

2002 AGM

Alexander Technique International

Minutes Of the 2002 AGM Business Meetings

1st Business Meeting – 11/11/02 9 AM

Started at 9:08 AM

Announcements were made in regard to the chemical sensitivity of some participants, schedule changes for 11/12/02, the need for a PDC chairperson. Members were encouraged to use the Interchange and to consider using it as a training tool; but some caution was expressed regarding the posting personal message to the list. A Sponsorship meeting was announced for later in the day.

1.) A motion to move to the "Committee of the Whole" was made seconded. Passed.

2.) Consent to agenda? Any changes/additions? Motion passed

3.) Chair asked that the nominations report in the packet be read by the participants.

No changes.

4.) Treasurer's Report: was reviewed and discussed. The report is attached.

5.) Sponsorship Report: 17 present for our first meeting. We looked at sponsorship data, at the Directory to make sure all have been sponsored. We discussed setting up an e-mail exchange on Yahoo Groups for sponsors and another exchange for the members of the committee. We agreed that a set of common criteria for sponsorship is needed and that ethical principles be established for sponsors and for teachers.

We discussed the need for a standard system of payment and what it should look like.

There is a need to find new sponsors—more international sponsors are needed. We discussed the possibility that each country have three sponsors.

The number of individuals being sponsored is increasing, 102 this year.

Add a day for sponsorship meeting concerns? Perhaps we can do this next at the next

AGM. Tell the committee of your ideas & concerns for sponsorship. Hopefully ideas will come from the sponsorship exchange

.

6.) Site committee report: Next year at the Armada Inn, Spanish Point, County Clare,

Ireland, October 19-23. The co-chairs of the Site Committee are resigning. Should

be go to Hungary for next year? Or to Spain? But there are AT members in Spain?

Would Bon Secours (year's site) work for the US again? So there are choices in Europe

but we need suggestions. Discussion needed re alternate meetings in N. America and

Europe if sites are available. Or what is preferred to Hungary or Ireland or back to the

States?

We have definite criteria – airport, price, nice surroundings. How would it be to be on the

west coast? West coast is a possibility, some concern re Europeans and their travel.

Need to get clear re the criteria: numbers present to attend? Cost for travel? Convenient

location? Can we explore Canada as a possibility? What will make us a true International

organization?

Jim wrote the Book on this!! Read it, use it. Great recognition for Jim's work.

7.) Communications Committee report: We are changing web masters; we are now

sending the Communique via e-mail and this is published three times a year.

This is the first time we have hired a Webmaster; he will redo the web site. Marketing is our next concern but the committee needs members – we welcome your ideas.

8.) Ethics Report: The committee works only on issues given by the membership.

Not our personal feelings. This is a report – questions about report here; questions about the proposal will be handled later in other business meetings.

The April 2002 Communique had the grievance Submission Form. Members are encouraged to look at it.

Re-write of Professional Conduct, #1 on Code, Teacher-Student relationship.

This was originally sent out for signature, but then withdrawn. There is a blue sheet in the

AGM packet that contains this re-write. It is a parallel to #1 on the Code of Ethics. This is

an ongoing solution to #1 on the Code (white sheet). #2 and #3 still needs some work so

the committee is asking for a mandate to proceed with #2 and #3 off the white sheet of the code of ethics.

There is a proposal from Switzerland re a member of ATI who does not act ethically:

should they be expelled? A subcommittee was established, the sub- committee looked at

the concerns of membership at 2001 AGM; a list of The concerns: Especially that this proposal might supplant the bylaws. The subcommittee came up with a new wording and this should have been sent out but not done. So it will be postponed...(it involves a bylaw change).

“Members found conducting themselves inconsistently with ATI bylaws or code of ethics

of professional conduct will be expelled from ATI if all other avenues of address have been concerned.”
The grievance committee determines non-compliance. It will be submitted as a bylaw change, sent to the membership, and then to the AGM for a vote.

The proposal: “A former ATI member who reapplies for membership shall not be

readmitted if their behavior is not consistent with ATI by-laws and Code of Ethics of

Professional Conduct.”

Then a rewrite of Proposal #6 from 01 AGM

Proposal #6: Now reads: “A teaching member involved in a grievance agrees to retain

membership in ATI until the conclusion of the grievance.”

Questions about readmission to ATI membership – must have behavior consistent with ATI by laws. So how do you tell?

Question: How do we handle a teacher who resigns in the middle of a grievance/dispute?

Instead of just letting them in, do we ask if they are abiding by the Code?

They must accept the Code. We exclude if they are not operating according to the code.

Question: if the person is expelled for grievance, should they be re-admitted to ATI? But if they can be re-admitted, how do we judge if behavior is OK at the time of application for re-admission?

This will have to come from the membership. A letter from a member (Tommy) adds that

we provide a way of returning one to ATI if they can show just cause for re-admission. So this is the committee's first step in addressing the concern that this is too harsh.

Jamee: in order to keep ATI as an open organization that can recognize redemption, if

someone gets booted, they can come back in if there is some way of knowing they have

changed, can they recognize what they did, and have they changed and honor their

commitment for signing the Code of Ethics?

This sounds cut and dried but we are trying to get the membership ideas. The grievance

should be followed thru to the end. Letters go back to the people involved. We need to

be responsible to the person filing the grievance. If someone acts in an unethical way, ATI remains liable? This is an open question still. Dale – ATI is not liable if the teacher

resigns from ATI. But privacy and confidentiality is still a concern so it is hard to

communicate. We do finish the grievance even now. All of them are taken to completion

even now.

We need to have permission from the membership to re-write #2 and #3 to finish the process. Now this is a report – proposals will come later. If you want permission, you can do that now (Catherine to Dale), the group- need to be clear about the request. Catherine: Dale and Monica are asking for permission to rewrite #2 and #3 and to use #2 and #3 as a work in progress while the re-write takes place and that the rewritten version will be submitted to us later for approval. We can do the same as we did in 2000 but do this at a later meeting.

Question re this AGM: are we going to go further with proposal #4 and #6. So we plan to

consider the blue page (rewrite of #1 in Code of Ethics). There are no other proposals. We have two other business meetings after this afternoon. If you have concerns, talk after this meeting to the chairpersons to set the agenda or agendas. The committee clarified where #4 and #6 are right now. These are from last year's AGM and in level 3. There was a question about when are students informed of the grievance process. Answer: this is a

code we are all comfortable with; working it out is up to the teacher. Inform them

whenever it is needed since the re-write does not specify the time to inform the student.

Question: Do we have to do this in the code? Or just say that it is needed for the teacher to do this? We could also include the phrase "when requested". We are trying to have a code that will enable the teacher to be responsive.

The old "g" is now "f" on the re-write (blue sheet).

There was a question about “intellectual” influence. This should be handled later in next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:22 am.

2nd Business Meeting, Nov. 11, 2002, 3:00 PM

1. Welcoming Remarks: (Meeting convened at 3:08 PM) Welcome by facilitator.

The roles for the meeting were covered:

Facilitator: Catherine Kettrick

Timekeeper: Anne Johnson

Advocate: Robin Eastham

Peacekeeper: Cathy Madden

Note taker: George Pryor & Rebecca Lisak

Door Keeper: Bob Lada

Scribes: Holly Stevenson – David Bainbridge

The facilitator presented the meeting agenda.

An announcement was made regarding signing up for committees.

2. Agenda:

Present ethics Proposal.

Participants asked to read the Ethics Committee Report—in five minutes.

Level I: Whole group discussion of the proposal.

Level II: small groups.

Group A: Professional and medical disclaimer

Group B: b1 and b2 on the blue sheet – abuse of authority & sexual relationships with students.

Group C: privacy and lodging of complaints (c and f on white sheet)

Group D: Business Logistics.

Report back to large group. Concerns are to be expressed in report-back-time.

3. Reading of Proposal and Level 1 Discussion: Time was given for the

participants to read the ethics revision proposal. (This was printed on a blue piece of paper in the participants' packets.)

Then a Level I discussion (10 min). (This should be a broad, general philosophic

discussion; one that determines how this proposal fits with our vision mission, why it is a

good idea, does it support us as a community, what kind of precedent might it set and what general problems in it need to be addressed. Not specific concerns yet – this is next level.)

The ATI mission statement was read:

“To establish an open means of global communication for people to discuss, apply,

research, and experiment with the discoveries of F.M. Alexander.

“To foster the use of the F.M. Alexander Technique in social and environmental

interrelationships.

“To create a vital organization whose structure and means of operation are

consistent with the principles of the F.M. Alexander Technique.”

The Ethics Committee presented the history of the proposal. It was first presented in 1996, then put off, and a 3 sentence code was developed for the whole membership. In 2000 part #2 was submitted to membership and conditionally approved. If approved it would reflect the wishes and vision of our membership. That is what this is at this point.

Titles were added (to the blue sheet) to clarify where it comes from. This was done only

for logistical purposes; otherwise, ignore the CAPS – should be in upper/lower case. It just shows mutual authorship. The blue sheet (the Ethics Report to the 2002 AGM), shows the corrections to #1 on the white sheet (The ATI Code of Ethics of Professional Conduct).

Article B in 2 parts because of different focus.

Article E and F (white sheet) are combined (on the blue sheet) because they say how the teacher operates with the student.

There were a number of clarifying questions: cultural abuse means we work w/ different people, different behavioral patterns and there are many cultural variables; members gave several examples of cultural abuse. Emotional abuse: example of transference;

Intellectually abusing students: example of violating techniques in other disciplines, e.g.,

Pianists and Russian Ballerinas by presenting ourselves as experts in these disciplines.

Questions: How do we gain influence if they have a choice to say yes or no? Response:

we need to be clear about our boundaries.

Emotional abuse? We cannot own it if a student has an emotional experience that is

positive. To say "I did that for you" is abuse, according to the Ethics Committee.

Q: Isn't the AT about offering options and possibilities? (This may be a concern not a

clarifying question.)

Response: this is a complicated issue yet we AT teachers have to own our authority and not abuse it.

Question: it is the way we talk about it, isn't it?

Question: are you talking about the inappropriate use of authority? Yes, according to the Committee.

Question: is the medical disclaimer written or verbal? Response: – neither, these are guidelines for the teacher to operate.

Question: What is the clarification behind “c”? Response: do not pass on information about the student. This information cannot be passed on without violating rights of confidentiality.

Question: Even anonymously? Response: yes.

Committee comment: consider this as a support for AT teachers, not for the AT police to come get you.

Question: is this a code of conduct or code of ethics? It does sound like ethics, doesn't it?

Response: we wrote this as a way of expressing ATI's way of thinking. It gives directives

w/o imperatives.

“Code of ethics of professional conduct” is the official title. Ethics is different from code of conduct.

At this point a “time out” was called by the peacekeeper.

Committee comments: Ethics: principles behind the conduct – Conduct is the behavior based on the principles.

Principles are more basic, Conduct is more specific. Ethics is intention, conduct is the behavior.

Do we want a code of ethics...? or a

Code of conduct.... or a

Code of ethical conduct...

We already have a three-statement code of ethics for all members.

Peter – why don’t we find out if we need two? Maybe we don’t need both.

The facilitator called a break to find the “three statement code”.

It was then suggested that we receive the Language Committee Report.

Language Committee: we are a new committee, formed after 2001 AGM. The purpose of the committee is: to make members welcome to ATI and able to participate in all activities whatever first language even if English is not first language. We need your approval of this purpose. At this AGM there is only one person here, rather two persons here whose first language is not English. How is for these people being here from the language point of view? We invite all to think about this issue. All the members of the committee except the chairperson have another 1st language other than English. This is an immense challenge because of our e-mail communication. Some members have had trouble participating in the committee work. We welcome your suggestions for moving forward. We have moved forward creating a series of language coordinators, a little start with that Yuzuru Katagiri in Japan, David Horsman in French language. He has a list of 64 documents translated into French already. We need to have this on the Internet. And develop this for all the other languages. We have trouble with English (code of ethics/conduct?) So the issues of translation are serious for the AT. Yuzuru has written an article for the Exchange regarding these issues. It is important that we internationalize ATI; there is no quick solutions but the issues are still very important.

Then, back to Level I discussion and the three-statement code of ethics. We

consented to a revision of the Code of Ethics in 1999 AGM. This is on our ATI

web site as follows:

Revised November 1999:

1. I will model and support the highest professional standards in all

dealings with the public and colleagues.

2. I will describe the Alexander Technique as a method of learning and

strive to present the Technique accurately.

3. I will respect Alexander Technique International, Inc. and honor it with my professional conduct. (This code applies to General Membership, the non-teaching members.)

Our lawyer said this is an insufficient code of ethics and we needed more on student/teacher relationship. We need one for both teaching and general members.

Suggest: the three statement is Ethics and develop a code of conduct. The 3 part statement is for general and the three part is for teachers. The ATI lawyer said we had to have more detailed so the three statement was not enough and the three-part statement was developed.

Maybe we need to go the legal way or follow the advice of the lawyers. Our lawyers have reviewed the three part. #1 was not approved by membership, so the blue sheet is the rewrite for the membership.

The facilitator did a recap up to this point in the meeting: lawyers don't care whether conduct or code of ethics. We need to have something to show to public that we will follow. The three statements will do for a code of ethics. Is the blue sheet and three part white sheet acceptable as a code of professional conduct? Is it okay for us to develop a Code of Professional Conduct? Any objections to that? Silence.

So we need to go to Level I discussion: Is it good to have a COPC (code of professional

conduct)?

If this is being imposed from the outside, from the lawyer, we need something to fill out

something to satisfy the lawyer, the legalities? We are making it detailed and complicated.

It is opening us up for more litigation. If we don't see the need for this, then we don't need it to fulfill our mission statement. If we do it only because the lawyer says we have to, it does not fulfill our mission statement. But it does help us because of our need to have a "vital organization" to deal with problems that come up without taking sides. It is vital for us to have the COPC. And it is useful to clarify for outsiders and students how we implement our code of ethics. It is in the best interest of our organization to have

insurance. We have the liability insurance to protect board, volunteers and committee

chairs. (We added four minutes to the Level I discussion).

Comment and question: we decided at my school to work with lawyers, collaborated with

them. So should we run it by our lawyers? It is practical; sometimes we don't have

choices, we just have to do it.

Committee comment: the original code was in the abstract and we were presented with

problems and the code did not help us. This code of conduct will help us address

grievances. We need this to support us (i.e., the Ethics Committee and the handling of

grievances filed against ATI members).

At this point we ran out of time for Level I discussion.

Comment: the ethics committee needs a code of ethics, code of professional conduct.

They can't operate without it.

Meeting adjourned at 4:22 PM – we will reconvene tomorrow to begin Level II discussion

3rd. Business Meeting, Nov. 12, 2002, 9:00 AM

Convened at 9:10 AM

1. Present Agenda and Announcements:

Agenda:

Present/consent agenda

Announcements – 2 minutes

Site question – 5 minutes

Review level I – 5 minutes

Level 2 discussion;

Level 2 report back from discussion.

Revisit site question

Proposal to accept 2 and 3 as working

Present proposal – 5 minutes

Evaluation – 10 minutes

Roles: Facilitator – Diana Bradley; Time Keeper – Lucy Venable; Jamee – advocate; Cathy – peace keeper;

Note taker – George Pryor & Rebecca Lisak; Door keeper – Peter; Scribes – Jan Baty &

David Bainbridge

32 members were in attendance.

Announcements: schedule changes.

Need for an executive secretary – and committee volunteers (discussion on committee

volunteers was extended for 2 minutes)

2. Site Question:

2003 – Ireland, 2004 – Hungary or Japan – or 2004 Hungary, or Japan 2006 – Congress is

2004 at Oxford.

2003 Ireland, 2004 Hungary, 2005 North America – International Congress August 2004

Oxford, England.

Concern: re rotation between Europe and North America. Have rotation every other year,

i.e., don't go to Europe two years in a row because of financial concerns for the

membership.

Concern: that we will not connect with the Congress and European teachers, to make ATI's business and pleasure available to the Congress.

Concern: Hungarians will feel isolated; they are members of ATI but have no interaction

with other ATI members. And they have found a very great venue for us already to hold an AGM.

Concern: some feel they want a "home" they can come to every year. Others want a

nomadic existence.

Concern: that we go to anything other than the Congress in 2004. Meet for ATI in London at about the same time.

Concern: concern for Hungarians is coloring our decision about where to hold the AGM.

Concern: to hear from our Europeans re traveling to Congress. (Rosa Luisa...) seems OK.

Others, feel okay about travel anywhere (Peter).

Concern: if we are worried about Hungarians, are we ignoring other parts of our

membership also?

3. Review Level I:

Comments and concerns: that we not make the code of conduct too detailed that someone

could possibly sue us or get at us. There are too many sections, subsection and subs of

subs, etc...!

And we need to compose a Code of Conduct for us, that we have an ethics committee to

fulfill our needs, not just for lawyers.

It does fit our vision statement since it helps our vitality as an organization.

It is good to clarify for outsiders what we represent and the conduct that we think is

appropriate.

We need liability insurance.... For board and chairs and therefore we need a code of

conduct.

4. Level II Discussion:

Four facilitators were identified – to guide the conversation of the four groups originally set up in the second business meeting.

.

Report back on discussion of Level II of proposed rewrites of code of conduct on blue sheet:

Group A: Professional and Medical Disclaimer:

Concerns – to use learning instead of educational. Period after usage. Education

and learning are not consistent throughout. Addendum to be added that we represent

ourselves as teacher consistently and get away from using words in the medical profession.

No apostrophe in principles. Leave in “we do not make medical diagnosis” from version

on the white sheet.

Group B: Abuse of Authority & Sexual Relationships with Students: no concerns

over article B2. Article B1 – understanding intention of language presented. “gain

influence over” and “authority” wording is too strong and doesn’t speak to intent.

Importance of this document is not able to be communicated from the ethics committee.

There is a real need to go on with the document; it gets bogged down in details, but do not let it get watered down so it doesn’t offer the protection it needs to offer. The language is not clear and it needs examples. There is a concern that the document will get delayed.

There is a lack of flexibility in language. Find a way to respond to the membership needs and meet legal requirements.

Group C: Privacy and Lodging of Complaints: (c and f on white sheet) – Article c (on

blue sheet). This group had concerns regarding the manner and timing in which permission is obtained. Wording implies medical, doesn't distinguish between personal and private info. Doesn't describe method for anonymous sharing. Doesn't describe circumstances of sharing. Part f. The teacher is providing the student with information to make a complaint about them. Timing – too late to provide information. How can the AT teacher inform the student of the right to complain without setting up a confrontational relationship? There was general concern that the student is always protected.

Group D: Business Logistics: Article e. The main concern is that this ought to be in

writing at some point, before commencement of lessons or at first lesson. Do you want all

students to know you operate a sliding scale if you do so? Can that be introduced

individually? A combination of the white and the blue sheet might solve these concerns.

Concern that these need to be put in writing or teachers can change their minds or the

student may misunderstand. We need protection. And what happens to sliding scale?

The white sheet #1, "e" and "f" are better statements and would resolve our concerns.

(solution: take "e" of white sheet and add.... "any special requirements ... to end")

The afternoon meeting will address solutions in small groups and then we will revisit the site question.

There was a call to accept parts 2 and 3 on white sheet as a work in progress, not a binding agreement. All the members were urged to read and send in suggestions for refining and improving this document to better reflect the wishes of the membership. This will also help the rewrite by the ethics committee. We will further discuss this document at the next AGM. Passing this will enable the ethics committee to deal with more grievances.

Unanimously passed.

Next meeting will be brainstorm of upcoming AGMs.

Meeting adjourned at 10:33am.

4th Business meeting 11/12/02-1:15 PM

Convened at 1:25 PM

33 in attendance

1. Announcements and Present Agenda:

Roles:

Facilitator: Catherine Kettrick – Advocate: Jamee Culbertson—Time Keeper: George

Pryor—Peace Keeper: Cathy Madden—Note taker: Rebecca Lisak.

Announcements: Those making presentations at workshops are asked to consider contributing to the “ExchangE”.

Agenda:

Discussion of site selection for AGM – 15 minutes.

Small Group Discussions regarding Level II discussion of Part #1 of Code of Professional Conduct.

AGM Evaluation – 15 minutes.

Feedback from featured speaker, Rita Herzog – 10 minutes.

2. Level II Small Group Discussion:

Divided into groups as in meeting 3 to offer suggestions for rewrites for Part 1 Code of Professional Conduct.

There was insufficient time for verbal feed back from the small groups. Therefore, the

Ethics Committee members collected and edited the comments of the four small groups.

These comments are included as follows:

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article A. Professionalism:

The Alexander Technique Teacher's conduct will reflect a professional Attitude

throughout the interaction with the student.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article B 1. Acknowledgment of Student Rights:

Recognizing their position of authority, an Alexander Technique Teacher does not use

this advantage to gain influence over their student either culturally, emotionally,

politically, religiously, financially or intellectually.

Group Concerns

"Understanding the intention ofto gain influence over "recognizing their position of

authority...= imprecision of wording.

The wording is too strong and doesn't really speak to the intent of what they want to say.

The important reason for doing this may not really be heard from the ethics committee and there was a real need to move on with the document.

Concerned that its gets bogged down in detail that larger picture gets lost-that it not get watered down so that it has no effectiveness and so that it will not offer protection.

Language is not clear enough and needs examples.

Delaying document because of language details.

Lack of flexibility.

In order to improve the language, which of the words that are chosen need to stay?

Dale (Beaver) showed up and answered questions, we want to be responsive to the membership first, and then let the lawyer look at it.

Group Versions:

#1.

Recognizing (all) the possible power of their authority, an Alexander Technique Teacher will not use this power to coerce a student to change something that goes against their personal and cultural values, their medical or mental health practitioner's instructions. If

a teacher's technical information that contradicts what a teacher of another profession gives them, the student must be free to decide whose instruction to follow.

#2.

Recognizing the hierarchical nature of the Student-Teacher relationship, an Alexander Technique Teacher does not use this advantage to exercise undue influence over their student, culturally, emotionally, politically, religiously, financially or intellectually.

#3.

An Alexander Technique Teacher understands that a teacher's inevitable position of influence must be used responsibly and not for the purpose of exploiting the student in any way.

#4. (preferred by group)

An Alexander Technique Teacher will act respectfully at all times to the cultural, emotional, political, religious, financial, and intellectual values of each student.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article b2. Sexual Interaction:

An Alexander Technique teacher will not enter into a sexual relationship with a student while the student-teacher relationship exists.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

AGM 2002

Article c. Privacy of Information:

The Alexander Technique teacher holds all information learned about the student during a lesson in confidentiality. The teacher must request of the student permission to release any information to a third party.

Small Group Response:

The Alexander Technique teacher holds all private information learned during the student teacher relationship in confidence. The teacher must obtain permission from the student to release any personally identifying information to a third party. Any request for confidentiality will be honoured by the teacher.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article D. Medical Disclaimer:

An Alexander Technique teacher informs all students that the F. M. Alexander

Technique is an educational process and does not represent the F.M Alexander Principles

as a medical cure.

Any health improvements the student may experience are ascribed to the student's usage

and understanding of the principles of the F. M. Alexander Technique.

Small Group Concerns:

Restore the third sentence from 1996 version- "At no time does.....

period after "usage" in last sentence, remainder removed.

I think of usage as referring to a particular way a word is used. I am not familiar with it

as another word for use.

Small Group Response:

An Alexander Technique Teacher informs all students that the F. M. Alexander Technique is a learning process and does not represent F. M. Alexander Principles as a medical cure. Any health improvement the student may experience are ascribed to the student's usage. At no time does an Alexander Technique teacher make a medical diagnosis or prescribe medical remedies.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article E. Business Logistics: (formerly articles "e" & "f" of the 1996 version – the 'white sheet')

The Alexander Technique teacher informs the student of lesson fees, times, and proper attire prior to commencing lessons. Any special requirements based on the content of a future lesson are mutually agreed upon in advance. {For example: a change of venue due to the requirements of a certain activity}

Small Group Concerns:

Information needs to be in writing – or teacher can change mind or misunderstanding of

student — protection.

What happens with a sliding scale?

1996 version better expresses article e — any special requirement

Small Group Response:

Any policy regarding payment, cancellation, lateness, or proper attire is fully explained

to the student prior to the commencement of the lesson, and put in writing. Any special

requirements based on the content of future lessons are mutually agreed upon in advance.

E.G., Horsemanship/Sports.

Code of Professional Conduct, Part 1

2002 AGM

Article F. Lodging a Complaint:

The Alexander Technique Teacher informs a student of the right to register a complaint

with the ATI Ethics and Complaints Committee and provide them the means to do so, if

requested.

3. Site discussion:

Concerns – no site committee at the moment

Is another time of year better for some members? Could we change AGM to August?

There is no policy to guide us.

Make reality of our internationality by making them (AGMs) accessible to the largest

number of members.

Only go to where places we have members, where members locally can help to organize.

Bylaws state that we meet in November –board will have to meet to okay change in bylaws which has to happen at an AGM (and go to the membership 60 days prior to the AGM).

The AGM should not conflict with the AMSAT meeting.

Piggyback on the International Congresses. Could we ask the congress organizers to add on 2 more days to the space rental for the AGM, and focus on exchanges and ATI business, not workshops? Most ATI members present for this AGM are planning to attend the Congress (contact Lucia Walker and Peter Ribeaux who are ATI members on Congress planning committee).

Jamee asked if people would be interested in continuing this discussion via email.

Teresa Lee is board liaison to the site committee; please email Teresa if you have interest

agm-site@ati-net.com.

Alternately (from congress years), return to Ireland since our resources are limited.

Request for one AGM in Switzerland – Rosa Luisa Rossi will explore sites.

Japan may be a possibility, fly to Tokyo, then 3 hours to city for AGM 2006.

4. Meeting (AGM) evaluation:

When we use Formal Consensus, it is important to list concerns prior to offering suggestions.

It is important to take 20 minutes or so to describe the process (Formal Consensus) before beginning the meetings; or we could receive something in writing to read ahead of time.

More time over the AGM to take care of business.

Small group process was so good that we're missing out on reporting back to group as a whole.

Apprenticeship opportunities appreciated. If we're piggybacking on Congress, we'd like to provide info on Formal Consensus process.

Hard to hear – maybe a roving microphone would be useful.

The order of hands up provides order, more formal to put your hand up if you want to speak; but the facilitator is responsible for noting order of hands.

Skill of facilitators appreciated, apprentices would help to facilitate the process. Notes from small groups will be posted for perusal today.

Motion to close the Committee of the Whole: Moved, seconded, passed.

Request to approve minutes as posted and corrected: Moved, seconded, passed.

Motion to accept parts 2 and 3 of the Code of Ethics of Professional Conduct as a working document:

Moved, seconded, passed.

4. Comments of Rita Herzog on the AGM:

Making clear requests is most effective, more specific = more effective. The more specific and clear the request, the more you are apt to get a positive answer.

“Could I see a show of hands of people who are willing to help?”

Asking for more time on a subject, need to request, allow a voice if there are concerns “Are there any concerns for taking 2 more minutes?”

If a person feels they needs to be heard, they can ask for someone to reflect back what they just said. This can help insure that the person was heard.

In a hot situation, before the next person gives their opinion, they could reflect back what

the pervious person said. This helps people to really listen to what others say.

Motion to adjourn meeting: Moved, seconded, passed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:41 PM.

(Announcement from Group 1: Monica will collect all written ideas from groups.)

Minutes Respectfully submitted, George Pryor, Rebecca Lisak