Wednesday 19 October

Present: Bob Jordan, Jim Buerer, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Piet de Boer, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall.

Not Present: Craig Robertson and David James will be arriving later. Daniel Schuessler, Giovanna Ghisays and Saul Alvarado are unable to attend this board meeting.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, and Carrie Ray

9:00am: The Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Action Group

Mary B led the board in an action group. Each member read the quote-portion out of *Just for Today* for their clean date sharing how it applies today.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Basic Text Project - Ron Hofius and Travis

Update

Ron began the report by explaining the premise the workgroup is currently working with: to not pull any story out of the current Basic Text unless it is replaced with a better one. At this time in the solicitation process, the workgroup doesn't have a lot of material that they feel will make a better text than the current one. He knows there are good writers out there that will look at the solicitation and then send submissions.

Call to Action

Travis explained that we've talked a lot in board meetings about mentorship and leadership cultivation as principles that the board can pass on to the fellowship. But doing this may mean more than just an announcement about the Basic Text project at the front of the room. For example, if each board member helped a couple of people submit their experience by coaching and encouraging them we could have the Sixth Edition we all hope to have. The cut-off is 31 December 2005; however, if members send submissions in after that date its okay as we will have to keep filling gaps.

Call to Action Discussion

- It was asked what can be done when a member has a great story but doesn't have great writing skills.

  One option is to have them write the story the best they can—which may not get through the evaluation radar screen. A second option might be to submit their name to Travis to be interviewed. A third option, which is currently happening in Sweden, is where a woman is interviewing and writing stories for members that don't have strong writing skills but have a great story. Helping each other is the key.

- It was asked if the workgroup talked about having a back up if they don't get what they want.

  This shouldn't occur unless board members help make this happen. It's going to take personal coaching for people since it wouldn't occur to most members to write their own stories, which is what happens at all levels of service. It was pointed out that there is a seven month period (from January to July) to fill in the gaps. Although the other items that Ron and Travis need to discuss during this session are more time consuming, this topic is the most important at this time.

- When Bob is asked when the deadline is, he tells members two weeks because they will never write their story if given too big of a window. Follow up with emails, phone calls, and encouragement.

Existing stories: Workgroup Recommendation

The process the workgroup used to arrive at a recommendation was explained: The board and the workgroup evaluated the existing stories, then a report was generated that ranked stories on the basis of recovery content. Separately, the workgroup looked at the historical role of the member and the historical role of the story but recovery content was always the most important criteria. The workgroup really agonized over this process and it didn't come easy. The following is a list of five stories the workgroup recommends as "probable keepers":

1. Mid-Pacific Serenity
2. I Found the Only NA Meeting in the World
3. I Was Different
4. If You Want What We Have
5. Up From Down Under

The reason why number five made the cut was because it talks about Atheism which the workgroup thought touched on the project's demographic considerations.

The following is a list of six stories the workgroup recommends as "maybes":

1. Alien (in addition to recovery content, this story had some historical value)
2. Part of the Solution
3. Sick and Tired at Eighteen
4. Fearful Mother (in addition to recovery content, the historical role of the member was a factor)
5. If I Can Do it So Can You (in addition to recovery content, the historical role of the member was a factor)
6. Little Girl Grows Up (while we evaluated this fairly high, the workgroup felt the story is too long)

The workgroup felt it was important to retain a woman's story even if it didn't necessarily rate strong on recovery content. The workgroup felt that the women's stories had significant role of the member simply by being women in early NA. A few of the "maybe" stories might be pulled for "probable keepers" based on what new stories come in.

CAR Content

The discussion moved to what should be said in the CAR regarding the "some or all" issue. Should the board put this list in the CAR to stir up the fellowship and get them talking? Perhaps now is the time to have this conversation with the fellowship as opposed to waiting for two years. Is the board comfortable with the workgroups recommendation? If so how does the board want to frame this discussion with the fellowship in the CAR?

CAR Content Discussion

- Michael feels that none of the existing stories should be in the new version of the Basic Text.

    It was explained that the workgroup is moving on the board's premise of "some" and Michael is voicing "all." It was suggested that the board needs to get clear on the some or all issue first.

- Ron B knows that the local members in his community are pleased to know that "Up From Down Under" might be taken out; although personally he thinks it's a good story. He is for the idea of keeping some of the stories. He is comfortable with the list and with floating it in the CAR.

- Jim is comfortable with the list and is for forwarding in the CAR. He isn't sure we could go down the all or nothing path based on the fact that we're not getting enough material in to remove all the existing stories. He will make a personal commitment to encourage and mentor folks to send in their story.

Some or All

The question was posed: Does the board want to keep some or all?

- Ron H proposed keeping some of the stories

- Michael is opposed and read all the stories. He feels this is a new time in NA and that NA is a growing fellowship and the Sixth Edition is a chance to move on and get some new stuff. He isn't attached with any of the names or the stories in the existing edition and is for the idea of putting the old stories in a historical book. He is hopeful that if the board pushes for stories they can get brand new wonderful stories that are just as good or better.

- Anthony is for keeping some of the existing stories. He believes the personal stories section in the Fifth Edition is a legacy of the fellowship. As a point of reference, we admonish members that use versions that are not approved. He can respect that NA is not new, but in some ways it still is. We have a responsibility to the fellowship to represent our legacy. He agrees with a historical section in respect to our legacy in the Sixth Edition. It strikes him as being disrespectful to those that came before him to wipe out what was our shared experience in print.

Ron conducted a quick straw poll on removing some of the stories. Everyone was for removing some except for one board member.

- Muk is somewhere between Michael and Anthony. She believes seven is too many to keep and goes against what we are doing here. She is for fewer than seven.

Michael was asked if he could live with moving forward with keeping some of the stories. Michael acknowledges the legacy aspect that Anthony has spoken about. The Basic Text in Spain doesn't have any stories in it. He thinks there are millions of copies of previous editions of the text around if someone wants to read the stories. He will stand with this group to move forward with keeping some of the existing stories.

The board agreed to remove some but not all of the existing stories.

CAR Content Cont'd

Ron suggested not publishing the maybes as a separate list, but perhaps including both the maybes and the probables as one list in the CAR. It should be conveyed that this list is being considered with the understanding that no stories will be removed without a better story to replace it.

CAR Content Discussion

- The board might be putting themselves unintentionally in a box that they will not be able to get out of. We would have to clearly articulate this subject to take the box away. How would you measure between the existing and the new submissions? This could cause a problem in publishing that point. We could lose flexibility by publishing a list based on members becoming entrenched in the list.

- Some other concerns were if the board publishes the list in the CAR, members could think they need to vote on the list. Also, members will want to make motions to keep stories and get too much into specifics.

Becky pointed out that the board doesn't know exactly what they're going to do and putting this level of specificity in the CAR will encourage members to stay in the details. Review & Input is a long process for the fellowship to review. Because it's not clear what the board is going to replace the existing stories with, she doesn't know that this level of detail should be put it in the CAR. Tell the truth: We're only certain about five stories but other than that we don't know. Give them the information we know now.

- It was pointed out that if we don't get more great new stories we will need to keep more than 5-7.

- It would make it clear that we're talking about creating something dramatically different without painting ourselves into a corner that we've made a choice to replace 31 stories. Part of the "truth" message could be it seems irresponsible to make more definitive decisions about the project since the solicitation process isn't finished yet. "The project plan said this and we still intend to..." From experience, members don't respond well to bluntness even when it's the truth. We can tell the truth without causing more harm than we intend. We can still get a response/feedback.

- What we're keeping is diversity and there is a way to frame it in the spirit of the project and the legacy. Travis is hopeful that we can frame it in a way that's appealing to the fellowship.

- Tom asked what the fellowship's reaction has been so far regarding the some or all issue, as he hasn't heard much about it. Perhaps what we defend against, we make real.

- It was asked if any of the existing stories' members have been contacted for an interview or to submit a new story.

  We did send letters to all of the existing story authors communicating the project and encouraging them to submit. We got a story from an existing member that wasn't very well written.

- Mary believes members are sitting back simmering and ready to attack based on the board's communication to the fellowship on the some or all issue. She is for communicating in the CAR that we're keeping some and being very careful not to say 31 are no good. She isn't sure she agrees with the list as is and adding some woman and removing a few of the five without seeing what new submissions will come in. She believes we should have some discussion in the CAR regarding keeping some as opposed to specifics. We need to hear from the fellowship and open it up for discussion on the issue. We're trying to figure out what the truth is supposed to be. We don't know yet. Perhaps, we should speak in percentages.

Ron H said that he is hearing from the board not to be too specific as to how many stories to keep. We will communicate our process and our thinking as to how this is shaping up. Thinks "some" is a little too vague and believes we can frame the discussion to keeping 5-7 and explaining the issue better and that it's being considered using generally the same criteria as the new submissions.

Becky reminded all that a month from this meeting the board will be out doing CAR workshops and the CAR will be out. The board is supporting a direction that they need to have a vision of. The board may have a hard time discussing the vision based on a specific number.

Anthony pointed out that the natural question will be which five, which seven, and why. Doesn't think the board is decided enough to get specific with numbers. The people that are simmering will get some information and know that the board is moving along. If you decide to publish a number you need to explain in the narrative which ones, why and how.

Ron H recapped that to respect Michael's opinion and Anthony's on legacy we could explain this in the narrative. Ron supports saying 20-25 percent and/or a number. Generally where we see it;

however, the number we retain will be based on what we get in and that we invite a conversation about that.

- Muk thinks that 25% goes above 7 which she is not for. As earlier expressed she wants fewer stories than 7.

- Mary suggests communicating that the finished product will have 20-25% existing stories and 75-80% of new stories.

The board agreed to publish in the CAR a rough percentage of how many existing stories will be kept in the Sixth Edition (15-25%). A rough draft will be sent to the board for input with a quick turnaround.

South Florida request

NAWS received an email from the South Florida region requesting that the board engage the fellowship using a survey to gage which stories to keep or replace. Travis had a discussion with the inquirer at WCNA 31 and encouraged him to send an email to the world board.

Board Member Submissions

As a point of information, Ron H explained that he hasn't participated in this discussion in any way with the workgroup. The memo from the workgroup explains that they strongly believe it's in conflict for a board member to submit a story. Travis added that this issue has taken on a life of its own. The workgroup's main concern is that it would undermine the integrity of the project since the decision makers would approve the stories.

Board Member Submissions Discussion

- Ron M said that he believes the board needs to come to a consensus and proposes that board members should not be able to submit their story.

- Tom explained that he knows the board is having this discussion because he expressed a desire to submit his story. He felt uncomfortable reading the memo and believes the stories should be about the message and not who the author is. His personal fear is that the 6th Edition won't have some factors in it that he would like to see in the new book. He believes he should be able to participate in at least forwarding some of the things he would like to see in the Sixth edition. The motivation should be to create the best book possible and feels the knee-jerk reaction from the workgroup is based around personalities and not a good book. He would still like the right to write his story but will surrender to the conscience of the board, but based on principle. He doesn't want to surrender. He believes that if you had never heard him speak at a convention then you wouldn't know that it was him as the author.

Ron H pointed out that board members don't speak at World Conventions and HRP members don't run for the board. How does Tom's point reconcile with these ideals?

Tom answered that one of his biggest premises about the Basic Text is he looks at the existing stories and there isn't much substance around the principles of recovery. Already, the workgroup is saying they aren't seeing much in the new submissions and feels that he wants to contribute. He would recuse himself from any decision making process should his story get to the last cut.

- Michael felt that the memo was hostile and he was hurt. Although it's not his intentions to submit, it still upset him a great deal. He believes the board members are a part of NA's heritage and believes they shouldn't be excluded from the process. It's an anonymous process and he would support Tom on his thoughts.

- Mary believes the workgroup wrote this memo based on fear. She has faith that the fellowship will rise above the personalities over a strong message. She defends any board member who writes

their story, even though she probably won't submit. She said that she has faith in the fellowship that they won't have a hard time with a board member submitting their story.

Travis made it clear that she doesn't think the workgroup believes that any board member couldn't stand on principle or personalities. The workgroup feels that this is not all about anonymity and that we are talking about authors of stories. She doesn't have an opinion on the issue personally. It wasn't anyone's intention to make the board feel hurt and offended and she felt the need to try to explain that.

Ron H conducted a straw poll on agreeing to not have board members submit their story. Three board members were for this idea.

Becky explained that what bothers her is the time and energy this topic has consumed. She believes a decision needs to be made.

Anthony thinks this is an issue and wonders if we should engage those we are responsible to, Conference Participants, and get their feel on it. This is a broader issue than just the board and perhaps that's the way to get a sense. He said that he believes you could say to the workgroup "thank you and we understand your concerns on the issue and it's the boards place to deal with this issue from here."

The board agreed to convey to the workgroup that the board hears them, the board got it, the ball is in the board's court and to ask the workgroup to continue to evaluate the stories anonymously.

KRA: Fellowship Support and Communications
PR Handbook Project

Update on the project - Ron Miller and Jane Nickels

The input from the fellowship has been factored into chapters 1-4. These chapters will be sent to the board on 25 October 2005 with input requested back by 31 October 2005 (depending on the release of the CAR). Please expect this material on these days and let someone know if you didn't receive it. It will be up on the FTP site and emailed. Chapters 5-9 were released early and we are awaiting input back from the fellowship by 30 November 2005.

The last workgroup meeting is scheduled to be in December. If the workgroup gets minimal input for chapters 10-13, it may not be logical to bring the workgroup back in March. It was noted that the workgroup is under budget at this time.

It was proposed to the board to release chapters 10-13 to the fellowship on 1 December 2005 for Review and Input for 90 days and to leave the 90 day approval period up to the conference.

The board agreed to release section 3 for 90 day Review and Input to the fellowship on 1 December 2005.

Approval Process and Distribution of Service Resource Material

CAT Material

The EC talked about putting the CAT on the website using a password page so that it's available to everyone. Draft material wouldn't be accessed without a password.

The board agreed to post the CAT on a passworded page on the website.

Approval Process of Service Resource Material

The current process for the approval of service material allows for distribution of material pending conference approval. Bulletins can be approved by the World Board alone and then distributed. The PR Handbook resource material is the current challenge. This resource material is what we are calling

the addendum material of the PR Handbook and it includes sample letters to professionals, the area planning tool, etc.

Becky explained that we're seeing some of the negatives with the policy concerning approval of service material. The board added the review and input period themselves to this project. Addendums are forms that change and should be allowed to be updated. At this point the addendum material is a resource that doesn't make sense under the current policy. It was a good intent but locking ourselves into longer approval and review periods is not a good idea and may not serve us.

Approval Process of Service Resource Material Discussion

- Ron H shared the intent of the policy which he remembered the term "pending conference approval" meant that it could be sold as any other approved item. This was how he understood it at the time.

  Becky explained the project plan for the PR Handbook that the board approved and the conference approved is a lot stricter than what is in the policy.

- This is the first time the board has taken a project and put it through from the beginning to the end and we're now seeing what's working and what's not working.

Anthony explained that again we're at a place of conveying what the situation is to the fellowship. It doesn't make any sense to shelf the handbook based on a policy fallacy.

Becky reminded all that material gets approved based on its audience. The project plan supersedes the policy. She is for changing the policy and believes international delegates will have an issue with distributing pending conference approved materials.

The board agreed to state clearly in the CAR what the board wants and give the conference some time to think about it. Convey that the object is to get this material to the right place. We were inexperienced with the policy which the project plan was developed from. The conference can approve chapters 10-13 if they choose or discuss how to handle "pending conference approval." Let the conference know what we think would serve members and give them the opportunity to choose based on the options we give them.

World Convention

WCNA 31 – Mike Polin

Mike provided an update of what occurred at WCNA 31 and asked the board for their ideas and perceptions about what worked and what could be improved.

There were a larger number of people in attendance than what was expected and there was an impact as a result of this number. We ended up spending more money buying materials on site. There was a ripple effect on the unexpected amount of people that showed up. Everyone felt the pinch of having this occur—from merchandise to registration. Mike said that he is looking at ways for how to reduce some of these issues for San Antonio. Some of the ways we can minimize this occurring again is by taking additional action. One way is having the ability to make reservations without having to put up cash and without going through a housing organization.

There are ways we can enhance our members' registration experience. Give the folks that pre-register something special for registering early. They should be rewarded.

The sense of entitlement that some of our members have is another important issue. We had a member physically assault a facility staff member. We feel a story needs to be told here to convey this message before San Antonio. This is a good opportunity to take some of those steps toward dealing with this issue.

On a positive note, we had an unprecedented level of PR through the Sunday morning breakfast, the Governor's appearance, the television interviews, and the radio shows. We Hope this is a strategy that we can build on for future conventions.

The newcomer donations were incredibly high for this event as well as the unity day donations.

Regarding audio recordings, we experimented on recording all of the meetings and workshops on one MP3 formatted CD-rom for $99 which accounted for most of the revenue. It was suggested to have a kiosk where one could download the mp3 onto their laptops.

WCNA 31 Brainstorm/Feedback

- Anthony explained that we have fewer problems with crowd control when we have 20,000 people in attendance than with a smaller amount. Also, we need some larger men working security.

- Mike explained that our goal is to do soft openings whenever possible. Substantial impact of having 25% more people than we expected didn't allow for proper planning time.

- It was asked where the barometer of members' intentions is of how much merchandise they can purchase.

   Every single person could have guaranteed themselves merchandise by pre-registering. Members didn't go to meetings until merchandise was sold out.

- Jim heard rave reviews about the San Diego merchandise system.

- It was explained that quantity limits called for dealing with merchandise functioning on Sunday with a plethora of merchandise left over. What happens is that we end up policing members on their intent of quantity limits.

- The idea of registering first before being able to reserve a room. Reserving tables would only be for pre-registrants.

Pros Post-IT:

- Soft opens
- Additional needs
- Close circuit TVs of workshops while standing in line
- Post-convention merchandise shopping cart
- Turn off stage lights
- Pictures of pre-reg merchandise
- More cash registers in merchandise
- San Diego merchandise line system
- Have merchandise online and ship to pre-reg before convention
- "Doors close at: " in Reg
- Pre-reg merchandise checkout
- Buy tables at events
- Communicate seating plans: FAQ
- Merchandise access based on date of registration

- Express lane
- Access for past trusted servants
- Color coded events seating
- Hit card when reserved
- Give CI more info to WB member
- Child care
- Hospitality room
- Alternate merchandise ops
- Exact cash reg lines
- More info in pre-reg news more access
- Tell the self-support cost story
- Wheelchair scooter vendor on site
- Local PR firm use
- More advanced pro-active PR work media
- Ship Pre reg pre convention
- Pay more $25 onsite

Cons Post-IT:

- Better event security
- Provide more information to additional needs members
- Signs need to be higher
- Access stairs to stage

- San Diego merchandise system
- Budget too tight
- Less choice in merchandise
- Better process for WSO lit sales
- Poor quality radio

Corporate

Spanish stories

The stories were approved by the past board. A portion of these stories will be put into a Spanish Little White Book. By conference policy, the current board needs to approve for their production.

The names will be removed uniformly from all of the stories as well as drug specificity. All copyedits from the front page will be put in with revisions.

The Spanish Little White Book stories were approved by the board for production.

French stories

These are a selection of French stories that are already in the Basic Text.

The French Little White Book stories were approved by the board for production.

Pre Reg Merchandise

It was explained that a small quantity of pre-registration merchandise is still available which we didn't want to sell to the public. A list went around for the board to purchase leftover items.

Approve July Minutes

The issue of legal names was briefly discussed. Muk requested to be referred to as Mukam in the minutes and not Sharon. This will be reflected in future minutes. She suggested that perhaps board members legal names will be reported at the beginning of their term or cycle and then their informal name will be used thereafter.

Regarding the final recommendation for possible candidates to be forwarded, the paragraph before the list regarding the 27 names was stricken from the record. It was noted that having the names in the minutes is not a form of reporting.

Staff will check if someone requests a copy of the July minutes if we could delete the nominees list.

There were no objections to approving the July 2005 World Board minutes.

Review Action Item List

Project Ideas: Item numbers 17, 18 and 19 need board action.

- Texts to Braille: A system is already in place to receive transcripts in Braille; it's just not a WSO inventory item.
- Purple GSR keytag: This idea was submitted last year and is still not looked at as a priority.
- Financial IP: will keep on file for future literature development.

No objection to the EC's recommendation for these projects.

> *Project Ideas Discussion*
>
> - Ron stated that he believes we're still struggling with how we give members a meaningful way to send in their ideas. Perhaps the ideas could go through the fellowship on a grass roots local level and not go through the board.

- Becky explained that the purpose was for ideas, but now it's become more of a production list.

- Anthony explained a good example was the idea to replace the music on hold at the office (because of the commercials). Regions are realizing that they don't necessarily need to make a motion. They will contact NAWS to forward their idea.

Business Cards

It was explained that the current business cards do not provide personal contact information.

- One option discussed was providing a personal email.

- Another option discussed was providing a fictitious email, for example Ron@na.org, which would automatically forward to the board member's personal email account.

It was noted that having an email address ending in na.org alludes to an official response from NAWS.

Produce business cards for board members. The board can choose to have either their personal email address along with the standard worldboard@na.org or just the standard email address on business cards.

Donations

It was suggested to use the word "contributions" on the donations portal. This will be discussed further during the Business Plan workgroup.

Emergency contact

Emergency contact cards were passed out and completed. If a trusted servant gets ill hopefully they are with a NAWS traveler that has a corporate card to cover all medical expenses. If someone outside of the US is at the WSO and a medical emergency comes up, we will facilitate medical attention without hesitation.

Legal Update

Anthony provided an update to the board.

Approve Revised Banking Bulletin #32

This bulletin was edited and revised to take away the language regarding entities. The focus changed to groups which are where over 90% of inquiries regarding tax and banking come from. The board already approved the bulletin, just not the corrections.

There were no objections to approving Bulletin #32.

Site under construction

The EC agreed to remove the information under the heading "Information for Professionals" from the website as it was extremely outdated. If someone clicks on this link it will say "Under Construction". This raised the issue that there are a few other areas that need to be updated as well.

The board ended the day with a sharing session that is not a recorded session.

Thursday 20 October

Key Result Area: Leadership Development

9:00am: The board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. David James and Craig Robertson arrived and were present.

Nominations

Back in July, the board displayed some disagreement regarding the leadership cultivation process. The board has participated in numerous discussions regarding leadership cultivation and the need for a system. The nominations' discussion that took place in July is a piece of this process. The board was uncomfortable with discussing the subject of people for varying reasons. The board might believe in cultivation as a broad premise; however, the board may be uncomfortable with its process and what it entails. The board must reach a consensus on what it means to cultivate leaders and what it means before approving the list of nominees. They represent the pinnacle for groups and service committees, and therefore need to be really clear in their belief of leadership cultivation. Before investing in building this system they must decide what they really believe.

Nominations Discussion

- It was asked how discussing nominees in July was relevant to cultivating leadership.

  It was explained that discussions regarding nominees on a personal level, for example, getting more women on the board, is a necessary process that must take place and be agreed upon. The board can always tweak the process; however, they need to be clear on the underlying principles.

- Ron H expressed his concern regarding the way in which the list was created: based on who each board member knew. He would prefer going light on picking names and work on building a process of cultivating leaders.

Anthony explained that we're spending $7,000 every time we spend a day talking about Leadership. He said that he hopes the board will get clear, philosophically, before moving any further in the process.

- Mary shared there is a necessary systemic need for this process, a great need in the fellowship. She feels there was a lack of direction in July which made her feel uncomfortable. There was no direction as to what the board needed before discussing specific names. She would have liked to know what she needed to look for. She wasn't prepared based on the lack of knowing what was needed. How does the fellowship access what they need first before electing trusted servants? The board needs to address this process so that they can model this process.

- Craig expressed that in the CAR draft it states numerous times the lack of resources which shows the need for a leadership development system. He has a vision based on the board's discussions and with Jim. The board needs to model the basics for the fellowship by identifying members then cultivating the identified leaders from there. He believes we're on the right track and believes the process is new which explains the messiness behind the July discussion. We have leaders but it's the leadership that's lacking; which is part of the leadership development system.

- Making a decision on the basis on what a nominee has done in service is not a full enough explanation of the process.

Needed on the board:

        o Bob: woman & business experience

        o Mary: non-US board members

        o Muk: African-American urban members

- Bob expressed it's difficult to talk about other NA members based on the principle of anonymity. Most of the people that were on the list were either on a workgroup or involved in World Services in some sort; in that way they had some cultivation. He was uncomfortable driving the car on a path that has yet to be paved.

- David felt uncomfortable during the July discussion. There is a difference between identifying and cultivating people; he doesn't see any problems with the HRP, from his perspective; he doesn't

think you can identify a specific demographic and then cultivate from there. He thinks we're going too far with the process of leadership—we can do something simpler.

- Piet notices, in the workgroups, new ways of doing things other than using parliamentary. We're moving into a new era and he can see that we're on the right path. He thinks we're well on our way even though he is a newcomer to the board. The board should slow down and not want too much too soon. The new tools he read about are going to help cultivate leaders. It might take some time for this information to go out, but a lot of people will benefit. He isn't afraid we will run out of leaders.

- Ron B thinks we picked a predictable list of people. After the conference, only two women will be left on the board. He asked if the board will have a conversation about what they need.

  The EC hasn't had a formal discussion about what the board needs. The board hasn't sent any demographic-needs information to the HRP.

- David isn't comfortable with identifying a demographic for the board. He feels we need to cultivate, not identify.

- We have a broad panel of people and we need some demographic direction to help select from that broad panel of people.

- A Higher Power is missing from this process. We're going into too much detail it doesn't need to be so complicated. There seems to be a lack of spiritual factoring missing from this process—it is only about what the board needs.

- Do more basic work, perhaps a policy of what the board would like to be. Create a standing policy— not a temporary year by year basis. It feels like we're reinventing the wheel.

- Craig doesn't believe we're talking about warm body syndrome. We're discussing something that is relevant in our service structure today. For example, for H&I panels his experience has shown having to be very selective as to who goes on panels similar to showing a snapshot of who NA is demographically. Craig wouldn't vote for someone just because they are a woman. He would vote for someone based on the qualities they could offer as a board member and that they are a woman. At WSC '99 no one was elected; a member came to him and said the HRP conspired etc; Craig suggested that perhaps a God worked in this process and it turned out exactly how it was supposed to turn out. The board can do the footwork and a Higher Power will do the rest.

- We lose a social connection when we lose Spanish members: Giovanna and Saul. We need more urban African-Americans on the board.

- Ron H believes this is a necessary philosophical discussion. He believes there is value in having different perceptions at the table, even though they may not have strong service structure background. Local members can say "the kind of perception I have is represented at the board," which provides solace. He doesn't think we should sacrifice the quality of recovery but also recognizes the need for certain diversity factors that are missing. Let's value diversity and let's go get it.

- Jim feels conflicted with believing that the process that got him here is defunct when the board seems well represented now. He asks if there are still pockets of the fellowship the board is not seeing. He feels honored to be sitting on the board but knows that someone else could well be there. The board could still function with the current system but is open to new possibilities. We need to try it out and refine it as we go along. We will learn some things from our experiences even though they're uncomfortable and a struggle. Let's see where it takes us; there's nothing to fear.

- The issue of affirmative action vs. merit is a common one amongst corporations. There is some discomfort with non-us folks being listed; would like to see it broken up a bit more.

- Tom explained that there was a certain point in discussing the Strategic Plan where the board realized they needed a leadership cultivation system before continuing with the Strategic Plan. The board needs to be committed in this process otherwise we won't be able to move in with the plan. There is a spiritual aspect to this process.

- Currently there is no system for those members who make it right up to the last process for the board. This is a resource that gets lost. They made it that far in the process and they should be recognized.

Anthony asked how many board members were previous regional delegates. (All but two board members were not previous delegates). Anthony believes the body may want to look at the overwhelming bias of this system, if the board believes in this system, or if there is a need for a change. This is what we'll predominantly get if something doesn't change. How do you get someone completely unknown to the conference or its process, if that something the board wants.

- Ron B noted that some board members haven't been delegates for a number of years. There's an overemphasis on the workgroups and those who have served on it before. Also the "shot gun approach" the HRP takes when approaching members with 10 plus years that don't necessarily have service experience.

- David believes that being a delegate or a strong link to the conference is an important filtering process in the leadership cultivation development. To elect someone with no experience with the conference doesn't sit well with him, based on the fact that board members serve the conference.

- Ron H feels there are two profiles that he's interested in and they are an ideal board member and ideal board. An ideal board member might be someone who has a good familiarity with the conference and business skills. He discussed the possibility of having someone that is a non-addict such as Jim DeLizia, Mike Quakenbush, or Bob Stone, for example, to serve on the board.

Becky noted that Khalil, who is now on the Business Plan Group, is a great example. This is a member who would never be a delegate. She can't imagine a board comprised of all members who have never been a delegate, but feels there should be some diversity of both. The conference will move and change based on the board's conversations with them.

Finalizing List of Names (*this section may be taken out of the approved minutes if necessary*)

The board reviewed the letter that went out to potential nominees as well as their responses. There were several potential nominees that didn't respond after a letter and a follow up phone call. Four people responded yes and five responded no. The following four members agreed to have their names forwarded to the HRP by the World Board:

1. Mark Hersh

2. Mark Henson

3. Tonia Nikolinakou

4. Tim Smith

There were no objections to the board forwarding the four names noted above to the HRP.

- It was asked if this list is too small to forward to the HRP. Bob responded that the process started with 27 names and dwindled down based on clean time, experience, and willingness.

  Becky thinks the board should communicate to the Conference Participants and the HRP that the board is still new in this process.

- Mary was uncomfortable that they started with such a broad slate and ended up with such a narrow number. Seems narrow and exclusive instead of broad and inclusive.

- Ron H wanted to state, for the record, that he is uncomfortable with the minimal number of names and gets the feeling the board could have nominated more names from the initial list of 27.

- Craig questioned the value in having three members from one geographical area of the world present on the board.

Out of support for the HRP process, the board was asked not to discuss any of the names including the initial 27, the 12 that were contacted, and the four that will be forwarded to the HRP.

Board Members for Reelection

The process for board member reelection will not be changed for this cycle. The two board members that are up for reelection, Ron Hofius and Tom McCall, will be submitting their names to the HRP.

It was noted that Bob had communication with Giovanna and that she is not interested in seeking reelection.

Anthony noted that future board members seeking reelection will need to comply with the self nominating process and complete a WPIF by the deadline.

- The process for the number of board members to elect was discussed. The terminology changed to 'up to 18 board members.' As the conference gets more familiar with this new process, the people that are new will be more willing to go through the process for reelection. There may be a problem when Jim is up for reelection. The board should forward a change in policy.

  Anthony reminded the board that they have an opportunity during the 06-08 conference cycle to evaluate the current policy and amend what's not working. He added that, at this point in the cycle, it's not possible to change policy.

- Bob read a passage from the Guide to World Services on page 14 regarding electing more than eight board members at the same time. It's an ideal which does not create a mandate.

Anthony stated that he believes the board needs have more discussion on having a mandate.

There were no objections to forwarding the two existing board members interested in reelection to the HRP as nominations coming from the board.

Corporate

Presentation of the 2004-2005 Audit - Mike Quackenbush

The 2005 audit was presented by Mike Quackenbush with Miller, Kaplan, Arase & Co., LLP, the auditor for NAWS. Mike provided a brief explanation of the auditing process.

Consolidated Financial Statements

Mike explained the first page which is known as a "clean opinion". The second page is the explanation of financial opinion. The amount of cash in the deferred revenue is a result of pre-payment for pre-registrants for WCNA 31 in Hawaii. NAWS has 5.6 million dollars in unrestricted net access.

The cost of sales reflected on page 3 of the audit report (on the line 'convention expense') does not include the costs associated with staff expense which is partially reflected in the line Expenses: salaries, wages, and taxes.

Internal Recommendations

Mike explained the letter to the World Board which discusses internal recommendations. There are some cautionary suggestions. Some of these are described below:

- Travelers should be more conscious and aware of taking travel expenses and paying it back in a timely manner.

Anthony explained that he is someone who struggles with doing this based on how much travel he does and his schedule.

- Reconsider reevaluating the allocation method in regard to whether the allocation percentage should vary from one year to the next; perhaps to consider an average percentage.

Amendments

- Mike will amend the Foreign Bank Accounts statement in the opinion.

- Mike will amend the year in Note 7 Contingencies which should read June 30, 2005 not 2004.

Fraud Letter

There was discussion about the Latin American bank account under "Findings and Recommendations" on page 4. NAWS is safeguarding the Latin American's money based on their request. Because the balance is small, at this time, Mike doesn't require NAWS to a restricted fund. The threshold to require a restricted fund would be approximately $8,000 dollars; and at this time it's at $5,800.

- Mike sent confirmation letters to two regional service offices with balances unpaid.

   Audit Questions/Discussion:

   - It was asked if it would be beneficial to show two conference cycles as apposed to two years.
      - o Mike suggested showing three years which would show one convention year, one off convention year, and one convention year back on.
      - o Anthony explained that conference policy asks for NAWS to report two years even though the audit shows one fiscal year.

   - It was asked when the Hawaii revenue would appear and it was answered that it would appear in next year's audit.

   - Based on this audit it's difficult to see what was made from the Hawaii convention. If one takes the income number and the expense number they can see that the numbers from San Diego were greater.
      - o It was explained that that's why the convention income report is isolated from the NAWS financial report.

   - Regarding Note 6, concentration of credit risk, it was asked if NAWS should be concerned about this amount.
      - o Mike explained that this is a common practice since this policy has been in place.

The board accepted the 2005 audit report which will be published in the Annual Report.

KRA: Communications

Discussion of the 2006 Car and its contents

Theme: It's All About Carrying the Message

The CAR provides standard reporting on some of the activity for the year, the Strategic Plan, and the workgroups. The board discussed if there is anything that they feel needs to be included in the CAR.

It was explained that every IDT that we've put out in the past has allowed for the board to revise and update it. This is an opportunity to train, and our opportunity to make changes if needed.

General CAR

The board was asked if, looking at the Table of Contents, there is anything that the board would like to see in addition in the CAR.

- It was asked how we pick IDT's for the next conference cycle.

  The board makes recommendations to the conference in January and March. Most likely it will be topics that will come out of the strategic plan.

- HRP report will not be included in the CAR. This is not a normal practice. The HRP report will be in the March Conference Report.

- Because there are only three regional motions they, will be on the same page as the discussion list.

The complete contents of the CAR will be emailed to the board.

Regional Motions

Motion 1

David suggested that the tone of this motion under World Board recommendation be reworded. It should state, "To create a project plan for the next conference cycle..." He would like it to convey that the idea of a glossary should relate to the Strategic Plan.

It needs to be rewritten to convey both:

- How to get an idea considered
- Intent of an idea

Becky explained that the original desire was a more specific glossary of terms such as 13th Step and NA slang to be inserted in the back of the Basic Text. Some of the terms they wished to have definitions for were some that weren't in the Basic Text. The region rewrote the motion to shorten it for the CAR.

The board agreed to revise the tone of the response.

Motion 2

Both the '99 world board recommendation is shown as well as the current recommendation for purposes of reviewing the CAR. It was noted that the board seemed clear on their consensus this year and in '99 the board wasn't.

- Craig brought up the possibility of adding a sentence in the board's recommendation regarding creating literature not just creating a statement. At this time he did not wish to add anything but will send in input if this changes.

The board agreed to keep the language in Motion 2 and remove the '99 recommendation.

Motion 3

Make this motion more reader-friendly; it sounds like the board is defending something in its tone.

Include:

- "At this time NAWS does it's best to..."
- The concept that anytime you collapse the time period one way, you increase it another way, and vice versa.
- Keep the concept of non-English speaking communities not having to translate English literature; but conveyed in a softer tone.

The problem with minimums is that when you mandate it applies to an IP and book length pieces. It wasn't believed that the intent of the motion maker was to mandate a year approval process for an IP.

World Board Decision

Confirmed decision to roll out in the CAR the idea of having special interest meetings in San Antonio.

Small Group discussions on Issue Discussion Topics in the CAR

Our Public Image

Set up:

- Use a point in the Vision Statement as a foundation & move to front
- Page 11-3rd Paragraph: Elimination of service committees at NAWS—better point made in Infrastructure
- Start out on positive; importance. Why should I care—accomplishments.
- 2nd Paragraph: Paternalistic tone in center
- Page 11/12: Hawaii; had opportunity to overcome preconceptions about addicts and did not always.
- People in front of meeting places/behavior/impressions
- NA's image; not personal or colorful image

Questions:

- #1: How do I take responsibility for NA's image? How do service bodies take responsibility? How can a sense of personal responsibility & ownership develop in me & how can I help others develop this?
- #2: How does a negative image affect our ability to carry the message?
- #4: How can our service committees improve our ability to carry the message?
- #1: Who is responsible…?
- #3: Not about welcome—not appropriate for them. Not a place they would send their clients as second point.
- #4: How can we better cooperate…improve our public image?
- Good lead into Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Set up:

- Missing: Purpose of service structure. Why should I be of service?
- Everyone is of service in some way—then taking on role where you work for NA.
- Page 13: Infra—take next step in what is underneath.
- Clarify principles that underlie
- Different today—how? Population, etc. NA has changed.
- Remove: area circus
- Page 14-Last Paragraph: Liked—and are our current services organized to meet those needs?

Questions:

- Structure to what is needed in community; how are our services meeting those needs—help to get out of box. Follow last sentence of set up. Could cover 3rd question with this.
- Underlying principles involved in service?
- What is basic minimum structure required?
- What about the current structure in your local community could be best suited to CTM?
- If you felt free to create a strong, healthy, vibrant structure, what would it look like?
- What can I do to make service more effective?
- Why should I be of service?

Leadership

<u>Set up</u>:

- Remove: Delmore Shwartz
- Page 10-1st Paragraph: Mentorship inspiring members to reach full potential
- Remove: outlaw; more positive stereotype
- Membership as a privilege with responsibility
- Page 9-2nd Paragraph: rework tone—more positive; nurture people; training/mentoring. Don't lose original thought.
- Page 8 Warm body syndrome; add no problem finding people, trouble finding leadership
- Page 9-3rd Paragraph: Talent to task; encourage to take risks & develop skills here

<u>Questions</u>:

- #1: Add "How do we <u>as a fellowship</u>…
- #2: What specific things could we do to help our trusted servants be successful? Examples of training/mentoring
- Add "stewardship" to questions
- Add raising awareness of broader issue of leadership
- #1: Do we consider experience & talent when matching talent to task?
- #2: How do we help…
- #3: Question too long; How can we instill a sense of ownership & responsibility? (for the roles we take on)
    - o   Difference between leaders & leadership
- Identify right people—<u>match</u> talent to task

Atmosphere of Recovery

<u>Set up</u>:

- Safety & Respect
    - o   Touch on disruptive member also
    - o   Examples of how to provide safe & respectful meeting place as a member

- o Does not get to real issues: not just sexual, not only new members, exploiting members—professionally, religious, financial, etc. Safety threatened—not just new
- Everyone should have equal opportunity to recover
- Page 6 – area & regional splits fit better under Infrastructure wording & focus to keep idea here

Questions:

- #1: Split into 2 or 3 questions. More open ended/discussion. Physical set up to affect atmosphere examples.
- #2: Change "develop" to "create"
- # 2 & 3: Questions: Need examples. In what ways are we carrying the message rather than the disease?

The board ended the day with a sharing session that is not a recorded session.

Friday 21 October

Key Result Area: Resources – Leadership Development

Full day spent on the third session with the board, staff and HRP discussing a leadership development system focusing on the World Services track. Notes for this section are at the end of the minutes titled "Leadership Development Strategy-World Service Track."

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

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Elaine Wickham, Fatia Birault, Travis Koplow, Jane Nickels, De Jenkins, Carrie Ray, Jeff Gershoff, Kim Young, Mike Polin, Shane Colter, Stephan Lantos, Tom Rush, Tom Boscarelli and Uschi Mueller.

HRP members: Tali McCall, Mindy Atkins, Francine Bluteau, Sergio Rojas and additional staff; Roberta Tolkan, Sara Jo Glade and Steve Rusch.

Saturday 22 October

Strategic Planning

Full day spent on the Strategic Plan Update for the 2006-2008 cycle facilitated by Jim DeLizia. Notes for this section are at the end of the minutes titled "2006-2008 Objectives and Approaches-FINAL."

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, David James, Jim Buerer, Piet De Boer, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Muk Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Elaine Wickham, Fatia Birault, Travis Koplow, Jane Nickels, De Jenkins, Carrie Ray, Jeff Gershoff, Kim Young, Mike Polin, Shane Colter, Stephan Lantos, Tom Rush, Tom Boscarelli and Uschi Mueller.

2006-2008 NAWS Strategic Plan
OBJECTIVES and APPROACHES
With Prioritization – FINAL (October 2005)

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 (and integrate training and leadership development needs).
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 the following basic tools for group and area (in priority order);
   a) Simple, interactive, contemporary packaging leaders can use to increase member understanding and practice of NA principles and concepts.
   b) Reference materials that can be updated regarding group trust servant roles and responsibilities, and guidelines for implementation.
   c) Discussion tools for running different types of meetings.
   d) Integrate tools for groups and area in existing literature where possible.
   e) Tool to improve understanding of the purpose and roles of the various components of the service structure.
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; integrate this approach with continuing efforts to develop partnerships).

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 (including development of spiritual members, older members and recovery, gender issues, youth and recovery, medication and recovery, benefit of service to personal recovery).
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. Provide a component of the website for groups, areas, and regions to post and share tools, techniques, best practices, etc. (integrate into redesign of website).
2. 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
♦ Better define tasks and requirements for positions.
♦ Increase use of events (e.g., Worldwide Workshop, Zonal Forum, World Convention and other fellowship workshops) for observation of potential contributors and future leaders
♦ Increase follow-up efforts after attendance at events such as Worldwide Workshops

New Approaches for 2006-08 (in priority order)
The following approaches will be incorporated into other priorities in the Plan.

1. Better utilize the World Pool as a development strategy (such as inviting Pool members to events, increasing communication, adding benefits for being in the Pool, utilizing Pool members for other than positions, including calls to action, draft review, workshop models they can deliver locally; response to surveys for input, etc.)
2. Provide orientation and training for RDs for roles at the Conference and outside of the Conference
3. Craft and communicate the message that there is value in experience, and expand roles for veteran leaders (such as using veteran leaders as a resource to go to regions; inviting them to events in their area; soliciting their input on specific topics; using them as mentors for RDs, etc.).

Key Result Area: Resources

Issue: Financial Capacity

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 (Business Plan Group to consider this January 2006).
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 Leadership Development Strategy – World Service Track

Involvement Level	Current Strategy	Necessary Changes
Passive/Attendee	♦ Group starter kit ♦ *NA Way* (articles, etc.) ♦ Website information/Bulletins ♦ Local CAR/CAT discussions	
Participant ♦ Participate in a workshop ♦ Review and provide input ♦ Attend WWW ♦ Participate in CAR or issue discussion at local level ♦ Regional Delegate	♦ Observation of potential contributors/future leaders at events (WWW, Zonal Forum, World Convention and other fellowship workshops) ♦ Shining Star identification system ♦ Modeling of effective leadership at events ♦ Some mentoring ♦ Publications: articles on the value of contributing/getting involved ♦ Personal contact ♦ World Pool ♦ Orientation at WSC ♦ CAR/CAT discussions ♦ Tools/methods to engage RDs in discussion ♦ Small opportunities (e.g., web information contact) ♦ Attempts to create an environment for involvement (stimulate passion for the vision; concepts of quality recovery)	♦ Raise awareness and clarify information on the process for getting involved ♦ Formalize the 'observation' process by suggesting what to look for, how to document and use the information to get members involved ♦ Increase follow-up efforts after attendance at events such as WWWs ♦ Use tools more effectively (such as the RD Bulletin Board on the web) ♦ Develop a more formalized mentoring strategy ♦ Reconcile the 'shining star' program with the World Pool strategy ♦ Make it easier to complete a resume for the World Pool and to capture the right information to make a decision on member talent for a task ♦ Increase recognition and appreciation of member interest, contribution and skill ♦ Increase opportunities to contribute (e.g., using the tools gained at a World Service meeting back home; or small roles that RDs can play at WSC ♦ Add/publish personal stories on service and leadership
Active Contributor ♦ Speaker ♦ Work group member ♦ Organize input at local level ♦ WCNA support member ♦ Facilitator at a WWW ♦ Regional Delegate	♦ Modeling of effective leadership at events ♦ Orientation to the job and the system in which contributors will work(e.g., WSC, workgroups, WCNA) ♦ A range of involvement opportunities (small to big tasks) ♦ Personal contact at events (including WSC, Zonal Forum, WWW) and follow-up calls, e-mails, etc. ♦ World Pool ♦ Tools and support to do the job (e.g., tools Delegates use to lead issue discussions), including financial	♦ Formalize an evaluation strategy (using information gained for further leadership development), starting with those making significant contributions (such as the WB, contributing to a workshop, etc.) ♦ Better define the task/requirements for positions ♦ Position contribution as 'personal development' ♦ Improve web presence

Active Contributor continued	♦ Recognition (e.g., closing lunch at Conference; certificates, etc.) ♦ Some evaluation of the contribution ♦ Some mentoring	♦ Better utilize the World Pool as a development strategy, inviting Pool members to events, increasing communication, adding benefits for being in the Pool (e.g., recognition); utilizing Pool members for other than positions (such as calls to action, draft review, workshop models they can deliver locally; response to surveys for input, etc.) ♦ Develop a system to better document and use information on members who exhibit skill/interest ♦ Consider more formal mentoring opportunities ♦ Develop transfer tools for use at other levels of the service structure ♦ Provide orientation to alternate RDs (use senior RDs to support)
Leader ♦ Work group chair ♦ World Board member ♦ HRP member ♦ Co-Facilitator ♦ EC member ♦ Regional Delegate	♦ Orientation ♦ Training ♦ HRP/nominations-election process ♦ Tools and support (e.g., talking points, reports, strategic issue discussion tools) ♦ Recognition ♦ Personal development/growth opportunities ♦ More formal mentoring	♦ Need to create personal growth opportunities for someone who enters the Pool, but does not get a position (see above for ways to better utilize the Pool) ♦ Need a strategy to identify skill sets needed in certain workgroups, etc. ♦ Need to clarify the messages/information on the nominations and elections process to better manage expectations (factor in translation issues) ♦ Better define criteria for positions ♦ Provide training for RDs for roles at the Conference and outside of the Conference (RD "Boot Camp" ♦ Provide orientation opportunities for RDs outside of the Conference
Veteran Leader ♦ Previous WB member ♦ Previous Regional Delegate ♦ Previous Workgroup Chair	♦ Some level of continuing involvement (e.g., workgroups) ♦ Keep on the mailing list ♦ Recognition	♦ Craft and communicate the message that there is value in experience ♦ Expand roles for veteran leaders (e.g., resource to go to regions; invitations to events in their area; invitations to WS events; invite their input on specific topics the WB is investigating; use them as mentors for RDs (practical tips for doing the job)

HRP/World Plan as a Leadership Development Strategy
ASSESSMENT

The following assessment was conducted based on the original intent of the HRP/World Pool (as created in 1998), principles of leadership cultivation in membership-based organizations, and criteria developed by the World Board for the ideal NAWS leadership development system.

Where the HRP/World Pool Strategy *Meets* Expectations

- Provides for an increase in members from around the world to be nominated
- Provides workgroup members that can be observed and further developed as leaders
- Is based on NA principles and standards
- Integrated personal contact
- Has a positive impact on other levels of the service structure by modeling leadership process (e.g., standardized forms)
- Provides an opportunity to evaluate personal recovery

Where the HRP/World Pool Strategy *Does Not Meet* Expectations

- Is not designed to be a development strategy (expectations are not realistic in this regard)
- Does not 'reveal' member abilities, but does reveal experience (no match between World Pool and 'shining star' systems)
- Still favors those attending the Conference
- The Conference stills needs to vet the candidates to have confidence in the slate
- Is not clear or understandable
- Does not provide for tapping the full potential talent available in the membership
- Does not allow for effective identification
- Is not a fluid/dynamic system that changes as needs change

Areas Where World Pool/HRP Strategy Must Evolve

- Shift in Pool purpose
- Integration between WB identification system and HRP identification system
- Broaden consideration elements (decision need to be based on more than resume)
- Better identify needs and requirements
- Increase confidence in those making the decisions
- Broaden the talent pool to include those with demonstrated ability for greater opportunity for contact, observation and evaluation