Leadership Principles | Leadership Cultivation Factors |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 |

Member Involvement in NA/Service Structure

| Levels of Involvement | Necessary Factors to Cultivate Involvement |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 1: Passive/Attendee</i></p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ goes to a meeting ◆ has a desire to stay clean | <p><i>Passive Attendee to Participant</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ feel a part of the group ◆ identify self as a member ◆ see a willingness to serve in others ◆ effort by others to reach out and engage these members ◆ sponsorship; encouragement ◆ a basic orientation <p><i>Participant to Active Contributor</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ have a do-able task ◆ have a positive volunteer experience ◆ have a sense of worth/have something to offer |
| <p><i>Level 2: Participant</i></p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ shares at a meeting ◆ is a sponsee ◆ puts money in the basket ◆ is willing to contribute at some level ◆ welcomes newcomers at meetings/shows interest in newcomers | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 3: Active Contributor* Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ desire to make a change ♦ opportunity ♦ serve by example ♦ invite to volunteer ♦ agendas that encourage participation ♦ understanding of commitment and responsibility, and pay off |
| Level 4: Leader Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ holds non-titular leadership roles ♦ 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 | Active Contributor to Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ sense of responsibility leading to commitment ♦ recovery based service (mature in working the steps) ♦ encouragement ♦ delegating authority ♦ sense of having something more to offer ♦ clear requirements for the position ♦ talent matched to task ♦ effective nominations process ♦ mentoring |
| Level 5: Veteran Leader Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ continues to sponsor ♦ looks at service as a career (lifelong service to fellowship) ♦ was a board member, chair, etc. | Leader to Veteran Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ desire to stay involved (some ego) ♦ sense of selflessness ♦ desire to mentor; contribute ♦ acknowledged value (system for this) ♦ appropriate roles/opportunities ♦ sense of obligation ♦ continued communication to stay in the loop |

Notes:

- ♦ critical turning point in involvement occurs between the *participant* and *active contributor* levels
- ♦ development of member through the levels of involvement is *cumulative*; for example, an 'Active Contributor' would still exhibit the some of the characteristics of involvement of the 'Participant' (e.g., s/he would continue to 'welcome and show interest in newcomers').

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

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Events and Fellowship Interaction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 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 | <p><i>Workgroups and Volunteer Opportunities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 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 |
| <p><i>Training and Orientation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Workshops (in general) ◆ World Board orientation and training ◆ Zonal Forums programs ◆ WSC programs ◆ World Convention programs | <p><i>Systems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ HRP ◆ World Pool and interview process ◆ Self nomination ◆ New nominating process |
| <p><i>One-on-One</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ personal contact by Board and sponsors at events, etc. ◆ mentoring others | |

Preliminary Assessment of NAWS Leadership Development System**General**

| Organizational Environment | Opportunities for Involvement |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 <p><u>Weaknesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 <p><u>Weaknesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ recovery issues ♦ low self-esteem ♦ fear of commitment ♦ struggles with being a member of the community ♦ non-welcoming atmosphere | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ some structured welcoming (key tag) ♦ atmosphere of recovery ♦ newcomer support and resources ♦ steps/sponsorship ♦ literature | <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ reading the readings ♦ acknowledgement of clean time <p><i>Weaknesses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ inconsistency ♦ cliques ♦ language barriers ♦ lack of targeted literature ♦ group-level leadership |
| Step | Barriers | Current Strategies | Strengths/Weaknesses |
| Moving From Participant to Active Contributor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ personally inviting ♦ announcements (bland) ♦ learning days/flyers/workshops/conventions ♦ orientations ♦ combined with fun events ♦ support person/mentor ♦ sponsorship ♦ personal sharing | <p><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ drafting people ♦ personal role works when done <p><i>Weaknesses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 | <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ one-to-one mentoring ♦ use of publications to inform fellowship ♦ beginning to make service look attractive ♦ sponsorship ♦ workgroup structure (creates a training/testing ground) <p><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 Veteran Leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ burnout ♦ unwillingness to let go ♦ no appreciation/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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 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 |

Areas for Improvement in NAWS Leadership Development System

| | |
|---|---|
| Opportunities for Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ how to access opportunities (need a focal point for information about opportunities); lack of volunteer management/coordination ♦ needs not clearly defined (lack of planning for needs) ♦ some opportunities demanding regarding time and dollars ♦ lack of range of opportunities ♦ continuing opportunities to serve and use your experience (lack of systems view, that also respects principle of rotation) ♦ language barrier | Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ rigidity of culture ♦ false perceptions about volunteering ♦ consistent understanding of leadership concepts ♦ perception of 'clique' that hold positions (feeling of isolation, not open to new member involvement) ♦ culture change – it takes more than willingness to serve ♦ don't have 'ethical guidelines' for leadership ♦ no culture of mentorship responsibility (except through sponsorship) ♦ negative perceptions about leadership (vilified; leaders are a target) ♦ poor models of leadership ♦ false distinction between recovery and serve |
| Processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ no evaluation mechanism ♦ World Pool – expectations for involvement (unrealistic?) ♦ Weak transition between leaders ♦ Weak identification process – match talent to task (weak requirement) | People <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Lack of sufficient orientation for volunteers/leaders ♦ Better use of previous experience ♦ Weak – don't nurture/cultivate potential (help them develop) ♦ Training at all levels, particularly Area and Local (the basics – how to facilitate a meeting; how to plan, etc.) |

- ◆ Need to broaden methods to identify talent/interest (maximize the service infrastructure to do this)
- ◆ Need to better use meetings/activities/interactions with the fellowship to identify talent
- ◆ Process to ensure basic requirements met before take on role

- ◆ Put people in positions before they have worked the steps

NAWS Leadership Development Strategy - General

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Passive/Attendee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ New Member Orientation (program; personal contact; materials) ◆ An Atmosphere of Recovery ◆ Communication of the Responsibilities of Membership ◆ Basic Tools for Groups |
| Participant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Message regarding the link between service and recovery ◆ Clarity of purpose, plan, and need for member talent/experience ◆ Active mentorship (a sense of responsibility to mentor on the part of leadership) ◆ Tools/training for meeting management, delegation, soliciting involvement, etc. ◆ Centralized resource/coordination for service opportunities |
| Active Contributor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Expanded involvement opportunities (including small tasks that remove barriers of personal resources, language, etc.) ◆ Training and orientation ◆ Clear job requirements, expectations and commitment ◆ Pro-active, wide-spread identification program for emerging leaders within each level of service and to move up levels of services ◆ Mentoring and coaching ◆ Recognition strategy ◆ Evaluation strategy |
| Leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Training and orientation ◆ Coaching; a smooth transition between leaders ◆ Recognition/acknowledgement of contribution and the impact ◆ Performance assessment (personal and group) ◆ Effective vetting progress for candidates (match talent to task) ◆ Spiritual principles of NA applied to the leadership role ('standards of behavior') |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Veteran Leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Continued communication of information (with consideration of confidentiality) ◆ Continued rewarding, substantive involvement opportunities (e.g., resource list; mentor; trainer) ◆ Smooth transition between leaders (e.g., on the WB) ◆ Recognition |
|-----------------------|---|

NAWS Leadership Development Strategy – World Service Track

| | |
|---|--|
| Passive/Attendee | Publications (<i>NA Way</i>) with message about value of contributing – Group Starter Kit |
| Participant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Participate in a workshop ◆ Review and provide input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Attend WWW ◆ Participate in CAR or issue discussion at local level | Observation and methods to identify and solicit at events such as WSC, Worldwide Workshops, Zonal Forums, World Convention, and other fellowship workshops. Identify the shining stars. World service modeling effective leadership at workshops and forums. Publications with articles with value of contribution, personal responsibility. World Pool. Personal contact. |
| Active Contributor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Speaker ◆ Work group member ◆ Organize input at local level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ WCNA support member ◆ Facilitator at a WWW | Includes most Delegates. Orientation and support – WSC, workgroups, WNA support. Modeling behavior. World Pool. Personal contact. Recognition. Issue Discussion Tools and Support. |
| Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Work group chair ◆ World Board member <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ HRP member ◆ Co-Facilitator ◆ EC member | Also includes some Delegates. Training and orientation. Recognition. Tools and Support. Opportunity to travel and interact with the fellowship – personal development opportunity. |
| Veteran Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Previous WB member | Could also include past delegates, HRP. Co facilitators, or workgroup members. Recognition. Keep on mailing list. Some level of continuing involvement with workgroups. |