

2007 AGM

AGM Membership Council Meeting

October 22, 2007 4:15pm

Attending: Bob Lada, George Pryor, Sarah Barker, Julie Rothschild, Shawn Copeland , Catherine Kettrick, David Mills, Peter Nobes, Mary Lou Chacey, Peter Brunner, Jennifer Mizenko, Carol Levin, Linda Hein, Jamee Culbertson, Patt O'Neill, Marsha Paludan, Antoinette Kranenburg, Debi Adams Rosa Luisa Rossi, Lucia Walker, Catherine Madden, Daiju Yokoe, Clare Rourke

I. Welcoming Remarks

II. Reviewed Meeting Intentions

The purpose of this meeting is to conduct the business of ATI. We will view this as a learning conversation as much possible.

We will listen and participate with good will and assume others are also acting from good will

We will attend to our means-whereby we listen, with respect and resiliency, especially when we feel strongly.

III. Announcements

IV. Review and consent to Agenda

Consented to

V. Moved to Committee of the whole (from Roberts Rules)

Antoinette moved and Debi Adams seconded All in favor.

VI. Assigned Formal consensus meeting facilitation roles.

Agenda Planner

Faciliatator Cathy Madden

Time Keeper Jennifer Mizenko

Door keeper Debi Adams

Public Scribe Antoinette and Catherine

Notetakers Linda and Sarah

Peacekeeper Patt O'Neill

Advocate Peter Nobes

The use of rainbow flags was introduced. If the discussion moves to quickly or is unclear (particularly in light of the many languages spoken) anyone may raise a flag and the pace of the discussion will slow down clarity will be the focus.

VII. Treasurers Report – Shawn Copeland, Treasurer

See Treasurers Report document

VIII. Professional Development Committee Report (Antoinette Kranenburg- Chair)

See Document enclosed in packet.

The committee needs more members participating in the collection of knowledge and questions. The committee is particularly looking for participants from other countries. Anyone interested is invited to go to the member's page and look at the committee's work so far.

Carol Levin requested that we don't use acronyms but use the full words in speaking. Assented.

Break

#### IX. Vision Mission Proposal (Jamee Culbertson)

Proposed revision:

- To uphold a vital organization whose structure and means of operation are consistent with the principles of the F. M. Alexander Technique.
- To use the F.M. Alexander Technique to foster interrelationships, both human and ecological.
- To sustain an open means of global communication for people to discuss, apply, research and experiment with the discoveries of F. M. Alexander.

##### a. Presentation and clarifying questions

Discussion: What is a vision mission statement?

See Linda's notes

##### b. Discussion

c. Specific concerns

Need to preserve introductory paragraph in current Bylaws

Proceeded with listing concerns

d. Resolution of concerns

All agreed to re-insert the original main paragraph in front of the three new vision mission points.

“Alexander Technique International is a worldwide organization of teachers, students and friends of the Alexander Technique created to promote and advance the work begun by F Matthais Alexander. ATI embraces the diversity of the international Alexander Technique community and is working to promote international dialogue.”\*\*\*\*\*

Our Mission is:

1. To create and sustain open means of global communication for people to discuss, apply, research and experiment with the discoveries of F. M. Alexander.
2. To encourage the use of the F.M. Alexander Technique in both human and environmental relationships.
3. To embody the principles of the F.M. Alexander Technique in ATI’s structure and means of operation.

Consensus reached

X. Evaluation of process of meeting

Peter was impressed by the ease and smoothness and flexibility of facilitator

Jen appreciated the creative light and livelies

Catherine appreciated that the light and livelies were quick

We took time for the rainbow

Lucia enjoyed going through the whole set of levels—enjoyed the attention and focus everyone brought to it.

Jamee was relieved to see what a group can do beyond what an individual reaching out could do.

David- appreciated the clarity of the proposal that allowed us to do the work

Power point and George were great help

Appreciated the flag waving and asking questions (for clarity)

Appreciated that the whole group are the facilitators

David appreciated everyone's willingness to say what they needed.

Clarifying question were allowed all along the way.

AGM membership Council Meeting

October 23, 2007 10:45pm

Attending: Count taken by Sarah Compton

36 in circle , 7 observing, 10 in work exchanges.

## I Announcements

Jenn announced urging everyone to meeting the sponsors who are up for election. Cathy Madden offered to talk with people about working with Greg Holdaway

## II. Reviewed meeting intentions

The purpose of this meeting is to conduct the business of ATI. We will view this as a learning conversation as much possible.

We will listen and participate with good will and assume others are also acting from good will

We will attend to our means-whereby we listen, with respect and resiliency, especially when we feel strongly.

## III. Review and consent to Agenda

Considered changing the order of presentation but did not change

Consented to

## IV. Assignment of Formal Consensus Roles

Facilitators: Lucia Walker, Patt O'Neill

Time keeper: Clare Rourke

Doorkeeper: David Mills

Public Scribe:

Peacekeeper:

Advocate: Rosa Louisa

## V. Reviewed Formal consensus process

Patt O'Neill used a chart to take us through the process steps

## VI. Presentation of Certification Coordination Committee (CCC) Proposals (George Pryor-Chair)

### Section A: Proposed new Bylaw

#### III.6.1:

Sponsors are ATI Teaching Members in good standing that are responsible for assessing a candidate who wishes to become a certified ATI Teaching Member.

#### III.6.2:

ATI Teaching Members can become Sponsors in accordance with the policy, rules and procedures adopted by the (Board-changed to) membership which can be found on the ATI website or obtained from the ATI office.

We don't have a Bylaw at all at this time. We need a replacement for the one deleted last year.

## Presentation and Clarifying Questions

Edivia –wanted to know whether the policies, rules and procedures should be adopted by the Board or the membership– which is it?

A request was made to explain the difference between changing a bylaw and changing a policies and procedures manual: Bylaws are legally changed with 3/2 vote of membership. Policies and Procedures Manual is changed as any other proposal.

Open discussion – level 1

Reviewed the new Mission statement (Patt O’Neill read it.)

Jenn Mizenko: this new bylaw fits with our mission

Catherine Kettrick: if it says “board” it does not fit our mission, “membership” would work better.

Rick Brennan: CCC is in favor of changing to “membership”.

Specific concerns – level 2

Carol Levin had a concern about language, and the word Sponsor. She looked at three dictionaries and the word sponsor does not in any way describe the process that we do for someone to become a teaching member or a person who is authorized to become a teaching member. She asked if we could put the definitions up on the board as to what a sponsor is. She thinks a sponsor is someone whose task is different, and does not in any way described what we have as sponsors and what happens in the certifying meeting between that person now called a sponsor and the person applying to become a teacher. Carol read all three definitions for the meeting. Rick said that the issue of whether a sponsor really does “sponsor” comes up every year, and could we bring it up over the Interchange or another way over the next year, and that every other alternative “word” has fallen short. Lucia asked if we wanted to take another two minutes for other concerns. Peter Brunner said that the word sponsor is too weak for the process. Catherine had a concern by proxy, and that was that if we accept this bylaw amendment, the only place the word “sponsor” occurs in the bylaws will only be in this amendment, and they think it will be confusing to have the word ‘sponsor’ come up only in this bylaw section.

Carol Levin: Language: the word sponsor does not in any way describe the process we use to authorize a teaching member. Carol submitted the definitions she found in print.

Rick Brennan: asked if we could take up finding the better term for this during the coming year

Peter Breunner: the word "sponsor" is too weak for a validation of someone.

Catherine Kettrick: this is the only place the term sponsor occur so it is confusing to present it here only.

Since this is a Bylaw change we are not allowed to change it (from Board to membership). We can only vote on the published version. Since tomorrow we will be looking at a revision—we will be able to change it then. We can defer discussion then.

Graham if the revision is adopted that will work, in case the revision is not adopted, we need to vote today.

It was determined that the vote is not possible because of the rewrite. The membership proceeded however to reach consensus. A vote can follow in the future.

Light and Lively

Resolve concerns – level 3

Cathy suggests we put the change of (membership) now and accept it as is—defer discussion of "sponsor" for the coming year. Stand aside on that one.

Catherine's confusing on sponsor.

Can we change to Who are responsible

Can we change ON THE WEBSITE to AVAILABLE. TO THE PUBLIC

Tommy suggested in future have David ( or someone good with grammar check proposals before submitted to solve this.)

Unresolved concern: Catherine and Carol standing aside (especially resolving in the future;) Graham asked can we accept the word sponsor at this time for the purpose of discussion and reaching consensus on the intent of the new Bylaw. Carol will stand aside only if we commit to doing this. Catherine will bring a proposal forward at the AGM.

Confusion with “only time seen” also standing aside.

Peter will stand aside if it is handled in the Policy and procedure manual

Reached consensus to accept new Bylaw

Because we were short of time Lucia suggested changing schedule.

New Agenda:

Section B : Certification Coordinating Committee Proposal

Presentation and clarifying Questions

Discussion of Level 1

Discussion of Concerns Level 2

All accepted

## Section B : Certification Coordinating Committee Proposal

See documents (published in conference packet and chart generated during meeting)

Presentation-clarifying questions 15 minutes allowed

George explained that this proposal, once accepted will be published in the Policies and Procedure Manual.

George Pryor took us through 13 points (published in the conference packet). He is asking for membership consensus on them.

George Pryor provided background on how these choices were arrived at –Three different questionnaires have been used to survey the membership over several years. Results from the questionnaires were used to guide the committee in creating the proposal. In other words they have heard from the membership thoroughly through these questionnaires.

Question: Are these points rigid requirements or to be viewed as guidelines? George says that is something to be determined by the membership though they are proposed currently as requirements.

#1 No change in current policy.

#2. What does “worked with” mean? George defined as giving Alexander Technique lessons and education.

#3. none

#4. Graham asked what the starting point is for determining beginning of seven years?

#5. none

#6. Lucia-current Sponsors are not ATI teaching members—do they have to become one?

The proposal is to apply to the future sponsors.

#6. none

#7. none

#8. Catherine; who decides on this “involved in:” criteria? All agreed criteria shall be determined clearly by membership.

#9. This is a procedure for doing sponsorship. Could be switched to “Procedure” part. Supported by Ethics committee

#10. Can we have a more descriptive form title than “Feedback Form”. What happens if they don’t fill out the form. (concern put in parking lot).

#11. Cathy: how are you preserving confidentiality for the candidate (parking lot concern). Sarah—would this be an assessment form. Need a better distinguishing title.

#12 none

#13. A sponsor candidate cannot include a nominator anyone who trained in the same establishment they trained in. (or who they trained with). Tabled so that the committee can clear up what their intention is for this requirement.

Consensus reached on #1 through #12 by acclamation.

Niall commended the committee and George for this work and the presentation of it.

level 1 Discussion –Deferred to next meeting.

level 2 Specifying concerns –Deferred to next meeting

## VII. Evaluation

Sarah Compton: Frustrated by all the time spent talking about process and how we're going to proceed.

Gabrielle: can we find a way for people to read the document thoroughly so we don't spend so much time reading.

Shawn Copeland: no place in the process to publicly thank the proposers. Evaluation period can include that.

Cathy Madden: parking lot is an innovation that is really terrific. The flags are great for misunderstanding

Antoinette: appreciates consistent light and livelies.

Cathrine Kettrick: thinks it would help to have a reminder of each section of discussion (level definition)

Nigel: It was important for me that we took the time to clarify and answer my questions

Niall: The work of the facilitators must be difficult because of the way the conversation shoots around the room. Argumentative rather than informational.

Jennifer Mizenko: requested that we return to the meeting intentions

Lucia: Appreciated the support of the time-keeper. We need more time. Would like firmer time keeping.

Broke for lunch

AGM membership Council Meeting

October 24, 2007 9:15pm

Attending: Quorum was reached at 9:15 am

Assigned Formal consensus meeting facilitation roles.

Faciliatator      Patt O'Neill, Lucia

Time Keeper      Jennifer Mizenko

Door keeper      Debi Adams

Public Scribe      Graham Elliot

Notetakers      Linda and Sarah, Carolyn Simon

Peacekeeper      Cathy Madden

Advocate      Peter Nobes

Reviewed meeting intentions

The purpose of this meeting is to conduct the business of ATI. We will view this as a learning conversation as much possible.

We will listen and participate with good will and assume others are also acting from good will

We will attend to our means-whereby we listen, with respect and resiliency, especially when we feel strongly.

Review and consent to Agenda

Consented to

Announcements

AGM 2006 Minutes are with Linda Hein, please read and approve them

Reminder to seek out the new sponsor candidates (also those up for re-election)

Please volunteer for committees

Tommy is doing a workshop at 12:15

The Speed of Dark, by Elizabeth Moon an excellent book recommended by George and Alice Pryor

Lucia reviewed yesterday's meeting and where we are beginning today

3. CCC Proposals Part A

Level 1 / Broad discussion

Reviewed the New vision mission statement

Discussion was stopped to allow George to present the newly written #13.

#13. A sponsor cannot sponsor any teacher certification candidate who trained in the same training school as they themselves were trained.

A sponsor candidate cannot be nominated by anyone who trained in the same establishment that they themselves were trained. #14 (this is a brand new item and is tabled.)

Don White: noted that the last four 11-14 items are about procedures where as the first are part of requirements.

Cathy Madden: This is a change from quality to quantitative

Jen Mizenko: this proposal advances ATI and gives more validity in the broader Alexander world.

Graham Elliott: This process is unique and this is a much needed clarification of a process.

Peter Nobes: this proposal is very important to fit with our original vision mission

Catherine: presents a proxy concern as follows: ATI's philosophy is to give everyone a chance to participate and make decisions, be open and free. If we say that you must have at least one current sponsor nominate you to become a sponsor, then that structurally puts a small group in control of who can be sponsors, and that is not what ATI is about.

Level two/ Specific Concerns

All attending stated concerns with any item 1 through 13.

See attached document "Concerns for CCC Part A"

4. Light and Lively

## 5. Level Three / Resolve concerns

Peter: distinguishing requirements and suggestions

Broke into smaller groups to discuss resolutions.

Ten Minutes feedback from groups

Cathy

#11 Privacy issue: All sponsors must provide the candidate they review with a feedback form. Both must keep a copy of the form. If a complaint is filed both sheets must be submitted with the complaint.

Jen Mizenko

Jennifer Mizenko offered three categories: 1-8 and 12 are category "becoming a sponsor"; 9-11 are sponsor responsibilities; and 13 is a requirement related to "becoming an ATI teaching member."

Some general debate about whether we needed to establish the categories or discuss each item.

Caroline Simon offered a different set of categories:

Eligibility

Teach 7 years #4

Actively teaching

ATI teaching certificate

Member for > 3 years

Actively involved in ATI

## Nomination Process

3 ATI sponsor

Sponsors familiar with work

One is existing sponsor

Re-approval after 5 years

Sponsoring

Not influence each other

Not sponsor teaching certificate for candidate from same training: #13 rewrite

Feedback to candidate

Candidate's sponsors feedback form.

ATI strongly recommends that an ATI teaching candidate finds at least two sponsors not affiliated with their training program (affiliated: 2001 document)

In case of financial or geographical difficulty.

Lucia broke the meeting into smaller group discussions to find a way to merge the two sets of categories.

The whole group reconvened and worked through all of the items determining which were requirements and which were recommendations. Some rewriting of items also helped reach consensus.

Consensus reached #1-11 For final results see attached document CCC Chart

#12 was moved to Part B and #13 was tabled for future rewrite.

Parking Lot issue

Tommy Thompson had a concern about having to be an ATI member for 3 years to be a sponsoring member (we would have no Hungarian teachers if that was the case). He has set it aside for the time being as it has become a recommendation and not a requirement.

## 6. CCC Proposal Part B

Procedure for becoming a sponsor: Application process and Election Process

See attached document CCC Proposals Part B

Presentation. Clarifying questions

If someone objects to a candidate because of an ethical issue does it go to the ethics committee.

Tommy wondered if the proposal requires changing the current bylaws if it changes the entire process from what we are doing now.

Level one (Moved to next meeting)

Level two (moved to next meeting)

## 7. International Committee Resolution Presentation

Changes as follows:

Facilitator: Jenn Mizenko

Time keeper: Patt Elliott

Presentation

Hirohiko Presenting International Committee Resolution (co-sponsored by the Board)

ATI resolves to explore how to become a genuinely multilingual and multicultural organization.

See attached document: International Resolution at AGM Final

Tommy said that Hiro's reading helped him understand so much

Presentation and Clarifying questions.

Does that mean that all packets will be fully translated.

How many languages? The answer was plus or minus 10.

Catherine Kettrick clarified that a resolution is a statement of our intention. It is not a commitment at this time to fulfill the goal. It will guide us in our future.

Graham Elliott suggests that the difference between resolutions or proposal distinction should appear in the wording of the document.

Level 1 – Discussion

David—this further focuses on our Vision Mission goals

Nigel— observes that we have very few of our international members do not attend the meetings because they are so hard to follow for non-English speakers. This could resolve the difficulty.

Tommy—this gives the International committee a charge ( in working with the agenda planning committee)

Jamee—If we don't take immediate action on this resolution we are not in compliance with our vision mission

Lucia— We need language sensitivity in additional areas (formal Consensus, emails, interchange etc.)

Level 2—Concerns

Graham—Concern with the achievability. Implies that we will translate everything into all languages. We will have to choose..

Jamee: we will have to prioritize

Cathy: concerned that we fully recognize our members who are able to translate and that we have a gratitude mechanism.

Debi: Wants to keep the resolution ideal and far reaching because we do not need to worry about its achievability

DJ: even if there is very good translations by translator because of cultural differences it will still be difficult but through good intention we will prevail.

Graham; concerned for the cost of doing universal translations

8. level Three—Resolving concerns

Rosa Louis Rossi urged us on (Linda verbatim?)

Tommy: we are already in the presence of change—address the concerns by accepting the resolution and resolving the concerns as we move forward in addressing the resolution.

Nigel—can we include a facilitator who monitors for language difficulties as a role in FC.

Rosa Louisa—the flag has been a great opportunity to express the moments of confusion for herself. How can we make the English speakers more responsible for their speaking so they are understandable.

David Change wording ATI resolves to explore how to become....We will aim to...get rid of all gerunds.

Resolution will be cleaned up per discussion and approved at the beginning of meeting 4.

## 10. Meeting Evaluation

### AGM Meeting 4

Quorum reached at 2:25pm

I. Review of meeting intentions

II. Assignment of Formal Consensus Roles

Roles: Agenda Planner

Faciliator: Jen Mizenko, Peter Nobes

Time Keeper      David Mills

Door keeper – Peter Brunner

Public Scribe: Antoinette Kranenburg, Catherine Kettrick

Notetakers Linda Hein and Sarah Barker,

Peacekeeper Cathy Madden

Advocate Rosa Louisa

### III. Announcements

Remember to express your preference for time/season to meet AGMs in the future

Remember to read minutes.

### IV. International Resolution

Level Three –Resolving Concerns

Reviewed the rewrite of the International Resolution (attached to Meeting 3)

We agreed that editing for miniscule detail was not needed at this time. The spirit and clarity is fine.

Moved to Consensus

### V. International Proposal

see attached document- International Committee Proposal

Presentation by Hirohiko Kawakami

No Clarifying Questions

## Level 1 General Discussion

Truly invites and welcomes our non-English speakers.

It has us do something about our commitment

Proposal matches Vision/Mission statement, and is symbolic of the philosophical and the practical goals.

## Level 2 Concerns

Does the translation of the Bylaws need to be a legal document

Where does the money come from?

Will the volunteer member translators be compensated?

The pot should not be limited to the \$5 per head.

How will ATI determine how many members we have in any year?

## Level 3 Resolution of concerns

Add code of ethics to the list

Add "at least \$5"

The board is directed to research whether translation need to be legal and or translators be certified.

Suggestion to look into grant writing for the funds for translations.

ATI Board will determine how many members we have in any year.

Consensus Reached

Light and Lively

VI. CCC Proposal A Level 3 Resolving Concerns

#2. Include on the Nominator form that they do know the candidate and have worked with them personally. Nominators must declare with signature. CCC committee will put this in place

#3. Added request to confer with current sponsor.

#4 Applicant will declare on applicant form—included in the current application. Take it out of passive voice.

#5 removed second sentence

#6 accepted

#8 added membership and rewrote for clarity. Deferred for tomorrow to think more fully about how this would be defined.

Tea Break

#9 rewrote for positive action

VII. Meeting evaluation

Specific thought and expression of procedure for becoming an ATI sponsor Section B was well done.

Appreciates growth of the organization demonstrated in the work of the day.

Appreciated the translation from Japanese to English.

Appreciates the engagement required to be a facilitator.

Some felt unclear about the time boundaries and lack of agreement on time limits.

Appreciated us taking ownership of the process.

The language difference is difficult, and in the future one member hopes for translations of the AGM papers before the AGM meetings.

AGM membership Council Meeting

October 25, 2007 9:15pm

Attending: Quorum was reached at 9:15 am

I. Review and consent to Agenda

Consented to

II. Reviewed meeting intentions

The purpose of this meeting is to conduct the business of ATI. We will view this as a learning conversation as much possible.

We will listen and participate with good will and assume others are also acting from good will

We will attend to our means-whereby we listen, with respect and resiliency, especially when we feel strongly.

### III. Roles:

Faciliator Jenn Mizenko

Time Keeper Jamee Culbertson

Door keeper – Peter Brunner

Public Scribe: Antoinette Kranenburg

Notetakers Linda Hein and Sarah Barker

Peacekeeper Cathy Madden

Advocate Rosa Louisa Rossi

Language Facilitator: Catherine Kettrick

### IV. Announcements

Rosa Louisa Rossi talked about the Congress with a warm and encouraging invitation for all of us to come.

Catherine directed us to other hostel accommodations in Lugano—some with kitchens. Also if you research hotels (up the hill) further out are less expensive.

Rick Brennan reminded us of ISATs conference in April—Come.

### V. Conference Evaluation

Each member expressed in one phrase/sentence their experience of the AGM.

Openness, lateness to meetings, the ocean , fantastic entertainment, better formal consensus, sponsorship process short shrifted, joi de vivre and playfulness, learned a lot in the business meetings and formal consensus, connection, closing circle too late. The beginning of something brand new.

## VI. CCC Proposals Part A

Level 3 (#8-#13) See CCC Chart and attached document

#8 complete rewrite:

Suggested a question to be added to the application form – “How have you been involved in ATI?”

Also the following phrase should appear on the application form:

“Examples of involvement include, but are not limited to, assisting or serving on a committee or the Board or attending AGMs”

Consented to as a strong requirement

#9. Consented to as a recommendation

Unresolved concern is that the limit in #7 (three years) is quantitative rather than qualitative. This concern is standing aside since the length of time is not required but is recommended.

#10 Sponsor Process Review Form is the new title. Without submitting not re-elected. See rewrite.

Catherine asks that the CCC develop a clear consequence and how it is implemented.

Consented to as a strong requirement

#11 Clarifies that the candidate fills out a response form.

Consented to as a recommendation

#12 Moved to Part B

#13 Rewrite

ATI strongly recommends that a person applying for an ATI teaching certificate finds at least two sponsors who are not affiliated with the teaching candidate's own training program. (Affiliated means a sponsor who trained in the same program or who currently teaches in the same program.

Among the three sponsors 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 more of the course time. Under exceptional circumstances, an individual applicant may apply to the Certification Coordinating Committee for exceptions to this rule. In these cases the Certification Coordinating Committee will facilitate the certifying process for that individual. The Certification Coordinating Committee will document the reasons they allowed this exception and keep this documentation on file in the ATI office.

Discussed rewrite and Jenn Mizenko asked if we agree with the spirit, and ask the CCC committee to find where it fits with its work, and bring it back to the 2008 AGM.

Referred back to committee for clarification and agreement.

Tea Break

## VII. CCC Proposal B

(Presented with Clarifying Questions Oct 24)

### Level 1 General discussion

Does not fit our administration style of membership responsibility—too much power with the board

Fits with the mission in representing us to the world at large.

### Level 2 Concerns

Concerned about the lack of participation by the members

What happens with losses or hold ups in the mail.

Can we use the same term for nominee/candidate/applicant

Candidate would not be informed if a concern were raised.

Concerned with detailed limits on objections—needs cohesion with the requirement and recommendations now agreed to.

Having to submit personally take away anonymity and cancels out an election.

Procedures of submittal may not need our consent

This came out of the problem of too few active voters in the past.

Level 3 Resolving Concerns

It was clear that there was not time to resolve the concerns and come to consensus.

This meeting surveyed those in attendance: Who is very invested in this process and would be interested in working further with the CCC committee. Antoinette recorded names as follows:

Debi Adams DAdams2796@aol.com

Graham Elliott gje@ntlworld.com

Gilles Estran gilles.estrans@tele2.fr

Irma Hesz info@at-praxis.de

Nigel Hornby nigemail@online.no

Catherine Kettrick catherine@performanceschool.org

Antoinette Kranenburg ak@KensingtonAlexander.com

Bob Lada rllalex@alum.mit.edu

Cynthia Mauney cyn@thia.org

David Mills davidm@performanceschool.org

Marsha Paludan mmpaludan@uncg.edu

Don White don@141.biz

Graham said if we can resolve and increase the participation level of voting we may resolve this in a different way.

We must be absolutely clear how people will be elected as sponsors for the following year. Catherine suggested that we continue to elect sponsors according to our Oxford, 2004 resolution but following Part A for all new sponsor applicants this year. All agreed.

Suggestion to move to close the committee of the whole. CCOW

Moved and seconded

All in Favor

## VIII. CONFIRM DECISIONS

1. International Resolution

2. Paying for translations

3. Vision Mission

4. Recommendations and Requirements for Sponsors #1 through #11.

5. Temporary election Process and re-election of standing sponsors

Unanimous vote

Committees commended for their work

Power point was an enormous help

IX. Bylaw amendment for definition of Sponsors deferred to Bylaws committee to prepare for voting a year from now.

(We can in spirit operate with the intent that has been agreed to in the Committee of a whole)

Moved the amended definition of a sponsor: (see amended text in CCC submission) be accepted as consented to.

Unanimous vote

X. Vote on renewal of 8 sponsors for five years (projected on power-point screen) and Robert Lada and Don White as new sponsors (see attached ballot). (this solves problem that the printed ballot was left out of the packet.)

All instructed to write on blank pieces of paper if they approved all or specifically who not. These secret ballots were collected and counted by Linda Hein.

XI. Election of Greg Holdaway

Greg Holdaway was elected as sponsor for one year : 6 abstentions, 37 in favor. Passed

XII. Moved and seconded that we reelect for one year all sponsors who are up for renewal who have not come to the AGM.

Unanimous

XIII. Approval of Minutes for AGM 2006

Unanimous

XIV. Bylaws

David announced that he will post the Bylaws revision on the membership only page.

Revisions are

1. Simplifying language
2. Recognizing things in the bylaws that we are not doing and removing them
3. Decisions that we have to make about whether to change to current practise or expressed concerns.

Anything that is there members are invited to respond with feedback (or join the bylaws committee) Ask for each item—does it make clear sense, does it seem reasonable, do you have any concerns or suggestions.

All members are urged to review and respond to the Bylaws revision to David Mills over this next year. The aim is to keep the bylaws as simple as possible.

Graham suggests that questions of style of governance should not be in the bylaws but thoroughly discussed as a group.

Can be adopted by mail by a majority vote of our membership.