

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Approved World Board Minutes**  
**8-11 March 2006**

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

Not present: Giovanna Ghisays and Saul Alvarado are unable to attend. Daniel Schuessler will arrive Thursday 9 March 2006.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, and Carrie Ray

**Wednesday 8 March**

**Action Group**

The following questions were beta tested to be used at the conference:

1. When did you first "get it" or got the message in recovery? Your first "A-ha" moment?
2. How did the message first get carried to you? How did you first carry it?

After the sharing session concluded, it was obvious that two questions will not work for the conference. Condense to one question.

**KRA: Communications**

**NAWS News**

The past practice of the board has been to communicate about CAR, conference, and fellowship issues in *NAWS News*, the *NA Way Magazine*, and the *Conference Report*. The issue to be discussed is the acceptability of including a section on motion three in *NAWS News*. There were some concerns that the board was using this publication as a means to express their opinion around motion three.

Discussion:

- Was shocked when he reviewed the section on motion three in *NAWS News* and wonders at what point the board refrains from talking about it. Doesn't want to see the board crashing the motion maker's intent with a sledgehammer. Questions if it's necessary for the board to take up a page in *NAWS News* on motion three when there are other issues in the CAR that did not get devoted a page. Regions are at a disadvantage because they don't have the opportunity to distribute a publication like *NAWS News*.
- The board would be remiss if they didn't respond in some way. Additional information gets added, misunderstandings get clarified, and the recommendation is very limited; so this is a way to provide such information to the fellowship. The *Conference Report* is a vehicle that is for regions and some post the report to their local area. There is a responsibility to provide more information since the fellowship has been talking about this issue.
- As a board we have a responsibility of leadership. Motion three has a momentum and *NAWS News* might be the board's last effort to educate members regarding the literature development process. Our presentation in the CAR wasn't as strong as it could have been regarding the idea of having delegates ask their regions to bring their vote of confidence for discussions at the conference. Supports including the piece on motion three in *NAWS News* as that's our communication to the fellowship.
- The original piece in *NAWS News* was a bit pushy as apposed to reiterating concerns. Cautioned the board to refrain from being heavy handed and taking advantage of this vehicle. The fellowship doesn't like to feel pushed.
- There is a valid point in the ethics on this issue. We can put things across in a way that's not pushy.

- When the board is out in the fellowship they hear compelling points missing that need to be conveyed. Doesn't feel this piece is compelling: we can and do have longer periods for R&I; we're not trying to shunt what's been brought up, and the board can go either way on this. The fellowship expects NAWS to speak their mind.

The options are to publish the piece as is, or remove it entirely since revision is not an option due to staff being out sick.

- Believes the body is all over the place and thinks when the term "ethics" comes into the discussion it lets him know that a larger discussion is needed.
- The reason the board puts their intent in the CAR is because delegates didn't want to get all the way to the conference and not have all the information. The maker of this motion doesn't understand the impact of his motion. Supports putting the information out there without concern of how it will be perceived. The board has responsibilities that aren't fun and aren't popular and the body needs to be clear on their role.
- Is in support of the revised piece to be in *NAWS News*. Looked in past publications and didn't see any inconsistencies with what or how the information was presented. Was glad that the last three paragraphs were taken out. Feels this is expected of us to do.
- Doesn't agree with the sentence, 'We also believe that the place to effectively impact a piece is in the review and input stage rather than the approval stage.' This has not been our experience as the majority of our members do participate in R&I, and those that do, the majority of those don't offer anything substantial to the process. It is mostly a stamp of approval and support saying a job well done. So actually the place to effectively impact a piece is on the front-end, when input is being solicited, as the input can come from any community, in any language, and translations aren't an issue. That input can be translated into English and factored into the piece. Would like this sentence to be revised in the *Conference Report*.

There were no objections to include the revised piece in *NAWS News* regarding motion three.

## 2007 World Convention

### Brainstorming Themes — Mike Polin

A brainstorming session might help to put together some key messages, concepts, or perhaps a theme for the World Convention in San Antonio. We're currently ahead of schedule as far as theme ideas, which means artwork will get started early for this convention. An update on the planning stages for San Antonio will be provided to the board soon.

San Antonio is known as "Pure San Antonio" and as a point of information the Alamo is not public domain which means the image could be used. The theme of the conference is All about Carrying the Message. If this is what we're using in a service setting, what would be a good theme for a recovery event? What comes to mind for Mike is "There's a New Way to Live" or "Another Way of Life."

The board put dots next to the themes that stood out to them; however, the exercise was non-binding. (See numbers next to themes)

- Recovering Against All Odds 1
- Recovery: A Reality
- Another Way to Live 1
- Lost Dreams Awaken (And New Possibilities Arise) 5
- Our Message is Hope (And the Promise is Freedom) which ties with the WSC theme 4
- Never Alone
- Big Recovery 2

- Remember: The Message, Primary Purpose, The Newcomer
- Our Gratitude Speaks...
- Happy, Joyous & Free
- More Will be Revealed
- Deep in the Heart of Recovery 1
- Pure Recovery 1
- Today We Have a Choice 5
- Sharing a Common Bond
- Anyone May Join Us...
- Finding Hope Regardless Of...
- 30 Years Later Still Carrying the Message 1
- Surrender to Win 1
- Old Habits New Attitudes
- Stay Clean 1
- Our Common Welfare 6
- Change 1
- Welcome Home 4
- Coming Together As One

What are the components you want for the theme of the convention? Who do you want this message to speak to and what do you want it to convey?

- Theme tie into overall key messages
- Audience is members
- Should have global relevance to all members
- Turn itself into images
- Recovery bridges our differences

Smaller themes work better such as, "Our Message is Hope". One word in a theme can be translated into many, many languages. Baltimore was one of the best pieces of artwork because the theme was so simple. Mike will take these discussions and work with staff. The final selection will be made by the EC so that artwork can be developed.

### **KRA: Recovery Literature**

#### **Basic Text Update — Ron Hofius**

The workgroup has no decisions to bring before the board at this time.

The workgroup is still accepting submissions even though the official deadline for submissions was 31 December 2005. The acknowledgement letter has changed to read that, while we are accepting submissions, they may not get the same level of attention they would if they were received prior to the deadline and that we will continue to attempt to fill gaps.

There are some workgroup members that are up to speed on reviewing the submissions in their queue. Some of the workgroup members that have more time on their hands are willing to take on

some stories for those who are not caught up. The task at hand is completely overwhelming. About 800 stories have been submitted.

In the third cut process the workgroup is reading aloud as a group because it gives the story a different view and they discuss it. Each workgroup member goes home and creates their own little meeting where they read the stories aloud and evaluate (only the workgroup member evaluates).

The preface itself has not been worked on as of yet and needs to be done by the August board meeting. Organization is something that is on hold until the workgroup is closer to the final collection of stories. Abstracts will be before each story and in the table of contents.

The Basic Text workgroup meets 24-26 March

The next big deadline is 1 Sept 2006

### **General Questions**

Will the workgroup have enough to select from after having seen all that's come in?

Ron has seen some good substantial material but it needs some editing. In looking at the breakdown and the variance in clean time and geographic diversity it seems like we'll be able to produce a book that is globally diverse. There are stories of quality from outside the US.

### **Editorial/Content Issues**

Other Twelve Step Fellowships & Drug References:

Ron confirmed with the board that mentioning other programs such as AA is okay unless someone's recovery is entirely in another program. If there is a slam towards AA there was a suggestion to edit it out. Ron also confirmed his thoughts that the board was okay with drug references.

Relapse Stories

There is a workgroup member that does not want a relapse story to be included. The board had no objections to including a relapse story in the Basic Text; we have an IP on Recovery and Relapse.

Higher Power/God

The question for discussion is to automatically capitalize any and all God or Higher Power references. In Ron's editorial experience with the NA Way he didn't automatically capitalize because he saw this as the writer's own spiritual expression. Travis sees the issue in a different way in that our literature has certain standards. Right now the workgroup is thinking of leaving it up to the author's decision. There is also the colours vs. colors spelling issue as well.

Editorial Discussion:

- Because some people will be uncomfortable with it not being capitalized, suggests asking author for permission to do so.
- Sees this as a translations issue; because it's an Americanized book it should be consistent throughout the first part and the last part. Doesn't want to hear NAWS' interpretation of someone else's culture. It's an attempt to go too far with keeping character. Use the same dictionary throughout. Arguing for uniformity. Would pick up the editorial mistakes rather than the culture of it.
- It's refreshing to give the writer the freedom to choose how they want to refer to their Higher Power. This makes it a lot more interesting and takes the sameness out of it.
- If the stories are supposed to be anonymous then wouldn't the term colour lead the reader to where they're located? *Ron explained that this leads to another editorial question with regard to names of cities or town. The workgroup felt they wanted the geographical diversity.*
- When a non-English story is translated do you pick a US English story or an Anglicized version? This adds a wrinkle to keeping it all consistent.

- May make more sense to use American English for this version because of the translation issue.
- Hopes that the board will still consider keeping the flavor of the author as far as spelling.

### **Fellowship Development — Anthony & Becky**

#### **Eastern Europe Workshop**

The biggest advantage of this workshop was introducing people to their neighbors, which will not only help them with their service efforts but with their recovery efforts. The three communities were ready to give up and once they were introduced to one another they were inseparable.

#### **Asia Pacific Forum**

For the first time there were 20 countries represented at the APF. One of the issues that came up was the site for the next APF. Pakistan wants the next APF to be there, but issues of visas and security came up. The APF funds all their participants and their administrative committee. There wasn't one Thai member represented at the APF. Thailand may become the center to hold the meetings, after 2008, due to low cost.

Anthony explained to the communities that attended the APF that NAWS can not attend all events every year and if experience, strength, and hope are all that is needed then we will find someone that can provide this; partnerships will be used a lot more.

#### **Iran**

Anthony and Becky went to Iran in mid-February. Evolution is happening at light speed in Iran; they've added 1,100 meetings in less than a year. At this pace, in 10 years, they'll be the largest NA community in the world; larger than the US. Because some members have over 100 sponsees they have step studies. The members in Iran are all about doing the steps right so, as a result, some members know about the steps better than most members anywhere else.

When discussing the service structure they came to the conclusion that the *Guide to Local Services* leads to regional splits because it drives for geographical convenience. The country will not be served by having a ton of different regions throughout the country.

The way WSO Iran packages materials is rather ingenious; we're looking into producing some of their packaging ideas for our inventory.

Believes Iran will eventually ask NAWS to distribute literature to areas since they can't continue with their current practice. If we take on distribution then we would need to take a look at prices. Items would be produced here then sent to area offices. This process is going to take some time but is inevitable.

There is a camp city that sets up places where addicts can come and detox; then meetings get started. There are four or five of these and more are popping up. Anthony and Becky did not visit these cities but plan to during their next trip.

Women have a pronounced challenge in this society and in NA. The male members in control are mostly married and believe that any relationship between a man and a woman is a 13 step. There is a moral attitude being passed down and perpetuated throughout 100's of thousands of members. The guys who are the power brokers have six to seven years clean and their thinking is members should never date anyone in NA - which is mostly fear-based. They fear it will harm the reputation of NA. What the elders say has tremendous weight in this community. There is one member who has teen cleantime who brings a different message when this issue comes up. There are very few mixed meetings. Groups of woman together cause attention. The women with time are simple, sweet, and country-like and don't comprise a lot of leadership qualities.

Anthony and Becky hope to go back to Iran in May to visit cities other than Tehran. Anthony would go back in a second and understands why Daniel said that he would pay to go back. It was unlike anything he had ever experienced.

### **Thursday 9 March**

#### **KRA: Leadership Development**

The first half of the day was spent with the board, staff and HRP discussing a Leadership Development system, facilitated by Jim DeLizia. The goals for the day were to confirm key concepts/results of discussion thus far on leadership development, identify practical change needed to move the leadership development system forward as discussed, and to frame the WSC session on Leadership Development. *Notes for this discussion are at the end of the minutes titled "Leadership Development Session."*

World Board Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Daniel Schuessler, 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, Bob Stewart, Catherine McCormick, Elaine Wickham, Fatia Birault, Jane Nickels, De Jenkins, Carrie Ray, Jeff Gershoff, Johnny Lamprea, Mike Polin, Shane Colter, Tom Rush, and Uschi Mueller.

HRP Members: Tali McCall, Mindy Atkins, Francine Bluteau, Sergio Rojas and additional staff; Roberta Tolkan, Keri Kirkpatrick, and Steve Rusch.

#### **KRA: Communication**

The second half of the day was spent in facilitated session with the board and staff on Key Messages for the 2006-2008 cycle. *Notes for this discussion are at the end of the minutes titled "2006-2008 Key Messages."*

### **Friday 10 March**

#### **Board Reflection**

#### **Board Reflection Session — Jim DeLizia**

The focus for the day was linked to previous discussions on Leadership. One of the core pieces of Leadership is evaluation. Evaluation is key and critical to do the job as a leader. The board will have the opportunity to reflect on performance and evaluation. When the new World Board comes in they will be able to stand a little bit taller based on what the current board has left for them. Boards are very complex entities with different personalities coming in and out.

*Notes for this session are at the end of the minutes titled "Board Reflection".*

#### **Board Performance Evaluation Strategy**

The effectiveness of the current board is each individual's effectiveness that gives the sum total. And, it's not just a sum total; there's an ex-factor. It's tapping into what each board member brings. Jim asked the body to participate in a personal reflection exercise.

Two questions:

What is something that you appreciate about this individual and what do they bring to the group?

(Each board member received a name and shared on what they bring to the group).

What have you gotten that's benefited you as an individual from this experience? What will you take away?

- Been able to apply his knowledge and experience gained from the board into his personal and professional life.

- Takes away confidence which has been given to him by what the board does.
- This cycle and this board have given her a new insight of how we're moving ahead and how effective our discussions are.
- Developed confidence—the ability to do. Protective walls are coming down.
- Will change his life - enabled him to do stuff that he's never been able to do. Willing to take risks now and get out of his comfort zone. Grown financially and emotionally.
- Compassion of management
- Feeling of small in something that is so big—humility.
- Joy to see the change in the fellowship and the board—it's focus, transparency. Connectedness to members all over the world. Sense of being connected.
- Has given her the freedom to express herself professionally, which has resulted in impacting addicts.
- More experienced, more skilled at being a trusted servant
- Is able to step back from emotional response and detach; accept criticism and not take it personally.
- Has had an opportunity to give back to NA; heighten awareness of coupling vision and action.
- Sense of building history which no one can take away from him – proud of this history.

The point of being an effective board is not waiting until board members are rolling off the board. How do you convey this experience to others - share the value of this experience and insert this into the leadership development system?

What would you tell the new board members?

- Rely on the support from other board members and NAWS in general. Tap into asking for help and rely on that help.
- Bring your recovery with you.
- Know that you're here for a reason and know that it may take a while to feel that; ask questions even if you feel that everyone already knows the answer. Ask unique questions because some may not have thought of those yet.
- Be prepared for unexpected developments and growth - might be uncomfortable, but a great ride.
- Delicate balance between surrender and speaking up - this is a constant ride to find that balance.
- Treat internal and external public with the same level of respect and importance

### **Performance Evaluation Strategy**

The purpose of an evaluation system is to >>>. (?)

The body shared some general thoughts and comments whether this would be of value for performance of leadership which Jim noted and will report with a revised draft strategy.

Jim inserted in the draft that, when electing workgroup chairs, to have a dialogue with them regarding clarity of roles. Outline their responsibilities clearly. Jim asked for feedback regarding this issue.

AE thinks we should try what's said here as a matter of tools, and not just jump into evaluation since they've never even done the measuring piece. We're going from nothing to a Cadillac and we need to learn how to buy a Volkswagen. We have to start somewhere.

Self directed opportunity for each board member to identify where they may fall short.

This would allow the board to generate a culture of accountability which will attract those who want that culture. How do you start that culture? Not by rolling out the Cadillac but by starting at the top by modeling accountability. Suggests that at the conference, report in NAWS report that the board is evaluating themselves to be accountable.

There's a difference between level of performance and attendance. We need to equip our current chair with a tool.

A sample team evaluation strategy was passed out.

- Evaluating fellowship travel and requests. Unprecedented level of requests for NAWS participation.
- This would act as the internal view of the environmental scan.

Jim will revise and send the board another draft.

The meeting concluded for the day and with staff, WB, HRP, and Co-Facilitators attended the World Services lunch at Maggiano's.

### **Saturday 11 March**

#### **2006 World Service Conference**

Mark Hersh (Co Facilitator) observed the morning session.

### **CAR Workshops & Sessions at WSC 2006**

The Executive Committee has started to assign two board members to each session so that every board member has a chance to facilitate. Sessions will stay the same but will move around based on Jim's schedule and revising the schedule. We tend to get institutionalized and are looking at different ways to schedule the WSC. There will be a leadership session on where we are and where we want to be and then a second leadership session will take place on how to make that happen and practical application. In Anthony and Becky's discussions with Jim they realized that there is a way to bring "How to be an Effective RD" into the Leadership discussions. We have an opportunity to make the sessions more valuable, which means more preparation and more work.

We will compile input from the first round of the initial IDT's and the CAR questions then we will feed that back to Conference Participants. The goal is to take the discussion to the next step in these sessions and to not discuss the IDT's again.

The key areas of what members want to see coming out of Atmosphere of Recovery are tools, targeted literature, re-looking at the Guide to Local Services, Common Needs, etc. which puts some responsibility on the board. The challenge is going to be presenting these issues in a real discussion, giving participants time to take it all in and ruminate on it, so they don't feel rushed. Many of the above mentioned issues are new material for participants.

The Executive Committee would like to see the Co-facilitators handle the old business session the same way since it worked so well. Mark Hersh was happy to see that new business was after the elections. Mark will be kept in the loop so he can feel prepared and comfortable.

There was an announcement for board members to make travel plans for the conference and send information to Elaine ([Elaine@na.org](mailto:Elaine@na.org)) so that conference expenses could be tracked.

Travel days: arriving Thursday the 20<sup>th</sup> and leaving Sunday the 30<sup>th</sup>. There will be a board meeting at 2pm on Friday before the conference. Board members were told to book travel for Sunday following the conference. The board doesn't need to be here for this day.

### **March Conference Report**

The board discussed the following issues to frame the Conference Report and for the WSC.

## **WSC Seating & Criteria Infrastructure/ Service Structure**

The board will initiate a discussion with the conference regarding the fallacies within the WSC Seating process and criteria stating that the original intent is not panning out. There is a human desire to talk to people who have had the same experiences that you've had, and to those who have not; this has led the board to see fallacies in the *Guide to Local Services*. The issue with metros is it's only applicable for cities. In Iran, they look similar to intergroup and districts - not areas or regions. The mindset is when serving at least a country or language there's an advantage with bringing everyone together. The three regions in the US that are seeking seating are small areas; who does that serve? The only thing we give smaller rural areas coming together is to create a regional split. Our service structure has flaws in two places. One is the metro vs. shared services and the other is regional splits. Regional splits might be valid for local service reasons but it results in too many regions at the conference.

### **Discussion:**

- Ask zones to create a shared representation at the conference, where regions come together, and ask if they can be represented at the conference as one.
- Representation at the conference is not the problem. That's one part of the equation. The question is whether our service structure is most effective for groups, areas, zones, and regions. Asking that one question doesn't fix the problem. There's no system or principles to hang your hat on. All of the input from Infrastructure told us that our structure is not working. The region itself is a flaw in the system. Having everything function separately is not serving. It's overly optimistic to ask zones to create a model.
- Ask the fellowship as an IDT "What would you create as a service system if you could?"
- Is amazed that members need approved literature to push towards making new decisions.
- We're putting the tool (APT) into a dysfunctional system. It may not be as effective as it could be.
- Implementation of the PR Handbook and the APT is an essential piece.
- There has to be communication to the fellowship that the APT is a tool to aid folks to open their minds. They have permission to create new service models. This isn't so you can fit into where you are, but that you can create where you want to be. Possible key message and/or IDT. Roadmap your way into something new. It's going to be hard for areas to break out of what they've institutionalized services to be. Give them permission to break out of models that may not be working.
- What we need is a service structure that children can play in. We expect a bit too much of members; create something that people can work with.
- Not only are we conveying that we don't need anymore US regions but also that we are losing regions that need to be here. This is an awakening of effectiveness for all of us. We're not looking at what's wrong with delegates.

There is energy that NAWS is working to dismantle local services, similar to having to dismantle the World Service structure. It was obvious that we had to explode the structure but it was the challenge to convey this change to the fellowship, because they are attached to it. As always we will tell the truth but be cautious as to how we say it. The challenge is where we want to take these discussions after the conference.

How do you get the regions to see that what they're doing is not constructive, North Carolina for example?

One possible approach is to pose a series of self illuminating questions having them evaluate what they're doing themselves, which would take them to a logical place. Have people consider issues that they may not consider if you told them what they're doing is wrong. If people realize themselves that this may not be the way, then they may be open to trying something new.

- Some of it is questions and some of it is blowing out the walls and asking what it could look like.
- Bring Leadership into this discussion—we're not doing a very good job of identifying the task. You have to look at the task before looking for talent-to-task. Tie Leadership discussion into the Infrastructure discussion.
- What resonates with people at the CAR workshops is making connections with what Leadership Development and Infrastructure means.
- Ask zones for their creativity and ask them if there's something different from one region = one vote.
- Does not want the questions to be too World Services' focused. The issue isn't just at World Services; it starts at areas. And at the areas and groups is where we carry the message the most - not at World Services.
- In framing this dialogue we need to let participants know that we don't have the model hidden in a closet somewhere. Get rid of that inherent thought. We don't have the answers.
- Provide a graphic at the conference. Show the US nation with 70 different regions and Iran with one. This will get delegates thinking. Showing regions and where you have representation, and where it's unbalanced.
- Provide equity picture by representation, meetings, and geography. Everyone has different ideas of what equity is. Give to participants and ask them for input. We don't know how to decipher equity so help us out.

Will get feedback from areas using the APT to help aid in the holistic discussion on the service structure as a system.

### **2006-2008 Issue Discussion Topics (IDT's)**

When the Executive Committee talked about the IDT's one of the issues was Infrastructure and the other was Atmosphere of Recovery. Atmosphere of Recovery wasn't one of our IDT's but came from the fellowship. It worked because members didn't have to have any service experience to have issues in their Homegroup. The challenge is how to find something that is not all about service but that is fellowship focused and not service-structure focused. From the Strategic Plan the board has these issues:

- ❖ Have a more holistic approach to the service structure as a system
- ❖ Broadening access
- ❖ Value and expansion for veteran leaders

What do we want the topics to be and how do we want to frame them? The holistic discussion would have to broken down to be more guided.

Discussion:

- We need to begin first by introducing the next level. At CAR workshops members expressed that they're tired of milling around with these same discussions.
- There is a lack of awareness of what our values and philosophies are. Throw out things like what are NA values and what are NA philosophies.

The Strategic Plan says that the board will frame, for discussion, two topics: Common Needs - Who's Missing and holistic discussion on the service structure as a system. Atmosphere of Recovery will

come out with four separate issues that may be a bulletin. We will continue discussion with Infrastructure since we identified issues and will continue with Leadership and Public Image which is the implementation of the PR Handbook.

- Put Atmosphere of Recovery in our service meetings. If the IDT's aren't something that the local members can wrap their heads around then it will lose them.
- Is unsettled with when to give the fellowship information and when to get information from them. They struggle with the broadness of the IDT's.
- Who is responsible? Links to lack of people in service. Sell personal responsibility equals personal recovery. This could tie into Infrastructure.
- The evolution could be: "Who is Missing?" (Which could be the first piece of the cycle) and the second could be "What Do We Do About It?"
- The second piece could also be about permission to change—by then the fellowship has experience with the APT and PR Handbook.

**First IDT Idea:**

- A. Personal responsibility for carrying the message
  - ❖ What lies beyond the only requirement for membership?
  - ❖ Who is responsible for keeping meetings open and functioning?
  - ❖ Who is missing from our meetings? And what to do?/ Common Needs
- B. Have a holistic discussion of the service structure as a system
  - ❖ Atmosphere of Recovery within the service structure
  - ❖ NA principles and values and doing service
  - ❖ The relationship of form to function
  - ❖ Permission to change
  - ❖ Practicing planning
  - ❖ Who is missing from our service structure?

**Second IDT Idea:**

I. Carrying the Message

A. Personal Responsibility or Who is missing?

- ❖ What lies beyond the only requirement for membership
- ❖ Who is responsible for keeping meetings open and functioning?
- ❖ Who is missing from our meetings? And what to do?/ Common Needs

B. Service System or Are You Being Served?

- ❖ Atmosphere of Recovery within the service structure
- ❖ NA principles and values and doing service
- ❖ The relationship of form to function
- ❖ Permission to change
- ❖ Practicing planning
- ❖ Who is missing from our service structure

Cautions that in our manuals we say that the groups are to carry the message and the service structure is to do everything else. Members will challenge the premise by what our literature says. We are setting ourselves up to undermine our own premise at the local level.

The IDT's will be discussed with broader staff first then there will be feedback to the board later.

### **Service Material**

The board discussed if there is anything else that needs to be said, in addition to the March Conference Report or heard at CAR workshops.

- Inquired if there was any discussion at workshops regarding approving literature that wasn't reviewed by the fellowship in the normal fashion.
- The bigger issue is the addenda for the PR Handbook.
- Did hear some? Felt a connection with no on Motion three but wanted to discuss the service material approval process change. He countered it by saying when it comes to service materials we're looking for ways to expedite the process but with recovery material speed isn't our objective. Quality is our objective. Thinks there will be some energy on this.
- Received some phone calls suggesting that, to stay with the policy, release the PR Handbook chapters that aren't approved in different colored paper.

### **Common Needs—Who is Missing?**

Would like to make sure more of the board's philosophy is in the Conference Report behind the decision to try common needs meetings at the World Convention. It was a simple way to try something different to address the issue of demographically diverse communities. There are a number of ways in which the issue can be addressed: targeted literature, abstracts in the Basic Text, and common needs meetings. Some cultures refuse to accept that they may need something else and some do accept. It's got to be about our broader vision to carry the message, not just common needs meetings. We don't know how to do this and we're just going to try some different things.

- The drive at MARLCNA kept being the board has decided to make this happen. It took some time to convey to members that the board is responding, not deciding.
- We had this conversation prior to Hawaii and decided to keep from having common needs meetings at the World Convention so that the board could discuss it at the WSC. That way, participants could put the breaks on the idea if they wanted.
- Most of the inflammatory input was from members that are married to the convention guidelines.
- Members asked: aren't we all one fellowship? There is the argument that if a woman shows up at a men's meeting they were asked to leave.
- The Executive Committee talked about adding to, not taking away, and will try to erode that fear.
- Is the homogenization of our voice the best way to reach our diverse populations? Do we need to take a stand on whether our homogeneous voice has kept us from reaching members that aren't here? We've had a push for keeping it homogeneous. To flourish within cultural pockets using own voice.
- We're speaking to an extremely conservative voice that believes we are eroding our 1<sup>st</sup> tradition.

### **PR Handbook**

#### **PR Handbook Status Update-Ron Miller**

The PR Handbook workgroup will be meeting this week to review and process the information that was inputted from the fellowship for Chapters 10-13. Most of the input provided was for Chapter 10, Technology. There is a short time frame for feedback from the board which is Thursday, 23 March with comments to be back by Sunday, 26 March.

There is no mechanism in place to remove a workgroup member from the body. A workgroup member has attended four out of nine meetings and has provided little to no input to the workgroup. Ron doesn't think we made prudent use of the fellowship's money based on his participation. This workgroup member cancelled trips and changed travel itineraries the day of the meeting which is expensive. After missing so many meetings the workgroup had to spend agenda time catching this member up because he is not on board. He hasn't been to a workgroup meeting since September 2005 and he is planning on coming to the unity dinner next week during the workgroups final meeting.

Ron is requesting a mechanism for how to remove a workgroup member and to address this issue. The board would be remiss to enter into the 2006-2008 cycle without a system in place. Ron was told by the Executive Committee to talk to the workgroup member explain that he can't take up all the time and to then leave it up to him.

Ron posed the following questions to the board: *We do not have any protocols for workgroup members. We ask them to serve on a workgroup on behalf of the board; how do we ask them to step down? What is the criterion for 'removing' a workgroup member? Are there performances standards that we need to establish? For example, what are the attendance expectations?*

Discussion:

- Just because there aren't guidelines or protocols doesn't mean action can't be taken. A situation like this doesn't need any guidelines. The workgroup member needs a phone call from someone.
- It's about will as much as protocol. The Executive Committee seats workgroup members and can unseat them.
- Trusting in the process of recovery regarding this issue may have been too optimistic.
- Wouldn't want to face the conference knowing that the board didn't do anything about it.
- In the reimbursement policy it states that if members do not make their travel arrangements 21 days before, they are then responsible for changes. There are already policies in place and we need to be more aware of members' behavior.
- This workgroup member is coming to a final add-on meeting and has not inputted any final material in the past. He could only harm the meeting. The workgroup is factoring in input that he's not familiar with which doesn't make any sense. Doesn't know how that could help the work.

There is a double standard with the position of accountability with regard to board members and workgroup members. The Executive Committee is clearer on what to do in the next cycle having gone through this. Point people need to be prepared to tell the Executive Committee "I want this person removed." The Executive Committee is being asked to take responsibility to take action on this issue. We tolerate a great deal and have learned some lessons from this scenario.

The board will start dealing with board and workgroup member's patterns when they first see them. The Executive Committee's hope was that members would do the right thing; however they've seen that this does not always occur.

There were no objections to the board chair phoning this workgroup member to cancel his ticket and not attend the final PR Handbook workgroup meeting. Explain that the airline ticket can be rolled in to the conference ticket.

## **WSC 2006 Nominations**

The World Board Chair read the list of names that will be nominated for the World Board, Human Resources Panel, and Co-facilitators. This list will be publicized in the March *Conference Report*.

## **Corporate**

## Draft 2006-2008 WB Schedule

WB Meeting 2006-2008 Schedule changes discussed:

- An extra day was added to the Executive Committee meeting for 17-18 May 2006.
- Bob Jordan has a job conflict with the board orientation meeting scheduled for 22-24 June 2006. (No changes were made to this meeting).
- The first board meeting scheduled for July 2006 needs to move to August due to the Basic Text review and input deadline. The meeting is rescheduled for 10-12 August 2006 with the Executive Committee meeting on 9 August 2006.
- Several board meetings had schedule conflicts with the 19-21 October 2006 meeting. The meeting is rescheduled for 26-28 October 2006 with Executive Committee meeting 25 October 2006.
- Having four-day board meetings is difficult for some members with regard to missing work. It was explained that when Jim DeLizia is here he takes up two days which leaves only one day to do business.

The following is an updated schedule for the upcoming conference cycle including changes mentioned above.

### 2006

17-18 January—Executive Committee	22-24 June (New WB members + EC Orientation only)
19-21 January—World Board	
7 March—Executive Committee	9 August—Executive Committee
8-11 March—World Board	10-12 August—World Board
31 March–1 April—Executive Committee	25 October—Executive Committee
23-29 April--World Service Conference	26-28 October—World Board
17-18 May—Executive Committee	

### 2007

24 January—Executive Committee
25-27 January—World Board
11-14 April—World Board (Retreat style—offsite)
11 July—Executive Committee
12-14 July—World Board
17 October—Executive Committee
18-20 October—World Board

### 2008

16 January—Executive Committee
17-19 January—World Board
12 March—Executive Committee
13-15 March—World Board
25 April-3 May World Service Conference 2008

## Adopt January 2006 Minutes

Having no corrections; the January 2006 World Board minutes were adopted as presented.

## Action Item List

### Project Ideas

1. "But the Doctor Prescribed It" IP

We've talked about conducting orientations for doctors on what NA is for purposes of education.

There was no objection to the recommendation to keep idea on file for future literature projects.

## 2. NA Book Online

There was no objection to the recommendation that our expectation is to have the Basic Text online sometime in the next conference cycle.

3. World Meeting List. The idea sounds good but is not practical at this time. Removing the world meeting list has never proven itself to be practical. The world meeting list is the number one visited site on our website because we don't deliver meeting lists, which is what professionals want. So professionals go to our website to look for meetings.

There was no objection to the recommendation that it's a good idea but is not practical at this time.

4. Information for newcomers on na.org. The website design is a top priority for this conference cycle. There will be a links on the homepage based on who the visitor is and what they are looking for. New material will not get created for the redesign. We are currently looking at ways to restructure the website. ...

There was no objection to the recommendation that a redesign is in the works and there will be something for newcomers.

## Legal Registration

The board will see a balloon in expenses in the coming cycle as a result of NAWS' assistance with helping the following communities complete the legal registration process: Egypt, Poland, Russia, Lithuania, Latvia, (the whole eastern block), South Africa, Paraguay, Dominican Republic, Nepal, and, if needed, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

There were no objections to authorize NAWS to make decisions to assist communities with the process of legal registration for NA.

Provide the World Board with legal registration financial impact.

## Lawsuit Update

The courts have agreed to dismiss NAWS from the longstanding lawsuit in New Jersey. However the plaintiff has the option to fight this decision which we feel will most likely happen. Regarding the Hall lawsuit, if fees go beyond \$40,000 we will delegate the case to our insurance carrier which will impact our liability coverage for the next year.

We were recently served with a lawsuit by an inmate who is suing both NA and AA. A fundraiser was planning to serve food which never got delivered so the penitentiary served food and it made all of the inmates sick. The inmate named in the lawsuit is suing everyone.

The issue of obtaining insurance is something that areas and regions need to take seriously especially in North America. NAWS lets people use the name Narcotics Anonymous without centralized control.

There were no objections to creating an insurance bulletin and an FIPT bulletin clearly articulating our relationship to the local entities that call themselves Narcotics Anonymous.

## New Products

A project idea was submitted to NAWS last year to enlarge the wallet cards. There is a proposal to increase the font size which would change the format from three panels to four.

There were no objections to increasing the font size and format of the Wallet Cards.

## Darwyn Langley

Darwyn Langley was a trusted servant for NA World Services some years ago. His sister, Celeste, contacted Anthony to alert us that he was using and not doing well. Her hope was, because he served

at the world level, he was entitled to receive intervention assistance from NAWS. Anthony explained to Celeste that NAWS does not do interventions but that he would do his best to contact several members in Darwyn's local community. Due to the disruption to our infrastructure caused by the hurricanes in the Gulf Coast areas where Darwyn was located we were not able to get in touch with anyone that could help. Many of the NA members in that area were consumed with their personal circumstances. Weeks later, Celeste contacted us to let us know that Darwyn passed away. She seems to want to hold NA World Services responsible for the reality of what the disease of addiction does to addicts every day. A copy of the minutes will be sent to her once they are approved as official world board minutes.

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

## **KEY MESSAGES SESSION**

### Themes

- 1. Growth – but who's missing**
- 2. Tools – support/time to deliver...importance of strength in structure**
- 3. Visibility – external face of NAWS/NA – credibility, PR**
- 4. Support coming in – donation- leadership resources (what allows us to be/do)**
- 5. Change – need relevance, pro-activity, focus on future – we are different today**
- 6. Diverse – no borders/global**
  - **Resources need to be more relevant and, although targeted, they unify to ensure all can be at the table**
- 7. \*Still all about carrying the message\* – benefit of planning – \*Accomplishment\***

### Key Message 1

- **Sometimes what is right in front of us is easiest to ignore**
- **The homogeneous voice is not attracting those who are missing**
  - **Who are we missing – diverse groups**
  - **Underserved**
  - **Those not heard**
- **Made progress with this, \*not about geography - it's about demographics\***

### Key Message 2

- **Tools for all levels of service and the assistance to implement them**
- **Strength of service structure – key to carrying the message**
- **Strength of smallest link**

### Key Message 3

- **Enhance credibility of NA as program of recovery by establishing & maintaining relationships with public & private professionals**
- **Our “insides” have to match our “outsides” ...experience in interacting with us has to be the same as the message we convey about us**

### Key Message 4

- **Funding & people**
- **Accountability**
- **Ownership**
- **“Who is responsible?”**
- **Owning own recovery – responsible for the organization**

Key Message 5

- **Change is necessary part of recovery**
- **Vision has not changed, but reaching the horizon does require adaptability**
- **Adjust, not react**

Key Message 7

- **Benefit of planning**
  - **Better use of resources**
  - **Being pro-active**
  - **Allows modification along the way - capacity to adapt to changing environment**
  - **Identify needs so less falls thru the cracks**

## **Leadership Cultivation Session March 2006**

### **Conference Session Discussion Facts**

Audience: Conference Participants

Setting/Context: Part I: WSC 2006, Early Sunday Night, first substantive issue discussion, Part II - What will it take to create the system at all levels of NA? (Solutions)

Facilitators: Bob & Mindy

Others Involved: EC, HRP

Logistics: 90 Minutes, after dinner, after open house (long break)

Critical about Audience: Leaders, varying knowledge and experience, diverse service experience background, culture, diverse perspective of leadership.

### **Type of Discussion:**

- Inform – Gather Input
- Broad buy-in  
Agreement/foundation for consensus

### **Outcomes:**

Willingness/desire for change

- Dispelled misunderstandings - common premise about leadership in NAWS (including HRP)
- Generate enthusiasm about leadership development impact in NA
- Tools to translate this back home
- Understanding that time has come – action
- Get input that leads to buy-in - meld our perspective with theirs, understand their issues

### **Overarching**

Building from what we already believe and practice

- NA Concepts and Traditions
- Vision requires leadership
- Link between cultivation – recovery – service – leadership
- Already using cultivation tool
- Every member exhibits leadership when they help another

**Ideas for 90 minute session at Conference:** The examples below are ideas from staff on how the Leadership Session should go at the conference. There was discussion on having a Part I and Part II.

1) Opening:

- Recap background
- Tie to strategic plan
- Layout the goal: Leadership System ( Development / Cultivation)
- Review existing strategies (power point)
- What isn't working (power point)
- Vision/Goal Environment: Review our work to date
- How to get there (go on to session II)

2) Leadership Development (90 min) Introduction:

- Begin with IDT discussions
- Get group to identify this problem is common to all

- Tie leadership to common principles
  - Sponsorship, 12<sup>th</sup> step
  - Traditions
  - Payback to NA
- Stress the positive: We DO have leaders, but we need involvement
  - Give examples
- Presenting the system
- Use material in Conference Report for foundation
- Use graphic to represent system, levels of system
- Talk through the system model (simplified)
  - Considering diversities
  - Engage RD's for their understandings, ideas
- Feedback and Buy-in
  - Create bridge to 2<sup>nd</sup> session
  - Consider local applications

### 3) Part I

- Introductions (10 min)
- Set up/Background
  - Fellowship discussion
  - CAR workshops
  - WB/HRP/Staff discussions
- Objectives/Outcome (5 min)
- Identification of what already exists in recovery process as leadership (sponsorship, etc...) (5 min)
- Identification of what already exists in Service (5 min)
  - Leadership principles
  - Cultivation in existence
  - Question what is the perceived conflict (2<sup>nd</sup> tradition) (10 min)
- Goals as identified thus far,
  - What's missing (5 min)
- Challenges/Key messages as identified (10 min)
  - Input, What's missing (5 min)
- Set up/ Part II (5 min)
- Q&A (15 min)

### 4) (Parallel story with flowers in the GARDEN)

Inform Conference Participants re: purpose of session and value (All Leaders)

1. WB/HRP Process – common points – recap of cycle sessions, discussion of leadership
2. Leadership principles
3. Salient points – IDT & CAR
4. Frame components of system with IDT's, i.e.: orientation, training; sporadic not consistent
5. Undermining (? – wrong word?) points w/ examples – sponsorship
6. Culture change - before we create a system we need to clean obstacles
7. Re-enforce spiritual principles
8. Paint picture (brief) of idealized system i.e.: roles, stewardship
9. Q&A = 30 min
10. Transition to part II

### 5)

- Bridge the gap between the fellowship access to the leadership development at World service level
- Acceptance and understanding of "leadership"

- Value placed on opportunity to serve – leadership is highly valued (reframe 4<sup>th</sup> concept)
- Process is understandable, supportive, accessible and flexible
- Based on NA principles/standards
- Has possible usefulness for other levels of service structure
- Key component – talent to task – reasonable (defined duties) expectations – success
- Not going to happen on it's own – needs a system
- Leadership development requires a strategy / system
- Problems are systematic of a systems issue
- Strategy/system integrates all
- Struggled with levels of service structure.

6) Session Structure (objectives of work session)

- Layout the issues and information gathered
- Drill down to NAWS
- Q&A
- RD limited
- Engage RD's in dialogue
- Set up Part II

7) Ways that we set people up to fail

1. Don't link talent to task
2. Don't train or orient to position
3. Focus on individual recovery and not the task at hand (Tradition one)

How can we better equip people to succeed?

1. Better identify talent in linking to task
2. Better apprenticeship, mentoring and orientation
3. Focus on first tradition and concept of service

8)

- Introduce the involvement and levels of service
- A system of leadership is good
- Cultivation is a big part of that system, moving member through
- The goal is always to support our 5<sup>th</sup> tradition - this is part of that
- It's not about ego - it is about giving
- Members should have "a feel" for each different phase of system
- An understandable model that members get
- An effective system yields effective leaders
- The system should allow or even facilitate diverse opinions
- Flexible and all inclusive
- Integration of WB/World Pool/HRP

9.) NAWS Leadership Principles/Leadership Cultivation Factors:

- Need leadership and a system to develop it as a team
- Proactive at all levels rather than reactive
- Leadership is an acceptable and necessary concept (reality)
- Need leadership development system that starts early (earlier than group level)
- Maintain a level playing field
- Membership acceptance of leadership
- Explain some of the conflicts with the second tradition

- Leadership principles are rooted in traditions
- Concepts and recovery. We need to reiterate those principles
- Our focus started on world services but realized in our discussions that cultivation must begin at other levels of service
- Cultivation is a principle that most of us are familiar with and do already. We just are not used to this terminology. Bridging recovery practices into service
- Talk about identification as an important component of a development system

## Common Elements

Opening “grabs” (→ Listen)



Context



Grounding (“what do we believe”)



Need

Benefit (of success)



Goals of the system → dialog?

↓flip-flop these two items?

Assessment of system → dialog?

→Issues



Structure of WS piece/link to all levels



Set up/Part II

## CONCLUSION

**Based on our assessment of the HRP/World Pool strategy, what practical change may be called for, in order to achieve the goals we have for the NAWS Leadership Development system? Consider the following types of change.**

### C-H-A-N-G-E-

#### Structure

- Formalize link between HRP & WB
  - Maybe workgroup of Board
  - Board may be part of the selection process
- Report to EC vs. just communication
- Traditional model...nominating committee of board members & outside representation

- WP structure???

## **Policy**

- Eliminating regional nominations from the floor
- Introduce the Board experience into the process of nominating candidates for the Board
- Clarification of WB & HRP experience requirements

## **Processes – Procedures**

- Blind CPR process → relevant?
- Two-way dialog between HRP – WB on identification of emerging ideas & evaluation of workgroups
- Evaluation process – developed
- Process to better understand capabilities of WP members...test with a “coffee date” before you make a commitment
- More intense interview process for project workers
- Shining star info → HRP
- Communication gap in needs of current board to the HRP
- Resume process...add work group experience...help w/ completing the form
- No mechanism to assess continued interest from the pool

## **People**

- Substance between succession training levels
- Better use of past leaders (e.g. on HRP)
- Orientation session improvement
- Clearer expectation of what’s asked regarding references
- Creates access to the HRP by individuals
- Talent → Task\*
- Input from conference participants, re: people from their regions with talent, etc

## **Culture**

- Self perpetuation...low/mistrust (no term limits)
- High trust...efficient

## **Resources**

- Capacity to handle increased volunteer management

**WB Reflection Session  
Past -> Present 2004-2006**

How Have We Changed?

- + utilization of board member talent
- Good orientation
- Change during cycle – allowed for greater participation
- \*Take more risks... try new things... \*DO THE RIGHT THING = DRIVER
- Stronger systems in place & better tools
  - More efficient (smaller board, larger fellowship)
  - More quickly tap board member potential
- Uniform Team
  - Board Staff <- Be aware it's a partnership
  - Board Culture
- Recognition that what everyone brings is not the same
- More strategic... more productive
  - Results
- Better communication
  - Between Board meetings
  - Between Board members
  - Internal / External
  - Better use of technology
- Handling controversial discussion more effectively
- Model of leadership for others
  - Not consequence driven
- Exhibiting leadership
  - Honest
  - Best interests of membership
  - Planning / Org.

Potential

- Delegation
  - To Board subgroups
- Experiential Gap
  - Front line staff experience... exposure to this
  - Equalize experience needed on the Board
- EC – WB communication, clarity, roles\*
  - Business planning group
- Orientation
- Better use of time in between meetings
- Clarity of board role in certain settings (e.g. workshops)

Accomplishments

- Unprecedented travel/contact with Fellowship
- Clearer sense of priority
  - On track with big projects
- Preparation of new board members
- Opening office in Iran
- Responsive... open-minded, flexible

## **FUTURE**

- Commitment
  - To leadership
  - Tools and Literature
- Trust
  - The Vision
  - The Plan
  - Each other!
- Administrative/Managerial
  - International Perspective
  - Introspective
  - Team-oriented
- Willingness
  - Responsible
  - Accountable
  - Formulate Specific Evaluation (for Board/Board Members)
- Facilitation Skills
  - Ability to interface with Fellowship
- Fluid, Flexible
  - Ready to meet our future
- Appreciate Integration, Relationships
  - The way things do, and must, work together
  - i.e. Appreciate "Systems"
- Trust in each other
  - Honest, Open-minded, Willing
  - Recovery sharing sessions (know each other)
- Be Friendly and Approachable, Informative
- Honest, Open-minded, Willing

### Board Development (Board/Workgroups)

- Performance Evaluation Process
  - Minimum Requirements
  - Mechanism to Deal with These Situations
- Clarification / Role Definition
  - Travel Team
- Institutionalize training / education
  - Part of each meeting to raise experience level of every member
- Philosophy
  - Common positions
  - Retreat
  - Update bulletins
- Sharing sessions more of a priority
- Opportunity for Mentoring
  - For new board members
  - Period of Time
- Tools to evaluate impact of trip visits
- Better utilize veteran leaders