

2001 AGM

The Stories That We Share

Recognizing and Celebrating the

Diversity of our Teaching

Minutes of the 9th. Annual ATI AGM, October 21-25, 2001

Armada Hotel, Spanish Point, County Clare, Ireland

October 22, 2001 – Opening Meeting, 9:45 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.

1. Welcoming Remarks: Meeting was opened by Robin St. Clair at 9:55 a.m. He gave the opening remarks to all the participants.

2. Announcements:

Additional announcements were made by the facilitator. Other announcements were made regarding Direction magazine, the Marj Barstow videotapes being marketed, the AT training course being offered in Austria.

Kathleen Morrison announced that she had a videotape of her ski dive for charity; also that she

had copies of an article she wrote for anyone interested.

Present Agenda: for this meeting; roles of Formal Consensus were introduced; positive comments were made regarding the organization of the meeting.

Board Report: (see attached) – presented by Robin St. Clair. It was announced that there is a plan to hire a bookkeeper. Therefore, the work of the ATI treasurer will change.

Proposal #3 presented: This was a proposal to make changes in the bylaws. (see packets – the revisions were mailed to the membership in July of 2001)

Catherine Kettrick presented this proposal.

It is important to note that by-law changes must be presented to the membership 60 days before changes. It was suggested that the membership trust the Board's decision in regard to the revisions since most of them were minor and of the "clean the house" variety. Vote: 29 ayes,

0 nays, 2 abstentions.

Treasurer's Report: (see attached) – presented by Lucy Venable.

Sponsorship: (see attached) – David Mills presented a report on Sponsorship in ATI.

Go to COW (Committee of the Whole): Motion requested by the facilitator; so moved by Lynne Compton; seconded by Graham Elliott. Vote: 30 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 abstention.

Present Proposal #5 with clarifying questions:

"No nominator for a Sponsoring Member may be a family member of the nominated sponsor nor a member of the nominator's own training school or other enterprise." (Proposed by Doris Dietschy and Margrit Gysin)

Presented by Catherine Kettrick. Questions: what is the meaning of "other enterprise"? Catherine was not sure, but thought it meant any business enterprise. Would "other enterprise" include people who regularly did workshops together? Catherine didn't know. Would this be applied retrospectively?  
Response: No.

Level 1 discussion on Proposal #5: Jan Baty acted as Scribe. David Mills explained that there

are nominators, sponsors and candidates. Nominators nominate the sponsors.

The question was asked whether this proposal helps us as a professional organization. The proposal gives us a commitment to be a professional organization.

It prevents “closed shop” groups nominating sponsors.

It may not prevent the “old buddy system. Question: how this prevents the “old buddy system”? Catherine Kettrick suggested that this is a Level II concern.

Level 2 Discussion on Proposal #5: (“Family member as nominator”) – Concerns:

1. Words “other enterprise” are too vague;
2. Should be “nominator and/or nominee’s own training course”;
3. Clarify “member of training school”;
4. Need a sentence clarifying the roles (facilitator clarified “nominators for sponsoring members”, “sponsor” and “candidates for membership”);
5. need clarification of “nominators/sponsors” roles to be included in proposal;
6. doubt expressed whether this proposal does enough to prevent “cronyism” or the “old boy’s network” (a lengthy discussion about what is a “concern” expressed in Level II and what is a “solution” and how to ensure that the discussion stays with the concerns to be expressed in Level II.)

Participants at this point urged to carefully consider the concerns before the next meeting.

Level 3 Discussion on Proposal #5: The proposal: “No nominator for a Sponsoring Member may be a family member of the nominated sponsor, nor a member of the nominator’s own training school or other enterprise.”

Change “nominator’s” to “nominee’s”, i.e., the person nominated by the nominator.

Grouping concerns:

How to control – & does not go far enough.

Nominator refers to what?

Meaning of “member” in phrase “..member of the nominee’s own training school.”

Discussion: Change “Nominator” to “proposer”? – No. – Change to “Nominator refers to an ATI member who nominates another member to become a sponsoring member.” – Nominator can be a member of the nominee’s own training school or other enterprise. – It shouldn’t be so difficult to find someone to sponsor you outside of your training — better to have diversity outside of training. – What does “family member” refer to? – Change “family member” to “relative”. – “...member of the nominee’s training school” means: a co-director, assistant director, faculty member or current student of the training course.

Revised proposal #5: “No nominator for a Sponsoring Member may be a relative of the nominated sponsor and no more than 1 nominator can be a member of the nominee’s own training school. Member of the nominee’s training school means a co-director, assistant director, faculty member or current student of the training course.”

Consensus achieved on Proposal #5.

Present Proposal #1 with clarifying questions:

“Among the 3 Sponsoring Members who approve a candidate for Certification as an ATI Teaching Member only one may be the primary teacher of the candidate. “Primary teacher” is defined as the director or any regular faculty member of the candidate’s training course. This definition of primary teacher does not apply to occasional visiting teachers. Under unusual circumstances, special arrangements may be made with approval of the ATI Board.” (Proposed by David Mills, Tommy Thompson & Doris Dietschy)

Questions: What does the word “occasional” mean? What does “unusual” mean in the proposal. Can it be stated as “a” primary teacher instead of “only one”? (There was some confusion about Formal Consensus at this point. The process and roles of FC were explained by Catherine Kettrick.)

Level 1 Discussion on Proposal #1: The facilitator reviewed the proposal: “Among the 3 Sponsoring Members who approve a candidate for Certification as an ATI Teaching Member only one may be the primary teacher of the candidate. “Primary teacher” is defined as the director or any regular faculty member of the candidate’s training course. This definition of primary teacher does not apply to occasional visiting teachers. Under unusual circumstances, special arrangements may be made with approval of the ATI Board.”

This proposal emphasizes our professionalism and our flexibility. There was general agreement that it does fit with ATI’s Mission/Vision Statement.

Level 2 Discussion on Proposal #1: Concerns:

1. “Regular” is too vague a word, needs to be more precise.
2. “Occasional visiting teachers” is too narrow, needs to be expanded.
3. “Occasional” needs clarification.
4. Omit the word “the” before “primary teacher”.
5. “Unusual circumstances” is not clear and is too limited.

6. The last statement is weak and may exclude and delay new members from joining ATI. The facilitator summed up this point by giving a preview of the next Business Meeting and Level 3 discussions of proposals.

Level 3 Discussion on Proposal #1: The proposal: "Among the 3 Sponsoring Members who approve a candidate for Certification as an ATI Teaching Member only one may be the primary teacher of the candidate. "Primary teacher" is defined as the director or any regular faculty member of the candidate's training course. This definition of primary teacher does not apply to occasional visiting teachers. Under unusual circumstances, special arrangements may be made with approval of the ATI Board."

Grouping concerns:

1. "primary teacher" refers to what?
2. "regular faculty members" has what meaning?
3. Need clarification of "unusual circumstances"

Discussion: "The primary teacher" change to "A primary teacher". – Change "regular faculty member" to "resident" or "core" or "resident teacher" or "main teacher". – And let the phrase refer to those who teach 20% or less of the time in the course. – Change "unusual circumstances" to "exceptional circumstances". 2 agreed to stand aside regarding the discussion of "exceptional circumstances." – Also change wording to: "...special arrangements for sponsorship may be made by the ATI Board."

Revised Proposal #1: "Among the 3 Sponsoring Members who approve a candidate for

Certification as an ATI Teaching Member, only one may be a primary teacher of the candidate.

"Primary teacher" is defined as the director or any resident faculty member of the candidate's

training course who teaches 20% or less of the course time. Under exceptional circumstances,

special arrangements for sponsorship may be made by the ATI Board.”

Consensus achieved on Proposal #1.

Present Proposal #2 with clarifying questions:

“The ATI Sponsorship Committee shall draft an official policy statement regarding the relationship between ATI Sponsorship and graduation from training courses. Upon approval of this statement by the ATI Board, any reference to ATI Sponsorship in the publicity materials of any Alexander Technique training course run by an ATI member must include, and be otherwise consistent with this statement.” For example, the statement might say: “In ATI, certification for Teaching Membership is determined by means of the ATI Sponsorship Process. ATI does not approve or disapprove of training courses and thus ATI Certification does not follow as a direct result of graduation from any training course.” (Proposed by David Mills & Tommy Thompson).

Questions: What is the explanation of the “time frame”? What is the relationship between ATI and AT training courses? What is the relationship between training courses and membership in ATI?

At this point, there was time remaining (14 minutes); the facilitator suggested adding to the agenda two items from the Business Meeting scheduled for October 23rd. We were able to handle just one of the items, as follows:

Level 1 Discussion on Proposal #2: (“ATI Sponsorship and AT Training Courses”).

The statement must be used if it is approved. An example is provided after the proposal but this

was not discussed. Is the statement consistent with ATI’s mission? Response was yes it is.

Level 2 Discussion on Proposal #2: Concerns:

Does this need membership approval?

Should The statement be only in English, or in other languages?

Will there be approved translations used by ATI schools?

Who will translate, who will give approval? If this (translation responsibility) would it take too long to have it done?

We need to give schools time to update and change current materials without throwing out existing publications and flyers.

How can ATI track implementation, how do we police the use of the required statement?

Can we really enforce this?

If we don't adopt this and in a very real way, others could register complaints regarding programs not consistent with ATI?

Level 3 discussion on Proposal #2: Approved languages: use web-based software to translate

and have it proofed. Insert: "...or approved translation."

Does this just make more work for us, for ATI? Which languages do we consider for translation?

Any language used by any school should be considered. If we use translations, who should be the translators? We need to trust the translation, trust is important. Someone we can trust in ATI.

The statement makes it clear to students that they are connected with ATI. It is not necessary to specify the language. Add, "...or approved translation..." or "...Board approved translation...".

That is to say, whatever statement the Sponsorship Committee write will be translated and approved by the Board.



Consider: mutually approved translation by the board and native user. Another suggestion: forget the translation – let each school translate and then police it if there is a complaint.

Does this need membership approval? Then, the membership looked at the example statement and concluded that it meets ATI vision/mission. It was suggested that ATI, Inc. be written out in full. The wording of the example statement was sent back to the Sponsorship Committee for editing.

Programs and schools with existing literature, publications and brochures could use an insert to publicize the statement.

The facilitator reviewed the statement with the addition or “...consistent with this statement or approved translation.”

The revised proposal reads: “The ATI Sponsorship Committee shall draft an official policy statement regarding the relationship between ATI Sponsorship and graduation from training courses. Upon approval of this statement by the ATI Board, any reference to ATI Sponsorship in the publicity materials of any Alexander Technique training course run by an ATI member must include, and be otherwise consistent with this statement or approved translation.”

Call for consensus on the proposal.

Consensus achieved.

Present Proposal #4 with clarifying questions:

“A member found conducting him/herself inconsistently with the ATI Bylaws or the ATI Code of Ethics of Professional Conduct shall be expelled from ATI. Establishment of inconsistent behaviour shall be determined by a ruling of the Ethics and Complaint Committee as indicated in the bylaws of ATI.”  
Proposed by Doris Dietcsy and Margrit Gysin.

Questions: Is expulsion a possibility now? (not presently).

Is there a process to be reinstated now? (reference to By-laws, sec. 10.4.6)

Is there a right of appeal? Is there a time limit? (e.g., of prison time served for a criminal offense, rehabilitation, reinstatement to society).

Does the Ethics Committee determine the "inconsistent behavior"? (Right now the violator can be expelled from ATI but the proposal wants to expand the power to expel. Right now the Ethics Committee just investigates and determines whether or not behavior inconsistent with Code of Ethics has occurred.)

Level 1 Discussion on Proposal #4:

Too explicit, doesn't give flexibility to operate on AT principles.

Doesn't provide a method of learning.

It does support professionalism.

If space is given for learning in the process before final expulsion, then it does support ATI's mission/vision.

Time limit should be relevant to seriousness of transgression.

Need legal advice to get explicit about choice of actions to be taken.

Does it fit with the last sentence of ATI's vision statement re legislative arena?

Questions were raised of policy and punishment and disciplinary procedures.

7. Level 2 Discussion on Proposal #4: Concerns:

objection to “shall be”, it is too harsh – needs greater clarification in the by-laws

there is no range or options of consequences (none in by-laws either)

no range of punishment options, too draconian

need a range of options before expulsion

proposal seems to remove options currently in by-laws

need educational options before expulsion

concern about what happens after expulsion

no mention of re-admittance to ATI membership or re-instatement to ATI.

Question about where does the proposal appear if not in the by-laws? Response: it belongs to the minutes and history of ATI.

Clarification: a proposal to change the by-laws has to be distributed to the membership 60 days before a vote is called for on the proposal.

Level 3 Discussion on Proposal #4: The proposal: “A member found conducting him/herself inconsistently with the ATI Bylaws or the ATI Code of Ethics of Professional Conduct shall be expelled from ATI. Establishment of inconsistent behaviour shall be determined by a ruling of the Ethics and Complaint Committee as indicated in the bylaws of ATI.” – Proposed by Doris Dietcschy and Margrit Gysin

Grouping Concerns;

Too explicit, no flexibility to operate w/in AT principles.

No range of options.

Produces a change in the by-laws.

The tone of the proposal is too harsh.

Discussion: The facilitator reviewed the current by-laws regarding complaints. – The proposal does not provide a method for learning. – There is no education option before expulsion. – This should be a by-law revision and brought before the 2002 AGM of ATI. – Wording should be in the proposal, “...up to and including expulsion.” (This was affirmed by several members in attendance.) – We should convey to Doris (Dietchshy) and Margrit (Gysin) our thanks for the proposal and their work on it and we want to invite both of them to be part of the decision making process because it is so important. – We should send the proposal with these suggestions to a committee to develop and write a by-law revision (and be sure to include Doris and Margrit).

From those in attendance at the Business Meeting, the following volunteered for the committee: Don White, David Mills, Rick Brennan, Kathleen Morrison, David Bainbridge (plus Teresa Lee as the Board Contact). – The statement was made that we agree with the proposal in principle but we think it should be in the by-laws; we want the committee to work on the revisions (and convey this also to Doris and Margrit). – Change the words “... shall be (expelled from ATI)” to

“... may be...); and convey this to the committee.

The proposal was then considered as “handled” by the meeting participants.

Present Proposal #6 with clarifying questions:

“Once initiated, a grievance procedure brought against any member of ATI will be carried through to its conclusion even if the member against whom the grievance has been brought resigns, or the grievance is withdrawn.” Proposed by the Ethics Committee.

Rationale for this proposal: The group has a compelling interest to complete the process through to its conclusion for the following reasons: 1. so the accused has a chance to defend themselves against accusations 2. so that the initiator of the complaint cannot be influenced through coercion (threats or bribes) to withdraw their complaint

Proposal presented by Catherine Kettrick. The idea behind this proposal is that a grievance, once filed, will be heard to its conclusion even though one or both of the parties resigns from ATI. It prevents people from making an accusation and then dropping it – or having the accused member resign. Even if that happens, the grievance process will be completed. Questions: In by-laws, can only members file a grievance? Can one legally pursue a grievance against a person who is not a member of ATI? Is this a good idea?

Level 1 Discussion on Proposal #6:

This maintains the professionalism of ATI.

We need legal advice regarding this proposed procedure.

It is consistent with our Code of Ethics.

It supports open communication with the public.

It supports members being heard and supported by ATI.

Level 2 Discussion on Proposal #6: Concerns:

Is it workable? The Ethics Committee is already very busy and the conclusion requires the cooperation of the people involved in the investigation.

If the member resigns, how can the Ethics Committee get information?

Will the grievance against the member be heard and acted on in absentia?

Could this process create the impression that ATI has more power than it really has?

It needs to be re-written to make it workable.

The wording doesn't seem to represent the intention of the proposal.

Need clarification/definition of "satisfactory conclusion".

Make sure it is legal.

Discussion conclusion and summary: It looks like we think this proposal is a good idea if these concerns are addressed and we will charge the Ethics Committee to re-write this proposal so that the concerns are resolved in the form of a by-law amendment and take it to the board.

Minutes of the 9th. Annual ATI AGM, October 21-25, 2001

Armada Hotel, Spanish Point, County Clare, Ireland

October 23, 2001 – Second Meeting, 9:45 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.

Facilitator: David Mills; Doorkeeper: Nora Suter; Time Keeper: Lucy Venable; Advocate: Graham Elliott; Scribe: George Pryor; Peace Keeper: Cathy Madden; Note Takers: Lucy Ackroyd and Alice Pryor.

Present Agenda & Announcements: 26 members present; the roles of Formal Consensus were

defined and explained; request for travel arrangements posted on bulletin board; workshop changes were announced; need for game players later in the evening today.

Present Ethics Report: (see attached) – presented by Catherine Kettrick. Code of Ethics was

sent out in the Communiqué and teachers were asked to sign and return it. This was a mistake. Only the first part of the code of ethics has been approved. The part on teacher student relationship was accepted in principle, with the desire on the part of the membership that the language be changed and brought back for approval. The Ethics Committee has been too busy to do this and is requesting help. Please contact Monica or Dale regarding the wording of the Teacher-Student relationship statement.

There was also a request for feedback on Proposal #6. (see below)

Level 1 Discussion on Proposal #5: – moved to 1st. Business Meeting – see above minutes.

11. Meeting Adjourned 11:18 AM.

Minutes of the 9th. Annual ATI AGM, October 21-25, 2001

Armada Hotel, Spanish Point, County Clare, Ireland

October 24, 2001 – Third Meeting, 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Facilitator: Catherine Kettrick; Doorkeeper: Alice Pryor; Timekeeper: Kathleen Morrison; Advocate: Graham Elliott; Scribe: David Bainbridge; Peacekeeper: Cathy Madden; Note Taker: George Pryor.

Present Agenda: No comments, no changes.

End of Business meeting

7. Sponsorship Workshop led by David Mills.

Minutes of the 9th. Annual ATI AGM, October 21-25, 2001

Armada Hotel, Spanish Point, County Clare, Ireland

October 24, 2001 – Fourth Meeting, 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Facilitator: Catherine Kettrick; Doorkeeper: Alice Pryor; Timekeeper: Kathleen Morrison; Advocate: Graham Elliott; Scribe: Jan Baty; Peacekeeper: Cathy Madden; Note Taker: George Pryor.

Present Agenda: It was suggested that the meeting split into three groups to discuss the three proposals on the agenda but it was determined that only 21 people were present and the group was too small to split. It was requested that those leaving early, write down three things they got from this AGM and leave it before they departed.

5. Evaluation:

WHAT WORKED WELL: WHAT WORKED NOT SO WELL:

Overhead transparencies worked wonderfully.

Good facilitators

Process of Formal Consensus (FC) works when everyone functions.

Refreshingly, FC was enjoyable.

People's patience and good humour.

Worked very successfully.

We are all learning FC

Cooperation of the role players.



Liked the candle (in the middle of the room).

Free to contribute as never before.

Liked seating arrangement.

Careful, thorough planning.

I was engaged in the process throughout; pleased we got consensus.

I felt comfortable and included.

#### WHAT WORKED WELL:

Do the Formal Consensus review at the beginning of the AGM.

There was no time scheduled for the oral site committee report.

Could not hear everyone; so use a microphone or close the circle.

English was at times difficult to understand.

It was hard to keep track of the proposals.

#### WHAT WORKED NOT SO WELL:

I was amazed how hard we worked on the proposals.

The planning was precise and nailed down.

Consensus is a silence = good.

I loved the levels, especially #1 level.

A lot of people contributed to the process; the process includes them.

Concerns are expressed = good.

The timing process works well.

I appreciated people's insights and awareness of our identity and trust and "set aside" principle.

The process leads to harmony.

Concerns are everyone's concerns.

Good separation of business and workshops.

I missed the moments of silence.

6. Closing the COW: So moved by Cathy Madden, seconded by Jim Froelich. Passed unanimously.

Approving the Minutes: Motion requested to accept the minutes of the AGM, 2000. So moved by Alice Pryor, seconded by Graham Elliott. 19 ayes, 2 abstentions.

Voting: Motion requested to accept proposals 1, 2 and 5. So moved by David Mills, seconded by Graham Elliott. Passed unanimously.

Adjourn: Motion requested for adjournment. So moved by Cathy Madden, seconded by Robin St. Clair.  
Passed unanimously.

Note: sections of these minutes have been rearranged so that each proposal has all the levels of discussion on that proposal together. Nothing has been added or deleted from these minutes.