

Friday, October 24 MCM – Meeting Minutes #1

Cecile Rist translated the English meeting into French.

Fiona Cranwell opened the meeting with some request to shut off cell phones.

Announcements:

Antoinette: Asked members to remove the Alexander Writing copies from the PDC, and replace them with the newly copied items for an ATI Anatomy Tournament. There is a workshop for this in tomorrow's schedule.

Linda: Request to settle up Registration Payments

Jennifer Mizenko: at 5:30 this evening will have a Q&A for Continuing Education Proposal in this room.

Corinne Cassini: gave time changes for early morning workshops

Fiona Cranwell thanked Gilles Estran and the French members who brought us to France for the meeting and for all the work they did to get us here. Introduced Paloma, Manuelle, and Nezli, the assistants for this meeting.

There are issues with the food and the eating plan for some members. Fiona Cranwell will investigate and get back to everyone with information.

Fiona Cranwell mentioned that meetings and workshops were scheduled a little differently this year, and thanked Julie Mulvihill. Any changes to the schedule would be made on the schedule hanging in the foyer.

Entertainment and no talent night will be this week. Fiona Cranwell went through the rest of the schedule, sightseeing in Bordeaux, and the ISMETA discount membership flyer.

Meeting Open:

Fiona Cranwell went through the treasurer's report, reporting that we are financially stable, and that expenses were higher this year because of the website costs.

Marilou Chacey took over the meeting, and announced that we may lose the projector due to chargeability issues.

Light and Lively

MEETING INTENTIONS:

Marilou Chacey put up the meeting intentions. Irene Schlump read them in German. Noelle Keruzoré read them in French.

AGENDA:

Marilou Chacey pointed out the Formal Consensus Process, which is how we as a group make decisions. Discussed the minute of quiet. She posted the Agenda, and mentioned that we started late and that she had cut off Fiona Cranwell. With translations, we needed all the time in the world. So, we agreed that we would all make an effort to begin on time, together.

Marilou Chacey discussed Committee of the Whole (COW). Marilou Chacey read the three points of the committee of the whole.

ATI membership assembled becomes one large committee during the discussion.

During the discussions, we will use the Formal Consensus Process.

The last day of the Conference will close the committee of the whole and return to Robert's Rules to vote.

Noelle Keruzoré and Corinne Cassini discussed the committee of the whole and Robert's Rules in French.

Marilou Chacey asked if someone would make a motion to leave Robert's Rules and move to committee of the whole and Formal Consensus Process. Jennifer Mizenko so moved. Members voted, and the motion passed with zero NO votes.

FORMAL CONSENSUS:

FC Roles for this meeting:

Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey

Facilitator: Jennifer Mizenko

Timekeeper: rj Fleck

Doorkeeper: Fiona Cranwell

Notetaker: Linda Hein

Public Scribe: Cirsten Verleger (English) and Vincent Pradourat (French)

Peacekeeper: Mira Adam has the small chime, and Jennifer Mizenko has her big chimes

Advocate: Rosa Luisa Rossi

New Role for this Meeting: no "name," but just a definition. Marilou asked who in the room had some knowledge and felt comfortable with formal consensus. She had them stand up, and indicated to the members still sitting to find one of the people standing to help to understand Formal Consensus if needed.

Agenda: Marilou asked if there were any concerns about the Agenda. Since we are very late, she suggested that we take 5 minutes from the meeting evaluation and that we could run five minutes late. Fiona said we can't run over, but then pointed out that it would be from tea time. Kate Lushington also volunteered to make her presentation quickly and save time there. No further concerns about the agenda.

Marilou ceded the floor to Jennifer Mizenko and Kate Lushington.

Proposal to change the By Law IV.6

Proposal presented. Kate Lushington summed up the proposal for the membership:

Starting point: When the Board realized last year that Fiona Cranwell had to leave the Board after one term as Chair because she had been an assistant for the term immediately before that, the Board decided (with the advice of a lawyer) that she would resign in September 2013 for one month in order to run for a second term as Chair. Fiona was voted in for a second term as Chair at Toronto AGM 2013. Therefore this allowed Fiona Cranwell to serve more than two consecutive terms on the Board as her two Chair terms were interrupted by a gap when she resigned.

Discussion: The Board remembered that this By Law was on the books, to make sure that there was always new blood, and no one was chair endlessly. The Board also feels that it fits our V/M statement to have only two terms. Then the Board thought about the idea of continuity and that if someone can learn more, that person becomes more valuable to the organization.

Conclusion: The Board realized this would not just include the Chair position, but all positions. The new proposed wording:

Members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms in any of the positions but no longer than four consecutive terms in all. Though Board members are elected for two year terms (see By Law IV.5) any board member who serves one year and one day in a position shall be considered to have served a full term of the purposed of this bylaw.

Time ran out, Jennifer Mizenko proposed that we add five minutes from the clarifying questions. Jennifer then asked if there were any concerns. NO concerns.

Clarifying Questions:

Eve Salomon had a clarifying question: What is the position, and what does a year and a day mean? Jennifer Mizenko clarified what a year and a day meant. Irene Schlump explained further to Eve Salomon. We need more time for clarifying questions, and so Level I on this item will move to another MCM. No concerns about moving Level I to next MCM.

Sarah Barker said given the comments for new blood, had the board given concern to counting how long one person could be on the board, which would be up to 10 years. Kate Lushington said she had no expectation that someone would actually serve for 10 years.

Time ran out, so Jennifer Mizenko suggested that people write clarifying questions up on the paper at the front of the room.

MEETING EVALUATION:

Rosa Luisa Rossi: appreciated extremely the clarity and calmness that Marilou presented the process.

Julia Gilroy (?): she thought it would have been quite valuable to read the FC Process papers before coming into the meeting.

Marilou Chacey: Thanked Cecile

Sarah Barker: She appreciated the facile way that Jennifer extended the time because it's great to know that we will give the time to each step as it needs.

Sakiko Ishitsubo: appreciated the French translation during the meeting, because it let her see the future of these meetings.

Irene Schlump: As always, the first MCM was heavy, and she appreciated that everyone was concentrated. Asked that we not clap hands, but make the hand movement in the air that was used before.

Meeting announced over, and Jennifer Mizenko turned meeting back to Marilou Chacey

Marilou pointed out that the FC Process information is in other languages on All Together. She said that weekly emails about FC Process will continue to come to conference participants by email in the weeks before the Conference in the future.

Fiona announced that the ATI Sponsors have a Sponsor meeting between 8-9 p.m.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Saturday, October 25 MCM – Meeting Minutes #2

Mira Adam translated the English meeting into French. Marilou Chacey opened the meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Fiona Cranwell gave an announcement for Gilles Estran regarding the community class for local residents to spread the word and to let local teachers meet the local community, but other international teachers are invited to attend the community workshop. The community class will be in the foyer of the meeting building.

Irene Schlump: mentioned that perhaps people leaving the meeting could sign up to share rides on the list outside in the foyer. Irene also mentioned that if anyone is leaving but wants to vote on the proposals to make sure that you give the proxy to Linda Hein.

MEETING INTENTIONS:

Corinne Cassini read the Membership Council Meeting Intentions in French.

AGENDA:

Marilou Chacey presented the agenda and asked if there were concerns about the agenda for today. With no objections or concerns, Marilou proceeded with the Agenda as is and Gave flags to those participants whose first language is other than English. Marilou announced that it would be very simple to continue with the same people in roles as the morning meeting except:

FORMAL CONSENSUS:

FC Roles for this meeting:

Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey

Facilitator: Rosa Luisa Rossi and RJ Fleck

Timekeeper: Susan Sinclair

Doorkeeper: Maryse Berninet

Notetaker: Linda Hein

Public Scribe: Antoinette Kranenburg (English) and Catherine Vernerie (French)

Peacekeeper: Peter Nobes

Advocate: Maria Weiss

Proposal to Form a Standing Committee.

Rosa Luisa Rossi took the floor as Faciliator and introduced Corinne Cassini, Sarah Barker and Jennifer Mizenko to discuss the Ad Hoc Continuing Education Committee Proposal to Form a Standing Committee.

Introduction: Corinne Cassini gave a bit of history for the reason for having continuing education. The first ad hoc committee was formed in 2009. Corinne gave information on the survey that was given at the AGM in 2009, and then the ad hoc committee ceased work. In 2012, at the close of the AGM in Papenburg, the current ad hoc CE committee (Shawn Copeland, Corinne Cassini, Sarah Barker and Jennifer Mizenko) formed and have been working on CE since then. During 2013 V/M committee decided to place four questions to the membership, and that result is presented now to the membership in the Meeting packet. The committee is now before the membership with a revised proposal, and that is the history. Jennifer gave a clarification that the V/M committee, is comprised mostly of past chairs.

Rationale of the committee members:

Validity of ATI teaching member Code of Ethics: 3.1 of our Code of Ethics states: ATI Teaching Members continue to deepen their knowledge and understanding of the FM Alexander Technique and to improve their teaching skill.”

High Standards/Quality

Sustain Membership: Section 3.2 of our Code of Ethics states: ATI Teaching Members recognize the labor necessary to run ATI and contribute their time and expertise to ATI on committees or other positions of leadership when possible, who contribute their time to the organization to document that time as continuing education.

Demonstrate to great AT community and global community the professionalism of ATI and its teaching members.

Sarah then reads the proposal of the Ad hoc CE Comittee:

To form a Standing Committee for Continuing Education (Continuing Education Committee, CEC) responsible for writing, implementing and administering a policy of continuing education for the ATI membership and to accept the following Terms of Reference for the Continuing Education Committee.

The Committee Terms of Reference:

The Committee is responsible for writing a policy of continuing education that reflects the Vision/Mission and code of Ethics of Alexander Technique International Inc., for approval by the membership of ATI.

The Committee may further develop or amend the policy of Continuing Education for approval by the membership of ATI.

The Committee is responsible for implementing maintain and administering the policy of continuing education for all teaching members of ATI.

When necessary, the Committee will consult with the Certification Coordinating Committee, Vision/mission Committee, Ethics Advisory Committee, or any other appropriate Committee.

The Committee is responsible for reporting on the current continuing education activities of the membership in the Continuing Education committee Annual General Meeting Report.

RJ took five minutes from the end of the meeting and put it on to the Clarifying Question Section.

Clarifying Questions on Ad Hoc CE Committee Proposal:

Peter Nobes: why does it say specific committees on the Terms of Reference?

Sarah Barker attempted to clarify for Peter. The committees that are named are linked to our rationale, because they are about teachers, and ethics because this fulfills ethics, but we wanted to leave it open if we needed others.

Antoinette Kranenburg as Proxy for Catherine Kettrick: Catherine has a question about implementing and administering the policy, because they are quite broad terms.

Sarah Barker answered that that was correct, they are quite broad.

Tania Canas: I'm confused so I have a question. Right now we are only deciding about forming a committee, not about what education will be required?

Sarah Barker answered yes.

David Gorman: Whatever terms of reference or anything that the Committee proposes will be put before the membership?

Sarah Barker answered yes.

LEVEL I DISCUSSION

Does the proposal support the ATI Vision/Mission Statement:

Rosa Luisa Rossi took the floor to begin the Level I discussion.

Peter Brunner says the proposal is supported by Part 4 of the Vision/Mission Statement.

Kate Lushington believes it supports Part 1 of the Vision/Mission Statement.

Cirsten Verleger also agrees that it supports Part 4 of the Vision/Mission Statement.

Marilou Chacey said that it also supports ATI's Code of Ethics, which enhances the members' personal respect for being a teacher.

Alison Deadman said that she believed that if the committee were to be formed it would give the opportunity for the members to abide by Part 2 of the Vision/Mission Statement.

Rosa Luisi Rossi says it looks like the V/M Statement is covered under the proposal. The meeting went back to the Agenda, and the meeting will move on to Level II, after a Light and Lively.

LIGHT AND LIVELY

LEVEL II, CONCERNS FOR THE PROPOSAL:

David Gorman: concerned that there is a conflict between the first three parts of the rationale and the fourth part of the rationale. His second concern is about the purpose of the proposal, and it has several parts but he will get to those later.

Irene Schlump: We have in ATI twelve committees, and three of them are ad hoc. We have an international committee and CE is different in different countries, and we have a PDC committee, and I think this is about Professional Development. And it is about our members and we have a membership committee, besides everything else. So there are two concerns within this theme:

1. Some of the committees only have one or two members, and my concern is that this big theme is overwhelming for another committee with only one or two or three members.
2. The so called continuing education would be too separated from the affairs of the international, membership and PDC committees.

Antoinette Kranenburg as proxy for Catherine Kettrick: Catherine Kettrick's concern is that this would give the committee, which is unelected, the authority to determine what counts as continuing education, and how much.

Peter Brunner has a concern that if we installed a committee for this project, the solution will take us 10 years. And from the professional point of view, it is essential to have a solution very fast.

NOTE: Peter Brunner is not a member of ATI or teacher of AT and so his thought was shared yet could not be taken into account as a concern. He was later asked to desist from making comment if he was going to be in the room during MCM's. His care for ATI is noted.

David Gorman asked why in the morning he was required to wait on his concern to be discussed in committee but that wasn't happening now.

Marilou Chacey suggested that Rosa Luisa Rossi ask for concerns about this proposal.

Tommy Thompson said he thought he had a concern in that listening to the concerns is that we might not take into consideration that there is a valid need for the committee because the continuing education is valid to all professional organizations, however we tailor it for our organization. His concern is that we are not concerned enough about the validity of establishing this committee to respond to a need.

Kate Lushington says she feels suppressed, and wonders why she cannot hear David Gorman's concern. She thought that everything had to be on paper and then go to the committees so that we vote on it. David Gorman told Kate she misunderstood him, or he was not clear. He did not have a second concern, just that he had two parts to his concern or they are very related. One has to do with the intent of the rationale and how that would come through, and he sees a conflict between the stated rationale and very allied with that is the purpose of it. What are we trying to accomplish? Every time he sees proposals that create more bureaucracy he wonders why, but if everyone is already doing it, it covers the first three rationales.

David Gorman was asked to give his concerns then. Jennifer Mizenko went over his previous concerns as recorded by the scribes, and added that he was in agreement with Tommy Thompson.

It was decided to continue the concerns on this proposal in the next meeting in the morning.

Marilou said that in Level II we list the concerns we have about the proposal. What Marilou heard David say was that he was concerned about us creating another committee, which is also what Irene Schlump said.

Antoinette Kranenburg gave another PDC announcement about the workshop in the afternoon.

Gilles Estran: David Gorman is giving a three day workshop right after the conference, if anyone has time to attend and is interested, let Gilles Estran know.

MEETING EVALUATION:

Jennifer Mizenko: I loved it, I hated it.

Fiona Cranwell: I enjoyed watching the apprenticeship of Rosa Luisa Rossi and RJ Fleck as meeting leaders in the FC process. I have hope for the future of our meetings.

Cirsten Verleger: the formality of the process does not help me understand that proposals and concerns.

Kate Lushington: She appreciates that Cirsten Verleger feels that way, she also appreciates the way the formal consensus works when she expressed that, and that it was part of the apprenticeship that caused the not understanding the concerns. She appreciated everyone's ability to take a step back, and for Rosa Luisa, Marilou and RJ to listen so that she felt listened to, and she was grateful to hear David's concern and that we will have more time. It's part of the process.

David Gorman: I have an ongoing sense that we do not have enough time. I'm just starting to get into the flow of the process, and it's over. I'm not sure how many other people share this sense, just my ongoing sense.

Marilou Chacey: I appreciate when people write down their thoughts, their concerns, and then look at them, and then come to the meeting prepared. When that occurs, we are able, ourselves, to be clear and concise, and I appreciate that there were some concerns done in that fashion.

Irene Schlump: The whole thing leaves me a little bit unsatisfied, because it does not seem to reflect yesterday's Q&A meeting, and so I'm very grateful to David and Kate for their concerns, and Marilou Chacey's statement just now because I know I can bring my concern tomorrow.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Glossary:

MCM: Membership Counsel Meeting

V/M Committee: Vision/Mission Committee

CE: Continuing Education

Q&A Meeting: There was a meeting for Questions and Answers on Memberships view on Continuing Education a day before

Saturday, October 25 MCM – Meeting Minutes #3

Cecile Rist translated the English meeting into French. Marilou Chacey opened the meeting.

MEETING INTENTIONS: Meeting Intentions read in French and English and German.

AGENDA: No objections to the Agenda as Planned

FORMAL CONSENSUS:

FC Roles for this meeting:

Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey

Facilitator: Jennifer Mizenko

Timekeeper: Susan Sinclair

Doorkeeper: Maryse Berninent

Notetaker: Linda Hein

Public Scribe: Antoinette Kranenburg (English) and Catherine Vernerie (French)

Peacekeeper: Peter Nobes

Advocate: Sarah Barker

Jennifer Mizenko took the floor as facilitator.

Continuing Clarifying Questions on By Law Change Proposal:

What do you mean by any of the positions?

Eve Salomon: Why a year and a day? Response from Jennifer and Marilou is that it counts as two years to avoid people stepping out in the middle of the term and who are then reelected and go on and on.

David Gorman: If you do the math, the number of years one could serve is 9 years.

Answer Kate Lushington – we don't expect that; we just would like to have the ability to continue leadership.

LEVEL I DISCUSSION – Does the ByLaw Proposal Support the V/M Statement

The proposal allows us to draw on the strength of the Board experience.

Sarah Barker: Potential for habit to direct the Board; danger of deleterious effect on “means whereby.”

Kate Lushington: Encourages us to use the Alexander Technique to recognize habit of the board as well as offering flexibility to recognize continuity. Proposal arose from the intent to further the ATI Vision/Mission

Kate Lushington: The Board needs the opportunity and time to experiment with administrative tasks. It Encourages and supports Part 3 of the V/M Statement: To embody the principles of the F. M. Alexander Technique in ATI's structure and means of operation.

Kate Lushington: Encourages the diversity of the Board, which takes time for accommodating various languages. The board currently has four languages represented on it.

LEVEL II, CONCERNS FOR THE PROPOSAL:

Marilou Chacey stood to speak for Cathy Madden, who has Marilou as her proxy. Cathy Madden's concern is that it applies to the whole Board rather than only to the assistant chair and the chair.

Marilou Chacey's concern is that it applies to the whole Board and not just the Chair. Only a slight difference between these two concerns.

We are at time, and Jennifer Mizenko asked if we could add 12 minutes on to the end of the meeting to hear concerns. No concerns, so 12 minutes added to the end of the meeting.

We clarified Sakiko Ishitsubo's concern.

David Gorman said he didn't have a concern but wondered if Marilou Chacey or Cathy Madden could say why, but that will come later in the small committees to work on the concerns.

Sarah Barker said that we must preserve the flexibility of service. We have not protected the Board, we have not guaranteed that we will have new Board members every two or every four years with this proposal. She is concerned that we have no structure to guarantee new blood will arrive on the board every two or four years with this proposal. She is concerned that she could be under a Board for nine years.

Eve Salomon is concerned that the proposal as drafted does not deliver what the Board says it wants to be done.

Sakiko Ishitsubo took a moment to make sure that the Japanese members understood the concerns.

Marilou Chacey is concerned that the wording was confusing, and with a ByLaw it must be very clear.

Antoinette Kranenberg is proxy for Catherine Kettrick, and she has Catherine's concern but not with her so she will need to review it and bring it back to the group.

Eve Salomon was concerned that it doesn't cover people coming back on to the board after a period of absence.

Peter Brunner says the wording doesn't address the core intention. (NOTE: his concern is not listed till he is not an current ATI member)

Jennifer Mizenko then said she saw the themes in the concerns, and wanted to now form sub committees.

The four major concerns are:

Determining who the proposal applies to;

"new blood" or making sure we have new board members regularly;

confusion of the language as it is written; and

actual problem isn't solved.

MEETING EVALUATION:

Fiona Cranwell: thanked the facilitators and appreciated the value of the concerns and statements.

Gilles Estran: Thanked the Translator! It was important.

Peter Nobes: He loved seeing Alexander people working together positively, but as the peacekeeper he found it really frustrating!

Tania Canas: She liked how Jennifer kept the meeting on track without being abrupt or jarring, she was firm and open at the same time.

Eve Salomon: she liked the way time was managed and renegotiated as necessary.

Corinne Cassini: she liked how that when we "took the time when we needed it, we took the time as we needed it"

Mira Adam: liked that we used AT in the way of driving or conducting the meeting and it is time to use this in the structure of the Board.

Irene Schlump: we could be better in working out the clarifying questions part because the time for making people understand should not be a time for tension. She thanked Kate, that she took it on for us, the Board, our tension...and she is grateful for the group's concerns.

Manuelle Borgel: She is again very happy to take the path of the Formal Consensus, and to see and watch you take that in charge.

Sakiko Ishitsubo: she is still new blood for FC, and in the workshop the people behaved well, but this is real life and it is great to see the AT is working in real life.

Kate Lushington: building on Sakiko's comments, she feels as though there is less difference in the process between the workshops and the business meetings. This is actually quite emotional

for her because she hadn't realized that this is her 3rd conference and she was in the hot seat but what an opportunity not always taken. She loves the alternate applause activity!

Jennifer Mizenko asked for a one word response with immediate gut response.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Glossary:

FC: Formal Consensus

MCM: Membership Counsel Meeting

Sunday, October 26 MCM – Meeting Minutes #4

Cecile Rist translated the English meeting into French.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Gilles Estran: Today is the Community Class. The problem is that the French Teachers do not know what community class is. So Gilles invites all the ATI teachers present to attend the community because we are going to receive people from the area to introduce them to the AT at 5:30 – 7:00.

Jennifer Mizenko: Tomorrow she is doing the early morning practice and is going to keep the space upstairs, doing a yoga based movement class.

Cirsten Verleger: Another announcement for people who attended the anatomy workshops, and explained the process of the tournament. She announced the prizes of the tournament: Jeanne Tjo received a tango, the Exchange goes to RJ Fleck, and Peter Nobes won the bottle of wine.

Peter Nobes: announced the talent show again, and said only three people have signed on yet. The Japanese ladies are going to sing! Sign up!

MEETING INTENTIONS: Marilou Chacey had everyone read the MCM intentions out loud in their own languages

AGENDA:

Marilou Chacey presented the agenda and asked if there were concerns about the agenda for today. Problem re translation, and problem/concerned was answered. Sarah Barker has a concern that we are going through the FC process on something that does not need to come to a decision, ~~and~~ the group will feel that we must hear all clarifying questions and all concerns, ~~and~~ she believes we can stay on time if we understand that this is a launch, a present to the proposers to help them move forward for next year.

Marilou Chacey said we can come to consensus on the wording of the bylaw that we will vote on next year, and we are able to do this as a group. We do not have to, but we are able to do so as a group. Sarah Barker said today is not a final decision, the vote will happen next year. Marilou Chacey said that the wording will be at consensus, and Corinne said we can come to consensus at any level.

Marilou Chacey said: Because this is a Bylaw, we cannot vote on it this year, but we can vote on the wording that will be brought to the membership in 2015. Marilou Chacey said that we cannot do the agenda as planned and suggested that we take time out of the evaluation time and from the Level 2 of the Revision.

With no objections or concerns, Marilou Chacey proceeded with the Agenda as revised as there were no objections.

Peter Brunner reminded people that they could step aside from their own concern. Flags were given to those participants whose first language is other than English. Marilou Chacey announced that it would be very simple to continue with the same people in roles as the morning meeting except:

FORMAL CONSENSUS:

FC Roles for this meeting:

Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey

Facilitator: Jennifer Mizenko and RJ Fleck

Timekeeper: Susan Sinclair

Doorkeeper: Irene Schlump

Notetaker: Linda Hein

Public Scribe: Julie Mulvihill (English) and Manuelle Borgel (French)

Peacekeeper: Cirsten Verleger

Advocate: Sandy Merelaid

Continuing Level II – CONCERNS on Proposal for a Standing Continuing Education Committee:

RJ Fleck took the floor to bring up the discussion regarding the concerns of the CE Proposal. Jennifer Mizenko asked that we read the concerns from yesterday.

David Gorman withdrew his concerns from yesterday as he believed that they would be adequately addressed if the committee is formed.

Irene Schlump has a concern that we are getting rid of concerns, as they now belong to the group. Jennifer Mizenko said that David Gorman is allowed to stand aside with his concerns. Irene Schlump said she had a question then about the process. She asked David if he meant to address the concerns in the small groups, and he said no, he was stepping aside as his concern would be addressed if the committee was actually created. Kate Lushington said she was concerned that withdrawing David Gorman's concerns would not save time. Marilou Chacey stated again that David Gorman was allowed to stand aside. David Gorman's concerns were removed from the list.

Prior concerns were read again.

Concerns from the current meeting:

Irene Schlump had a concern about the Terms of Reference, that they are ending on the policy. *The terms of reference were put up for everyone to see.* She is concerned that it is more about punishing than anything else. The committee's path is to find a policy.

Jennifer Mizenko said these concerns were about the proposal, not the policy.

Tommy Thompson said that the reason we are talking about this at all is because one of the members said that they were not being taken care of in their own countries. ATI has a history of addressing international members with regulatory policy and other matters, so his concern is that in not establishing a committee, and usually when we do establish a committee it is because we feel we need to give a lot of attention to the issue, it is up to ATI, our mission statement, the Board, the Membership, to address government regulatory policy when necessary.

We are at time, and we have not yet reached the end of concerns or grouping of the concerns. Seeing no further concerns we are closing Level II of the FC process.

It was suggested that people who want to meet in a subcommittee to work about the concerns should meet after this meeting to determine a meeting time.

LIGHT AND LIVELY

PRESENTATION OF THE BYLAW PROPOSAL REWRITE – WITH CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:

The Current Proposal was re-read to the group:

IV.6 members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms in any of the positions but no longer than four consecutive terms in all. Though Board members are elected for two year terms (see ByLaw IV.5) any Board member who serves one year and one day in a position shall be considered to have served a full term for the purposes of this ByLaw.

The new wording is as follows:

IV.6 Members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms on the board

with the exception of the chair who may have already served in another Board position and who may serve up to two consecutive terms as a chair.

David asked how this addressed the whole "gap" question, and how it would stop someone from resigning and then coming back and serving again for however many years. Marilou Chacey said that is answered already in IV.11 in the ByLaws.

Eve Salomon said that because of the word consecutive, it would be considered that the second person appointed would be the one considered to have served; the first person, who resigned, could keep coming back and getting elected, resigning, and coming back. Eve said that we

thought about putting a restriction on the total number of years someone could serve, and they decided that would mean an additional ByLaw and new proposal.

David Gorman said that what was clear in the old one is now not clear.

LIGHT AND LIVELY

LEVEL II, CONCERNS on the new proposed wording:

David Gorman: is concerned that the change now does not really address the issue of replacing vacancies. Jennifer Mizenko responded that that issue is taken care of in another section of the ByLaws already.

Marilou Chacey said she thought it was a concern about the limit of this bylaw, but we can go back and say...it is needed, but not appropriate.

Marilou Chacey said procedurally she did not know what to do. Sarah Barker said it was a valid concern, and that it will be resolved by the subcommittee, but it will not go in the wording we send to the membership next year. She said David Gorman could say he will stand aside as long as a committee will deal with this issue and bring it back to us next year in the appropriate wording.

Marilou Chacey had a concern over the wording that might be housekeeping, but she couldn't remember. Then she said it was not housekeeping, and said it wasn't clear if it was "additional." Meaning the person could serve an additional two consecutive terms. Her concern was clarity of the wording.

No further concerns. Jennifer Mizenko closed the concerns. Moved on to working with concerns.

Jennifer asked David Gorman to write his resolution, he declined. Sarah Barker wanted to see the relevant ByLaws, because she thought David Gorman's sentence of concern might better be put into the other section.

David Gorman suggested that we change IV.10. Jennifer Mizenko said we can't change other ByLaws but we can add to the proposal that was presented. David Gorman suggested that we take the last sentence of the original proposal and add it to the rewrite.

Marilou Chacey:?????

Alison Deadman: has a concern that we are not remembering that someone may serve on the board for two years, come off the board, and go back on to the board ad infinitum. Her concern is that what we are trying to do is to create tighter and tighter boundaries, and we are never going to have a situation of stopping someone coming off and on unless we say you may only serve a certain number of terms.

David Gorman asked if anyone was concerned about that.

Jennifer Mizenko said resolving the concerns creates new concerns, which is where we are. She suggested that as this will come before the membership next year that we send this to the board with our concerns and have the Board resolve the Concerns.

Marilou Chacey has a concern about that because the Board has come to membership for help with this and the wording now belongs to us, the membership, a committee could be formed here that includes board and other members to address the concerns.

Kate Lushington said she said we could put the David Gorman concern sentence at the beginning of the proposal and just do housekeeping.

Jennifer said we need two committees: one will work on resolutions for all the concerns on the proposed bylaw change, and another will work on the concerns on the standing continuing education committee and present those resolutions tomorrow.

Immediately following this meeting is Meet the ATI Sponsor time, so meet around the charts to figure out a time to meet.

MEETING EVALUATION:

Rosa Luisa Rossi: She loves this process and thought she had trust and then she lost the trust, and then we had another time that opened up and I thought wow just go with trusting this process! So she decided to trust the process.

Peter Nobes: The word I used the other day was group. We haven't been a whole today.

Marilou Chacey: She felt like everyone took to heart that we are all doing the best we can. And the other phrase that goes with that is that we have all the time in the world because this is not a life or death situation.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Monday, October 27 MCM – Meeting Minutes #5

Corinne Cassini translated the English meeting into French.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Marilou Chacey: Announcement of Peter Brunner’s meeting at 5:30 today to talk about books with Facebook pages.

Gilles Estran: He is offering a dancing conference, for the first time. With Mathieu.

He said that if anyone wants to give anything to the staff as a thank you, we will leave one envelope to gather the money. We have to exit the rooms by 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Cecile Rist: Please translate after the person has finished speaking

Fiona Cranwell: Vote and give them to Linda Hein today so we can count the vote overnight.

People who voted online do NOT vote again today. Also give proxies to Linda Hein.

Marilou Chacey: asked if there were concerns in continuing the announcements for another minute.

Corinne Cassini: morning practice for sitting meditation tomorrow.

Tommy Thompson: Announced Frank Jones meeting.

MEETING INTENTIONS: Marilou had everyone read the MCM intentions out loud in their own languages

AGENDA: Marilou Chacey presented the agenda and asked if there were concerns about the agenda for today.

FORMAL CONSENSUS:

FC Roles for this meeting:

Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey

Facilitator: Jennifer Mizenko and RJ Fleck and Rosa Luisa Rossi

Timekeeper: Susan Sinclair

Doorkeeper: Andrea Aberle

Notetaker: Linda Hein

Public Scribe: Kate Lushington (English) and Maryse Berninet (French)

Peacekeeper: Tania Canas

Advocate: Kathleen Juhl

FC Advocate: MULTIPLE

PRESENTATION OF THE BYLAW PROPOSAL REWRITE – WITH CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:

No concerns about taking 5 minutes from taking the extra 5 minutes from the evaluation of the meeting time.

Jennifer Mizenko took the floor, and wanted to begin by saying that we have all made great personal sacrifice financially, time wise, leaving family and friends to gather together to do the business of ATI so as we move through this meeting let us respect that we have made this choice to be here and to be a part of the progression of ATI.

The subcommittee that worked on the re wording of the bylaw presented their work.

Eve Salomon, David Gorman, Alison Deadman, Fiona Cranwell, and Kate Lushington.

The Current wording is:

IV.6 Members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms on the board.

The NEW WORDING IS:

IV.6 : Members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms on the Board with the exception of the chair who may have already served in another Board position for up to two terms immediately before being elected as Chair and who may serve up to two consecutive terms as chair.

IV.6.1: any Board member who resigns more than halfway through their term will be ineligible to stand for election at the next AGM.

There is still disagreement within the subcommittee about IV.6.1. For now we are not addressing it at all, and there is still housekeeping to be done since David Gorman has forgotten a word while dictating it.

Jennifer Mizenko asked if there were clarifying questions. Sarah Barker mentioned as FC Advocate that for now phrasing and wording is called housekeeping, and that is not a concern in the FC process.

Jennifer Mizenko asked if there were clarifying questions about the new wording. There were none.

LEVEL II, CONCERNS OF THE NEW BYLAW PROPOSAL WORDING:

Jennifer Mizenko asked if there were any concerns about the new wording. None were voiced. Jennifer Mizenko read the new wording one more time. She asked that the membership just sit with what was read. Hearing no concerns, consensus was reached.

Then Jennifer saw some head shaking so then Marilou Chacey said she did not even hear the call for concerns. So Jennifer then asked again for concerns.

Irene then asked if she could do a clarifying question: but over talking and general noise...no concern stated, and no resolution offered. Jennifer Mizenko said that we can come to consensus without talking about IV.6.1.

Irene said, no, which comes first, if this is my concern, will she state it before.

Then David Gorman said he is concerned that WITHOUT the addition and speaking of IV.6.1, there discussion about IV.6 is incomplete.

Joan FitzGerald asked that if there is (ILLEGIBLE). David Gorman said that there are concerns with IV.6.1 as it is written, but we never got a chance to (nothing said). Jennifer Mizenko asked if David Gorman would stand aside on his concern, knowing that it will go forward on this proposal. No further concerns. Jennifer said that hearing no further concerns, she would like to call for consensus.

Then Jennifer Mizenko called that we had reached consensus on the proposal wording to be sent back to the Board to be presented for next year as a Bylaw. This needs to be presented to the membership again in due time. The exact wording of a Bylaw amendment must be publicized 45 days prior to the AGM.

LIGHT AND LIVELY

INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW WEBSITE: Fiona presented the new website, and presented it page by page. Victoria Leomant had objections to things on the website. Fiona asked someone to volunteer to handle the resources portion of the website. Anyone with concerns and changes should go to Fiona. Linda Hein explained what the member pages would look like.

PRESENTATION ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION PROPOSAL - WITH CLARIFYING QUESTIONS

Rosa Luisa Rossi and RJ Fleck took the floor as facilitators. Jennifer Mizenko took the floor to present the Resolutions to Concerns and the rewritten Proposal. She read the following information re the concerns.

Resolving Concerns:

ATI Committees:

This proposal is about Professional Development & Membership Committees.

This proposal separates the function of Continuing Education from the Professional Development Committee, Membership and International Committees.

Concerns about creating another committee and bureaucracy for ATI.

Resolutions:

Terms of Reference for Professional Development, Membership and International Committees are not related to CE (Show Terms of Reference)

Four ATI members have been committed to this AD Hoc Committee since 2012 and are willing to continue serving on the Ad Hoc or potentially established Committee.

It will be a part of the Committee's job to develop an elegant and efficient method of accounting for CE activity, which must be approved by the membership.

Committee is not elected and therefore has too much power to develop the policy

Resolutions:

The chair of the committee is elected.

Terms of Reference #1 and #2 state the policy must be approved by the membership.

If there is a policy of CE then there must be consequences for not following the policy.

Resolution:

This concern does not relate to the proposal to establish a committee. And predicts an outcome from the committee that is unknown.

Proposed Terms of Reference are end gaining.

Resolution:

Terms of Reference #1 and #2 state any policy developed is subject to the approval of the membership through Formal Consensus.

Terms of Reference #4 states the proposed committee will consult with CCC, V/M, Ethics and any other appropriate committees.

Presentation of the REWRITTEN PROPOSAL the subcommittee worked on (Irene Schlump, Jennifer Mizenko, Sakiko Ishitzubo, Sarah Barker, Victoria Leomant)

We propose....To form a Standing Committee for Continuing Education (Continuing Education Committee CEC) responsible for designing a policy to provide the members with a means of recording Continuing Education Practices with official recognition by ATI. This record will represent ATI's commitment to Continuing Education as a Professional organization.

Terms of Reference:

The committee is responsible for writing a policy of continuing education that reflects the Vision/Mission and Code of Ethics of Alexander Technical International, Inc., for approval by the membership of ATI.

The committee may further develop and amend the policy of Continuing Education for approval by the membership.

The committee is responsible for investigating, implementing, maintain, and administering the policy of continuing education for all teaching members of ATI.

When necessary, the committee will consult with the Certification Coordinating Committee, Vision/Mission Committee, Ethics Advisory Committee, or any other committee.

The work of this committee will support the continuing education practices of the membership.

The committee is responsible for reporting on the current continuing education activities of the membership in the CEC AGM Report.

Actual changes are #3, the group added one word: investigating.

Also added Term of Reference #5, and moved the previous #5 to #6.

Clarifying Questions on the rewrite:

Catherine Vernerie had a concern, but these are clarifying questions, so she was asked to hold her concern.

Joan FitzGerald said that ATI members need to discuss ethics and ethical concerns frequently. Will the ethical concerns be in the hands of the ethic committee, and everything else in the hand of this committee. Jennifer said that the terms of reference of the PDC have to do with developing a body of knowledge through which we certify our teachers. Its sole purpose is about teacher certification. ATI named that committee with a different definition that other organization would use Professional Development.

RJ asked if there were any other concerns.

Tommy asked if the assumption was that any ATI member would have to satisfy this to maintain membership. Said it would be answered later.

LEVEL II – CONCERNS ON CONTINUING EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Catherine Vernerie has a concern that the committee needs to address the diversity of local national policies in the committee itself. The nuance is how are we going to meet the issue of diversity.

RJ asked for time, and determined that we have one more minute so we can hear David Gorman.

He said that Catherine is ahead of the game, and the committee hasn't even been formed yet. RJ asked if we could take this off to move forward, but it was let to stand as we could still go forward. RJ asked if there were any further concerns regarding this proposal. Seeing no further concerns beside Catherine Vernerie's concern, he asked if she would stand aside or withdraw her concern so we could have consensus. She said how can we form a committee without knowing that it will tackle that diversity. The word "investigate" allows the committee to do this. *Time is called.*

Gilles Estran explained more to Catherine Vernerie. She agreed to stand aside, which means that her Concern (committee must address diverse regulations in ATI Teaching Members countries.) is attached to the proposal. So RJ called consensus on the proposal.

Marilou Chacey asked if we could take five more minutes to complete our meeting to do evaluations. No concerns about this.

MEETING EVALUATION:

Sarah Barker: It was very hard work over breakfast to be prepared for this discussion, and she wanted to thank everyone who took part in this very difficult meeting.

Jennifer Mizenko: happy to move forward and grateful for collaborative spirit.

Corinne Cassini: Appreciates the work that we do here at ATI, and she let other people work on it, and they brought back a proposal that she likes better than the one she worked on.

Cirsten Verleger: Tres Bon!

MEETING ADJOURNED

Tuesday, October 28 MCM – Meeting Minutes #6

Corinne Cassini translated the English meeting into French.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Fiona thanked everyone who has supported this Conference, from Team Gilles, Maryse, Gilles, the three assistants, Paloma, Nezli and Manuelle, the translators, especially Cecile, event planners and Linda Hein. She announced the site of the Conference for 2015, and asked for people to consider hosting the 2016 Conference.

MEETING INTENTIONS: Marilou had everyone read the MCM intentions out loud in their own languages

AGENDA:

Marilou Chacey presented the agenda and asked if there were concerns about the agenda for today. None.

Marilou asked for a motion to leave the COW. David Gorman made the motion and the meeting moved from the Committee of the Whole and into Robert's Rules.

VOTING COMMENCED:

PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSALS TO BE VOTED ON:

NEW Reworded Proposal:

We To form a Standing Committee for continuing Education (continuing Education Committee CEC) responsible for designing a policy to provide the members with a means of recording Continung Education Practices with official recognition by ATI. This record will represent ATI's commitment to Continuing Education as a Professional organization.

Continuing Education Terms of Reference:

The committee is responsible for writing a policy of continuing education that reflects the Vision/Mission and Code of Ethics of Alexander Technique International, Inc., for approval by the membership of ATI.

The committee may further develop and amend the policy of Continuing Education for approval by the membership.

The committee is responsible for investigating, implementing, maintain, and administering the policy of continuing education for all teaching members of ATI.

When necessary, the committee will consult with the Certification Coordinating Committee, Vision/Mission Committee, Ethics Advisory Committee, or any other committee

The work of this committee will support the continuing education practices of the membership.

The committee is responsible for reporting on the current continuing education activities of the membership in the CEC AGM report.

Concern attached to the proposal: Committee must address diverse regulations in ATI Teaching Member countries.

Voting Procedure on the Continuing Education Proposal:

Sarah Barker moved that we accept the proposal to establish a standing committee for continuing education. Jennifer Mizenko seconded.

Marilou said that for people with more than one proxy, put up the number of fingers of proxies voting for.

Vote taken on the CE proposal: 41 YES, 0 NO, 2 ABSTENTIONS.

The Continuing Education Committee (CEC) is now formed as a permanent committee of ATI.

NEW REWORDED PROPOSAL ByLaw IV.6 (to be sent back to the Board):

Members may hold only one Board position at a time and serve no more than two consecutive terms on the Board with the exception of the chair who may already have served in another Board position for up to two terms immediately before being elected as Chair and who may then serve up to two consecutive terms as chair.

Stand aside: proposal is incomplete and unclear without IV.6.1:

IV. 6.1 Any Board member who resigns more than halfway through their term will be ineligible to stand for election at the next AGM.

Voting Procedure on the ByLaw IV.6 Proposal (to be sent back to the Board):

RJ Fleck moved that we vote on this proposal. Rosa Luisa Rossi seconded.

VOTE: 40 Yes, 0 NO, 3 Abstentions

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ELECTION RESULTS ON COMMITTEE CHAIRS, ATI SPONSORS AND BOARD POSITIONS

Corinne Cassini announced the results of the election, wherein all Board members and Committee chairs were elected in, all but 1 (Joel Kendall) re elected ATI Sponsors were elected in, and all three new ATI Sponsor nominees were voted in.

Corinne then announced that since the new Continuing Education committee had been approved, we needed people to volunteer for the committee.

Marilou asked if we had nominations for co-chair for CEC, which are Jennifer Mizenko and Shawn Copeland as co chairs. 37 YES, 0 NO, 5 ABSTENTION

LIGHT AND LIVELY

MEETING EVALUATION:

Rosa Luisa Rossi: I appreciate the FC process and the clarity of structure. She said that next time we do not repeat and repeat and repeat something that has already been said in prior meetings to leave more time for clarity of discussion and real talking to each other.

Sarah Barker: I would like us to raise our awareness of the AT as a tool that we may use more deliberately and consciously during the meeting. It has worked well in the past when listening is primaryso that one of the things that will avoid is the interruptions that happen. We tend to be a little more calm when we are really remembering that the AT is our tool and we trust our facilitator and no one needs to interrupt or take over the meeting. That is part of the process, and ATI has added it to the FC, and somehow to her it (AT) was not high enough in its presence.

The meeting was extended until 10:10.

Peter Nobes suggested that meetings would be quicker if announcements were written down and they were put up.

Marilou Chacey said further evaluations should be put up on the papers, or send to Fiona Cranwell or Marilou Chacey, or Shawn Copeland.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION:

Jennifer Mizenko: great live music!

Marilou Chacey also said to send evaluations of the full Conference to Fiona Cranwell.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Glossary:

COW: Committee of the whole

CE: Continuing Education

CEC: Continuing Education Committee

FC: Formal consensus