***2019 AGM #1***

***ATI Conference and AGM 2019: Ennis, Ireland  
AGM 1 Monday, October 21, 2019, 2-3;30pm***

***SECTION I:***

**Welcome from the Board -Alison Deadman**

**Welcome from the Site Committee – Fiona Cranwell**

**Introduction of Assistants- Fiona Cranwell**

The assistants are: Judith Willets, Abigail Whitman, Judit Pasztor

**Introduction to the Conference App-Fiona and the app company**

Michelle and Stuart will be in the foyer to address any questions or concerns.

**Welcome from Workshop Planning Committee -Morgan Ford Brunketurner**

**Announcements:**

Fiona-Cranwell – reminded people about, meals and paying for the banquet

**Meeting Intentions read by Penelope Easton**

**Formal Consensus Roles and Agenda-Marilou**

1. Roles for future meetings may be filled during the meeting.
2. Roles for this meeting were established beforehand for ease:

* Agenda Planner: Bill Conable
* Facilitator: Marilou Chacey
* Timekeeper: Susan Sinclair
* Doorkeeper: Rachel Prabhakar
* Notetakers: Holly Cinnamon and Morgan Ford Brunketurner
* Public Scribe: Sara Goldstein
* Peacekeeper: Peter Nobes
* Advocate: Alison Deadman
* Language Advocate: Cirsten Verleger
* FPC Advocate: Cathy Madden

**Light and Lively presented by Lucia Walker**

**Ethics Advisory Committee Proposal- Debi Adams**

***SECTION II:***

Proposal:

*The Current Language:*

*The Ethics Advisory Committee shall consist of:*

* 1. *Five Teaching Members, at least two of each gender, and none of whom are members of the Executive Board*

*Our proposed language:*

*The Ethics Advisory Committee shall consist of:*

* 1. *Five Teaching Members of varied gender, no gender identity comprising more than three positions, and no member currently on the Executive Board.*

**Level I Comments:**

* Kate Lushington:  Fits with Vision of ATI- ATI embraces the diversity of the international AT community. The new language embraces the diversity of gender identity.
* Cathy Madden: Our Vision/Mission supports continued learning and as we learn to understand more, we are adapting the care of who we are.
* Sarah Barker: This indicates we are paying attention on a worldwide level, as the conversation is changing beyond binary gender. We are an aware worldwide organization.
* Marilou Chacey reread the proposal and called for consensus. No consensus. Clarifying questions began right away.

**Clarifying Questions:**

*Math question about what “no more than three” means, so what are the possibilities?*

“Three men, two women” or “Three women, one differing gender identity, one man”, etc.

Debi Adams clarified that this was correct.

***SECTION III:***

**Level II: Concerns:**

Anthony Taylor: Concern about how the word “gender identity” is being used in the proposal. If we are trying to be responsive to the world, we should use the most current worldwide language.

Cirsten Verleger: Concerned that the idea is to have everyone represented, but the math does not ensure that everyone is represented because you could have “three men and two women”.

Victoria Leomant: Add to first concern: how it translates internationally, phrasing for different countries, not just in English.

***SECTION IV:***

**EVALUATION:**

Alison Deadman: I appreciate Marilou guiding us through the process.

Eve Salomon: I appreciate the level of attentiveness and care in the room.

Marilou Chacey: We can review the process again should anyone need that.

Sara Barker: I learned a lot by listening to Marilou talk about the context of each step, supporting our calm listening and elegance.

Holly Cinnamon: I appreciate that ATI would consider this an ethical question and consider this question.

Marilou Chacey: I appreciate support in the room and level of cooperation.

Rosa Luisa Rossi: I appreciated that ATI has grown so much and done so much work that now we can return to work on such fine details.

Marilou Chacey suggested that all those with concerns should form a small group discussion and meet with the committee to try and resolve some of these concerns and bring  possible solutions to the next meeting.

Marilou closed the process for now, mentioned that we’ve all been very efficient and cooperative in our work, and suggested that with the extra time left, we reward ourselves with a bit of sunshine and a break.  We will move on the Level III tomorrow. Meeting adjourned.

***2019 AGM #2***

***ATI Conference and AGM 2019: Ennis, Ireland  
AGM 2: October 22, 2019, 9AM – 10:30AM***

***Section I:***

**Announcements**

* Peter Nobes reminded people about the No Talent Show

**Meeting Intentions – Read by Maria in German**

**Formal Consensus Roles**

* Agenda Planners – Bill Conable and Marilou Chacey
* Facilitators – Cathy Madden and Marilou Chacey
* Timekeeper – Morgan Ford Brunketurner
* Doorkeeper – Sara Goldstein
* Notetakers – Morgan Ford Brunketurner and Holly Cinnamon
* Public Scribe – Lucia Walker
* Peacekeeper – Eve Salomon
* Formal Consensus Advocate – Jennifer Mizenko
* Language Advocate – Irene Schlump
* Advocate – Peter Nobes

**Agenda**

Cathy Madden asked if there were any concerns about the proposed agenda. There were no concerns. The agenda was adopted.

***Section II:***

**Ethics Advisory Committee Proposal – Level 3: Resolving Concerns**

Debi Adams reported that the working group had slightly revised the language. She read the new language in the proposal.  The German and French translations were also read as there had been a concern about appropriate language in translation.

***The current language:***

*The Ethics Advisory Committee shall consist of:*

*a. Five Teaching Members, at least two of each gender, and none of whom are members of the Executive Board*

***Our proposed language:***

*The Ethics Advisory Committee shall consist of:*

*a) Five Teaching Members of varied gender or gender identity, none comprising more than three positions, and no member currently on the Executive Board.*

*Der Ethische Rat soll aus folgenden Mitgliedern bestehen:*

*a) Fünf Lehrer\*innen-Mitglieder unterschiedlichen Geschlechts oder unterschiedlicher Geschlechtsidentität, wobei kein Geschlecht und keine Geschlechtsidentität mehr als drei Positionen umfassen und keiner von ihnen aktuell Mitglied des Vorstandes sein darf.*

*Le Comité Consultatif d’Ethique est constitué :*

*a) Cinq Membres Enseignants, en tenant compte des genres et des diversites sexuelles; chaque catégorie n’occupant pas plus de trois postes, et aucun membre n’appartenant au Conseil d’administration*

***Section III:***

**Clarifying Questions:**

Kate Lushington: (Noting that there were only translations in German and French) What happens for the Japanese? Does it go out for translation?

Marilou Chacey: Once we have an adopted proposal, it will be translated.

Rossa Luisa Rossi asked for clarification of the terms in the German translation.

Maria Weiss read and explained gender versus gender identity terms in German

Irene Schlump: We had to clarify the language a lot and make it really precise to make it diverse in language.

Marilou read the concerns from yesterday.

**Concerns about the new (revised) proposal**

Eve Salomon had a grammatical concern: to what does the word “none” refer in the phrase “none comprising more than three positions.”?

Bill Conable: It applies to the closest noun, which is “gender and gender identity”.

Eve Salomon: Okay, I stand aside.

Kate Lushington: I don’t understand what is different from yesterday.

Marilou Chacey: If you would like the language of yesterday, you can look on your app.

Irene Schlump: Clarifying which language Kate is looking for.

Jennifer Mizenko pulled up the language of the original proposal on the app.

Tommy Thompson: My concern is that we are getting confused. It might be that in the future, when we look at what has been done by a committee, versus what has previously been done, we might put both up (On the PowerPoint Slide). [It was suggested that this be brought up in the meeting evaluation]

Marilou Chacey: Does this resolve the concerns of yesterday?

Cirsten Verleger: Something was explained to me yesterday, which resolved my concern.

Holly Cinnamon: Clarifying that the goal of this proposal is to eliminate the binary language that currently exists, rather than to recruit.

Maryse Berninet: Not quite sure about French translation. I would like it to be approved by other French people.

Kate Lushington: I have the same concern that Eve had about the grammar.

Morgan Ford Brunketurner: Holly is willing to work with Maryse on the French.

*Marilou Chacey: Any further concerns? Hearing no concerns, we have consensus.*

**Light and Lively – Led by Kate Lushington**

***Section IV:***

**PDC Proposal: Presentation and Clarifying Questions**

(Facilitator now Cathy Madden.)

Catherine Kettrick presented a history and rationale for the proposal in the form of a PowerPoint presentation.  The content of the slides can be seen below:

**Professional Development Committee: Proposal Background and Rationale**

Why we started ATI

1. To continue the learning, collaboration and fun of the Congresses
2. To have an organization we could join
3. To develop a way to evaluate someone based on the quality of their teaching, not the quantity of their training.

Traditional Training Programs

1. Three years duration
2. 1600 hours
3. Five to one teacher/student ratio
4. 80% ‘hands on” training

The Traditional Teaching Model

1. Everyone has faulty sensory appreciation
2. which leads to “bad use.”
3. You can only learn the Technique
4. one-on-one
5. It takes a long time.

Traditional Training Model

1. Teacher trainees need a long time to correct their faulty sensory appreciation
2. Because teaching means giving the correct sensory experience to the pupil

Professional Development Committee Tasks

1. Define the distinct theory and body of knowledge that constitutes the F. Matthias Alexander Technique and distinguish it from other means of improving human use and functioning. (1998)
2. To objectively delineate the practice of the Alexander Technique, including the use of the technique by individuals, the teaching of the technique and the training of teachers.
3. Develop a means to evaluate the competencies of teachers. (ongoing)

To become an ATI teaching Member (1992—1993) one had to:

Provide a letter from your primary teacher/trainer stating that you are qualified to teach.

Election of ATI Sponsors (began in 1993)

1. ATI members will elect other ATI members to become ATI Sponsors.
2. To become an ATI Teaching Member, you must be evaluated by three ATI Sponsors.

The content for

Ethics was adopted in 2012; for Alexander’s Writings in 2015 and for Anatomy in 2017.

But, we only have the *content*.

We do not have anything saying *how* the Candidate will demonstrate their knowledge (what steps the Candidate will use).

The current proposal seeks to establish a means (the how) for a Candidate to demonstrate their knowledge in each of the three areas.  This how (means) will be used for each of the three areas.

***Section V:***

**Questions:**

Irene Schlump – In 1993, not everybody had to go through evaluation, had it already started – recognized that teaching members from other organizations could just come join ATI.

Tommy Thompson– Respecting their variety of ways and ways they trained. There was no structure, but as we evolved, we began to question what we were doing and why, based on the original way we decided to do it. We realized that if we were an inclusive society, we had to recognize other people’s way of training. We wanted to give credence to our belief that you could be trained in many ways. Some teaching programs were rather sketchy, so we had to vote on those. But we wanted the system to reflect our values, which is to open up the possibilities of training.

Marilou Chacey – All of these things you are talking about, were they done in the meetings like this?

Catherine Kettrick – the first two tasks were not, we sent them out to be voted on. But the third task was done in a meeting, using Robert’s rules and Formal Consensus.

Sara Barker – This how, the one you are proposing for Alexander’s writings, will also be applied to the other areas? So there is no way to have an evaluation online?

Catherine: Yes. You will see the process in the proposal, but yes it applies to all three areas.

***Section VI:***

**Proposal Presentation:  
The Proposal  
Preface:**

*Alexander Technique International uniquely values the individual's choice to train in this work in whatever way works best for them. Teaching Candidates are free to learn the information and develop the necessary knowledge and skills in whatever ways they choose.  ATI has established criteria and a means for evaluating the competencies of teachers applying for an ATI Teaching Certificate. These criteria and means are based on our values, and have been consented to by the membership via the Formal Consensus Process.*

*The Proposal is divided into two parts: the first is the how, i.e. the steps in the process; the second is the what— questions that will give the Candidate an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge.*

***Part I - The How***

*The Demonstration of Knowledge can be completed any time before the Demonstration of Teaching Skills.*

*The Candidate will respond to each of the items in Part II.  These items are intended to elicit the knowledge that ATI members have decided that all ATI certified teachers must know.*

*The Candidate will record their responses in any form that is convenient and comfortable for them (e.g. writing, audio or video recording). These responses are the Candidate’s Demonstration of Knowledge.*

*3. When the Candidate is ready to do their Demonstration of Teaching Skills, they will send their Demonstration of Knowledge to each of their ATI Sponsors in advance of their Demonstration of Teaching Skills. (The Teaching Candidate will discuss with each of their ATI Sponsors how far in advance the Candidate must provide their Demonstration of Knowledge). These ATI Sponsors will review the Candidate’s Demonstration of Knowledge. If they have any questions, they can talk to the Candidate about any part of it prior to (or during) the Evaluation of Teaching Skills.*

*Note: The Professional Development Committee is currently in discussions with the International Committee, ATI translators and the Board to develop a means for translating Candidates' Demonstration of Knowledge, and the Study Guide, if that is necessary.*

*The Study Guide (already completed) will be available on the ATI website.*

*The Candidate will include their completed Demonstration of Knowledge in the Application Package and it will be filed with their other application materials, currently kept by the Certification Coordinating Committee.*

***Part II - The What: The Alexander’s Writings portion of the Demonstration of Knowledge***

*Note: This part of this proposal has already been consented to in 2015.*

1. *Give a brief summary of Alexander's life and work. Be sure to include where and when he was born and died; the names of his four books; what other kind of writing he did; what his early work focused on; and the role his brother played in his work. (From the proposal adopted in 2015).*
2. *Using your own words:*

* *explain each of the ideas (listed below) and how they have influenced your development as a person and as a teacher (from the 1998 report and the ATI Criteria).*
* *with reference to the first chapter of the Use of the Self, describe how Alexander discovered each of those ideas (from the proposal adopted in 2015).*
* *What literature (by Alexander or other authors) would you recommend to a pupil and why? (From the ATI Criteria).*

*Effective date: This proposal will take effect on 1 January 2020. It will only apply to Candidates who apply for Certification on 1 January 2020 or later.*

*Note: The Use of the Self is available in German, Japanese, French and Spanish. The Resurrection of the Body, (ed. Ed Maisel) is available in Italian. The last chapter of this book is the first chapter of Use of the Self. (Also available: Constructive Conscious Control of the Individual (German and Italian); and Man’s Supreme Inheritance, Constructive Conscious Control of the Individual, and the Universal Constant in Living, all in Japanese).*

***List of Ideas (in alphabetical order):***

*Note: These are the terms Alexander used to name important concepts and principles of his Technique. You do not have to use these words. You do have to show--using your own words--that you understand what each concept or principle means.*

* *Conscious Direction*
* *End-gaining*
* *Faulty Sensory Appreciation*
* *Inhibition*
* *Means Whereby*
* *Primary Control*
* *Pyscho-physical Unity*
* *Universal Constant (Use Affects Functioning for better or worse)*

***Section VII:***

**Clarifying Questions – Level 1:**

Sharyn West: I want to know the difference between saying these are F.M.’s ideas, and how he was sometimes ambivalent… that’s embedded in this…

Catherine Kettrick – Yes, that is implied.

Sarah Barker:  (In response to where Demonstration of Knowledge records will be kept) We have something called “Base Camp” where all documents are filed. It is online and it belongs to the ATI Office’s database and records.

Cathy Madden -  Adds 5 minutes to the agenda for clarifying questions.

Sarah Barker: My interpretation is that as an ATI Sponsor, I will receive this body of writing or two hour video, and I will spend the time personally evaluating that robust test.

Catherine Kettrick:  Yes, that’s the implication.

Rosa Luisa: What does it mean the study guide?

Catherine Kettrick: It is to help the candidate to prepare for all the Demonstrations of Knowledge.

Irene Schlump:  If I am a candidate, I send my material into an ATI Sponsor, and ask if they will sponsor me.

Catherine Kettrick:  You would reach out to an ATI Sponsor and say “I have my Demonstration of Knowledge, when would you like it before the sponsorship..

Sarah Barker:  If you are coming to a pre-day, you would go through the administration to know when the Demonstration of Knowledge is due, and send it to the CCC before the conference.

Rosa Luisa Rossi:  Is this information available on the website? So the responsibility to get that information is the responsibility of the trainers and trainees, so ATI doesn’t take care of that part.

***Section VIII:***

**Meeting Review and Evaluation**

Sarah Barker: I love the history behind the presentation, we should always have that.

Rosa Luisa Rossi: I appreciate the detail and the work of this committee. I would suggest that the congress or the world should know what ATI is doing, a presentation. Okay, can you feel my heart? Such fire.

Maryse Berninet:  Two days ago, there was a proposal, but I didn’t understand it. But now I understand it.

Sarah Barker: Kate (Lushington), I would like to apologize to you. I lost trust and I interrupted. I think that may have caused you a lot of stress and I’m sorry.

Kate Lushington: Thank you.

Irene Schlump:  I would love to have the study guide not only on the members side, but on the public side. This has to be seen in the public.

Delia Rosenboom: I come from England, so know STAT well. I believe we actually have quite a rigorous process, but I actually think that STAT members should not just receive a certificate, but also have to go through this process.

Irene Schlump:  When we come to solving the concerns, I would appreciate to have the current language, the old proposed language, and the new solving the concern all on one slide.

Christos Noulis: I come from Greece, where we have no societies, but only 4 teachers. This was a really clarifying and useful presentation for me, and I would like to thank you very much since it covered all I wanted to know.

Lucia Walker:  Having the history, felt like part of the vision/mission showed up in the meeting.

***2019 AGM #3***

***ATI Conference and AGM 2019: Ennis, Ireland  
AGM 3: October 22, 2019, 2:00PM – 3:30PM***

***Section I:***

**Announcements**

Peter: Talent Show

**Meeting Intentions, FC Roles & Agenda 10**

Meeting Intentions were read by Lucia Walker

**Formal Consensus Process Roles:**

* Agenda Planners: Marilou Chacey and Bill Conable
* Facilitators: Cathy Madden & Diana Bradley
* Timekeeper: Don White
* Doorkeeper: Julia
* Notetaker:
* Public Scribe:
* Peacekeeper:
* Advocate:
* Language Advocate:
* FCP Advocate:

**Approval of Agenda**

Cathy Madden presented the agenda – there were no concerns.

**Board Report**

Alison Deadman referred members to the board report that had been published in the last edition of the *Communique* and was also available on the Conference App.  She thanked her fellow board members and summarized some of their activity.  In addition, she noted that the board had been monitoring members’ feedback on our administration company (AMC).  Over the year, concerns were taken up with the AMC as they arose. The board saw that even with the passage of time, many concerns were not being addressed in a timely fashion and a few were not being addressed at all.  About a month ago the board sent the AMC a formal letter (as per the terms of our contract) indicating clearly where they were not in compliance with the contract and giving them 60 days to resolve these issues.  If the issues are not resolved, the board will start the process to terminate the contract.

**Light and Lively: Susan Sinclair**

***Section II:***

**PDC Proposal Level I**

Vision/Mission was read by Jennifer, Gabriele in German

Jennifer Mizenko: Proposal supports #4, our vision of professionalism.

Holly Cinnamon: “Record their responses in any form convenient and comfortable for them” supports our vision of accessibility.

Lucia Walker: Clarifying the professional profile is supporting professional advancement of ATI.

Sarah Barker: We are applying the “Means whereby” by allowing the candidates choice in presentation.

Marilou Chacey: ATI decided to do this in the 90’s. This fulfills a vision.

**PDC Proposal Level II: Concerns**

Sarah Barker: Concern about the “how” of the Candidate sending their Demonstration of Knowledge to three ATI Sponsors. Doubts that all ATI Sponsors are willing to be rigorous in their reading and evaluation of that sort of Demonstration of Knowledge. We may need to find the best way to evaluate these demonstrations. Giving them to the ATI Sponsors may not be the best option.

Delia Rosenboom: Concerned that this process is not different from what is happening now. The ATI Sponsors will still be doing the same job, twice. Workload concern. Her understanding was that this work was supposed to be given to someone else.

Gabriele Breuninger: Concerned about the “discuss this in advance” part and the process of sending it in. Concerned about cheating. Concerned about the knowledge of ATI Sponsor workload and their willingness.

Tommy Thompson: We might not be appreciating our growth in this writing.  This might affect other committees and add to their workload and require them to make changes, as well: Sponsorship, International Committee, CCC.

Peter Nobes: Concerned about actual learning and not being required to embody the work.

Victoria: Concerned about cost of translation and cost of administration time.

Eve Salomon: Concerned about unnecessary duplication of workload. We don’t need three people reviewing this.

Sarah Barker: Worried we can’t meet the rigor of this plan with objective review. This requires a high level of skill.

Holly Cinnamon: Concerned that having individual ATI Sponsors being the evaluators will not allow for objective and consistent evaluation.

Debi Adams: Concerned about timing. If the proposal were consented to, and if it takes effect in January 2020, this may pose problems for ATI Sponsors and candidates working together internationally.

Irene Schlump: Concerned this may affect our organization and the sponsorship process negatively.

Tommy Thompson: We may not have ATI Sponsors willing to take on this load.

**Light and Lively: Jennifer: Head and Shoulders, Knees and Toes**

***Section III:***

**Certification Coordination Committee Proposal:**

Sarah Barker: Certification Process has really grown in terms of Clarity, Focus and Rigor. Building community between  ATI Sponsors.  We need more communication between ATI Sponsors. Communication is difficult. She would like us to expect more from the ATI Sponsors and be clearer about those expectations.

*The Alexander Technique International  
ATI Sponsor Requirements*

*Rationale:*

*ATI Teacher Certification is an important function of Alexander Technique International. This was most fully articulated by the addition of a fourth point to ATI’s Vision Mission Statement at the 2010 ACGM: T****o provide a means for recognizing Alexander Technique Teacher competence and providing certification for those teachers who qualify.***

*The membership elects highly qualified ATI Certified Teaching Members to serve as ATI Sponsors. The ATI Sponsors determine whether or not a teacher has demonstrated a competent ability to teach.*

*Twelve years ago (2007) the membership reached consensus in requiring certain behavior and strongly recommend other behaviors to guarantee the standards of our ATI Sponsors.*

*At that time we decided to require all sponsors to submit:*

* *a biannual report of their activities*
* *we also strongly recommended that they provide each candidate with a feedback form.*

*Neither of those activities have been fulfilled by more than two or three out of 35 sponsors.*

*ATI, through the work of the Certification Coordinating Committee (CCC) has had almost no oversight of the sponsors in our 25 years. This has led to many incidences (anecdotally reported by observers) in which unusual or questionable procedures have been used by a few ATI Sponsors.*

*This lack of oversight is principally due to inadequate response from ATI Sponsors when they have been contacted via snail mail or email.*

*In addition, it is also clear that when the membership votes for a new ATI Sponsor or to re-elect current ATI Sponsors the membership may be unaware of the requirements and recommendations we make of the ATI Sponsors.*

*CCC has tried to remedy this through several innovations at the ACGMs since 2013.*

* *All Sponsors are publicly introduced to all members attending the ACGM through an ATI Sponsor panel where approaches to certifying teachers are shared and discussed and a Coffee/Tea where informal conversations can happen. This also fulfilled a requirement passed in 1994 ACGM “Proposal #5 – Sponsoring Members to meet together and make a report to AGM.”*
* *All candidates for re-election submit activity reports and statement of purpose to be provided with the ballot so members could assess the activity of the ATI Sponsors.*
* *New ATI Sponsor applicants submitted the application form plus three nominator recommendations.*

*CCC also holds a private hour-long ATI Sponsor meeting at each ACGM.*

*Another proposal that has been passed in the last few years is a requirement that ATI Sponsors charge the fee established by ATI for sponsor certifying sessions. The Board is still working on what that fee will be but once established all ATI Sponsors must adhere to the fee schedule.*

***ATI currently has 35 ATI Sponsors. The group of ATI Sponsors who ever attend ACGMs are comprised of approximately 12 ATI Sponsors. Eight to 10 Sponsors at the most attend ACGMs at any one time. Of that group 4 to 5 have served on or as chairs of committees or board members. The rest have little to no contact with ATI other than to pay membership dues and conduct certification sessions.***

***In the past four years new ATI Sponsor candidates have been invited to observe pre-day certifying sessions. All have taken the opportunity. Several have reported the wide range in variety and quality of certifying methods and approaches to teaching candidates.***

***Also new ATI Sponsor applicants are provided with three samples of certifying processes for current sponsors as guides as they write their own proposed process for the application. It is always made clear that these samples are not required processes and that each ATI Sponsor will determine their own process.***

***The proposal offered by Sarah Barker and Rosa Luisa Rosa will strengthen the requirements made of all ATI Sponsors. These requirements are intended***

* ***to increase all ATI Sponsors’ awareness of the needs of ATI and ATI certification;***
* ***to provide for on-going discussion and improvement in the certifying process through meetings of the ATI Sponsors;***
* ***to create a high and consistent standard of certification;***
* ***to provide ATI and CCC with clear and reasonable guidelines for selecting future ATI Sponsors;***
* ***and to release individuals serving as ATI Sponsors who do not work for the benefit of ATI.***

***There is future work to be done once this proposal has been accepted.***

1. ***The most important thing is to create an annual video conferencing program to be offered by CCC (one to three a year so that ATI Sponsors have several meetings to choose from in order to meet the requirement to participate in one meeting per year). It will be a platform of support offered by CCC allowing ATI Sponsors to participate in the continual evolution of the ATI Certification Process.***
2. ***A formal review of ATI Sponsors’ participation will need to be established (by the review of annual ATI Sponsor reports and review of candidate feedback forms).***
3. ***To establish procedures for removing ATI Sponsor status when an individual does not conform to the requirements.***

***It is our intention that much more robust and open communication amongst the ATI Sponsors will help ATI and CCC maintain the freedom for each ATI Sponsor to set their own certification process and yet to have those processes fall within parameters of excellence and practicality.***

***Proposal for Stronger Requirements for ATI Sponsors***

***Current Requirements and Recommendations  
Re-election of sponsors:***

*Re-election of sponsors:*

1. *Sponsors are re-elected for 5-year terms by a simple majority.*
2. *~~Sponsors are strongly encouraged to attend an AGM prior to being re-elected.~~*

***New Requirements  
Re-election of sponsors:***

*Re-election of ATI Sponsors*

1. *ATI Sponsors are re-elected for 5-year terms by a simple majority;*
2. *ATI Sponsors attend an ATI Annual Conference(ACGM) within the five-year period before being re-elected;*
3. *Pay annual membership dues on time;*
4. *Submit CCC’s required re-election documents by the published deadline;*
5. *Sign the ATI Sponsor Commitment for election and re-election.*

***Current Requirements and Recommendations  
Conduct as a sponsor:***

*It is required that:*

1. *~~All sponsors make an independent decision for sponsorship of any individual teaching candidate.~~NEW WORDING*
2. *~~All sponsors fill out a Sponsor Feedback Form (provided by Certification Coordination Committee –CCC) once every two years to be submitted to the CCC.~~*

*~~It is strongly recommended that:~~*

1. *~~All sponsors provide the candidates they review with a Candidate Feedback Form (form provided by CCC). Both the sponsor and candidate retain copies of the form if the candidate files a formal complaint about the sponsorship process. Then the candidate feedback form is submitted with the complaint.~~DELETE*

***New Requirements  
Conduct as a sponsor:***

*It is required that ATI Sponsors:*

1. *Certify all teaching candidates independently of other ATI Sponsors;*
2. *Submit ATI Sponsor Annual Report;*
3. *Adhere to the certifying session fee established by ATI;*
4. *Maintain involvement in ATI in some way, for example: be on a committee, attend Annual General Meetings, and stay informed about the current work of CCC and ATI;*
5. *Participate annually in at least one ATI Sponsor meeting either in person or via video conferencing.*

***The Alexander Technique International (ATI) Sponsor Commitment***

*(ATI Sponsors will be asked to sign this on their election and re-election application)*

*Because I understand that regular communication with ATI and the Certification Coordinating Committee (CCC) is crucial to the functioning of the ATI Sponsor Certification process I agree to maintain regular and steady communication with the Certification Coordinating Committee (CCC). I will demonstrate this through:*

1. *My quick response (within 3 weeks) to emails and communications from the Certification Coordinating Committee (CCC).*
2. *Maintaining my ATI membership and submitting the ATI Sponsor’s Annual Report. (no later than six weeks after the dues renewal deadline)*

*I also understand that my regular participation in ATI affairs will help me maintain a full understanding of ATI’s values and procedures. Therefore, I am committed to:*

*My involvement in ATI in some way beyond sponsoring in order to stay informed about the current work of ATI. I will therefore participate annually in at least one ATI Sponsor meeting either in person or via video conferencing. I will look for other opportunities to be involved, for example, serving on a committee.*

*I understand that ATI Sponsors are encouraged to provide candidate certification during the pre-day ATI Sponsor events at ATI ACGMs and/or observe at least one of those evaluations whenever possible.*

*My certification of each teaching candidate will be made independently of other ATI Sponsors.*

*I will certify candidates in a way that allows for various training approaches and at the same time maintains high standards in the quality of teaching and demonstration of knowledge in the three areas.*

*I agree to adhere to the certifying session fees established by Alexander Technique International.*

*Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

*(Sarah Barker and Rosa Luisa Rossi, June 2019)*

***Section IV:***

**Clarifying Questions:**

Eve Salomon: Is the new AGM attendance requirement the same as it was before? Sarah: Yes.

Jennifer Mizenko: How is the candidate feedback form shifting?

Marilou Chacey: is the form/agreement the ATI Sponsors are to sign a replication of established requirements? Sarah: Yes.

Holly Cinnamon: Please clarify “Certify all teaching candidates independently of other ATI Sponsors”.

Sarah Barkier: No two ATI Sponsors will be evaluation a candidate in the same room, and they will not discuss it together outside of the evaluation.

Anthony Taylor: Does certified mean affirmative evaluation?

**LEVEL I VISION/MISSION:**

Jennifer Mizenko: This supports our mission to make ATI a professional organization.

Catherine Kettrick: Intention to support

Irene Schlump: Supports vision of diversity of ATI Sponsors.

Delia Rosenboom: Supports and clarifies roles of ATI Sponsors

Marilou Chacey: Supports the ATI Sponsors feeling truly a part of ATI, and responsible to all of us.

Holly Cinnamon: Creates a “means whereby” to have a network of communication.

**MEETING EVALUATION:**

Sarah Barker: Appreciate the Agenda Planners. Marilou and Bill reformatted the rationale at the last minute, so it was much clearer.

Debi Adams: Closed Concerns portion on the PDC proposal too quickly. Needed more time.

Jennifer Mizenko: Appreciate the facilitators helping us in the learning process with Formal Consensus.

Catherine Kettrick: Thanks everyone for the work we did yesterday and today. Astounded by how much more creative we are as a group than as individuals.

Debi Adams: Appreciate Cathy’s ability to summarize and clarify concerns.

Cathy Madden: Appreciate all the roles and Lucia for keeping track of them.

Delia Rosenboom: Appreciate all the clarity and work done to present these proposals elegantly.

Kate Lushington: Appreciates really knowing what the ATI Sponsors are doing.

Marilou Chacey: Appreciates how efficient we are being with time, ending early.

Marilou Chacey:  offered a chance for others with concerns to come forward tomorrow and have them added.

Kate Lushington: would like us to hear those as a group, or at lease know what they are.

Irene Schlump: Does the financial report belong with the Board report? When do we hear that?

Answer: Later in the week, maybe Thursday. MEETING ADJOURNED.

***2019 AGM #4***

***ATI Conference and AGM 2019: Ennis, Ireland  
AGM 4 Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 11am-12:30pm***

***Section I:***

**Announcements**

Sarah Barker presented ATI teaching certificates to candidates how had completed their Certification Process at the Pre-Day: Darci Balkcom, Molly Kittle, Gabriele Beruninger, and Christos Noulis

Fiona Cranwell: Bus announcements for trips, taxi share, open class to the community

Peter Nobes: No Talent Show

Tommy Thompson and Sarah Barker: Vote in the election

Marilou Chacey: Light and Lively Volunteers

Alison Deadman: Minutes from first AGM are on the App – please review and send corrections to Alison.

Thanked translators for all their work throughout the year.

Lucia Walker– Sharyn and Lucia actor research project.

**Meeting Intentions**

Everyone read the intentions in their own language.

**Meeting Roles**

* Agenda Planner – Bill Conable
* Facilitators – Diana and Cathy
* Timekeeper – Judit Pasztor
* Doorkeeper – Susan Sinclair
* Notetakers – Morgan and Holly
* Public Scribe – Kate Lushington
* Peacekeeper – Irene Schlump
* Advocate – Eileen Johnson
* Language Advocate – Christos Noulis
* Formal Consensus Process Advocate – Rosa Luisa Rossi

**Agenda**

Approved with no concerns.

**Treasurer’s Report**

Victoria Leomant:

Balance sheet will be up on the app soon. ATI has had a healthy year and will give back to the members through upcoming plans. Please communicate to the committees what you would like to see happen with the funds that we have. Thank you for being a member and for participating – that’s how we make a profit. We’re very healthy, we’re doing very well.

**Questions:**

Sarah Barker – Do you have anyone following you to train them to be the next treasurer?

Victoria – I would like to do a six-month joint treasury, so anyone who knows someone who might like to be treasurer, please pass on the information to them.

Catherine Kettrick – being a treasurer is different from bookkeeping – what are your duties?

Victoria – Bookkeeping is taken care of by professionals. Treasurer does due diligence – making sure budget is correct. Treasurer creates the annual budget and the Conference budget. Also, to look at the balance and do budgets for things when ATI has excess money. Every conference has a different budget, so considering that, and what can be in the budget is important. Some financial background is good.

Kate Lushington– Is there any legal requirement?

Victoria – Not really, because we employ professionals. I’m English, so I don’t know American filing laws, so I have to rely on the professional that we employ to say what’s needed. It’s not hard.

Cirsten Verleger – Do you have a number of what we have – of what our actual budget is right now?

Victoria – Our reserves are about $179,000 and our profit this year is about $20,000. Our year end is December, but the year end is when our balance sheet is a full year. It does go in the Communique if anyone wants to see it.

Marilou Chacey– If there are further questions, see Victoria.

***Section II:***

**CCC Proposal – Level 2 Concerns**

Sarah Barker – Clarification that you are not consenting to the example agreement, but you are consenting to the proposal, saying that the Sponsors will be asked to sign an agreement like that. So we can discuss the agreement, but you don’t have to consent to that.

Lucia Walker – Certifying session fee. We agreed we were going to establish one, but my concern is about different countries and the value of the dollar.

Peter Nobes – I have a concern about the fee of the certifying sessions. There is no clarity about whether it is only at the AGM versus in the private practice.

Maryse Berninet – Concern about a French teacher who can’t speak English. How can they attend a video or an AGM? For us, it is a big problem for some people, because they are very close to ATI’s Vision Mission but they can’t share

Marilou Chacey – I have a concern that #4 has grouped two different things: CCC and ATI grouped together.

Gabriele Breuninger– Concern – how do we know that the Sponsors stay informed about the current work of the CCC? How do we enforce the agreement?

Catherine Kettrick – Concerned about #1 – word certify and #4 certifying session, because ATI Sponsors do not certify, they evaluate and endorse, ATI the organization certifies.

Joe Kaplan - #4 Kind of vague and difficult to enforce in the current wording, someone could say they are informed but what does that mean for the responsibility? How to determine if they are informed? What does it actually mean?

Tommy Thompson– Concerned with word certifying. Shouldn’t we know what the fee is before we agree to it?

Sarah Barker – This is reflecting a proposal that has been passed. This is already in effect. But the board has not been able to put it into action. The board needs to determine the fee. But the proposal that has said that there will be a fee has been agreed to already.

Irene Schlump– How is this taking care of ATI Sponsors who are not really sponsoring for a long time? Or maybe did not at all sponsor in five years?

Sarah Barker – The idea is if you look at a Sponsor’s five year annual report, you are going to re-elect them. If you don’t see activity on that ATI Sponsor’s form that they are doing a good job and serving ATI, then you vote against them. So the members are responsible for making sure the ATI Sponsors are doing their jobs.

Diana Bradley – Is it really a simple majority of the membership, or a quorum at an AGM? What does the simple majority refer to?

Joe Kaplan - #2 seems redundant with #4 the last one. If we are requiring people to attend an AGM every 5 years, then that just doubles with what the last slide says.

Sarah Barker – To be re-elected, minimum you have to attend one conference in the last 5 years. But every ATI Sponsor, in every year, has to participate in ATI in some way.

Joe Kaplan – So number 4 doesn’t say that you have to do something annually for ATI?

Sarah Barker – No, you don’t. So your concern is that it’s very confusing.

Joe Kaplan – Does number 2 under re-election satisfy #4 in conduct?

Sarah Barker – No but it’s not clear and we will work on it.

Irene Schlump – Hearing Sarah’s answer to my question and having talk to my French friend here, we found out that there are not so many French ATI Sponsors, so sometimes they do not sponsor within 5 years. So it would be a problem to not vote for them anymore, but we need them. How do we ensure that we do not lose an ATI Sponsor, or a tool to teach sponsors who do not frequently sponsor?

Sarah Barker – There is nothing in this proposal about the number of sponsoring sessions to be re-elected. But what your saying is that we need more training sessions.

Irene Schlump – I thought you said if they don’t sponsor in the last five years, don’t vote for them.

Sarah Barker: I was not saying that you were looking at sponsoring sessions, but their activity and their contribution to ATI. It is not required that they sponsor regularly, but activity could include committees, attending AGMs… etc.

Diana Bradley asks to add 10 more minutes to Level 2.  There were no concerns.  10 minutes were added.

Sarah Barker – Concerned that paying membership dues on time means only that due date and there is no flexibility in that. I’m not sure what ATI’s policy is when membership fees are dropped, but there is no flexibility there. Humans are humans.

**Light and Lively by Delia**

***Section III:***

**Evolving our Governance Means-Whereby**

Cathy Madden introduced the session:

We are here. Different relationships to different members and different committees change. You might realize – Oh, there are new things that I want because things have shifted. I would like you to get into small groups and discuss what you notice.

An example from myself: on the website there is something on there that’s not true about me. The need it reveals is I want to be able to change that myself. If there is a frustration, what is the solution?

One thing I thought of this morning is our bylaws say that no board member has been compensated. As a former chair, I know that chairs give up paying business to do the work of ATI. At the very least, I’d like them to come to the conference for free.

A very large question that came from someone else is that someone who is used to working with organizations looked at things and said: You have a very formal set of bylaws for a group who wants to work as flexibly as you do.

As you look at evolving governance, that is a possibility. Many of the original founders are here, and I remember what we did and why we did it…

But it’s a pretty big area, so I suggest we get into groups of 5, and if there is anything on your mind, share it and then find solutions, and then we’ll share the solutions, the yesses.

Marilou Chacey  - So the yes is what we want?

Cathy Madden – Yes.

Christos Noulis – Is it a request or a solution?

Cathy Madden – It could be either. Something do-able. Try to make diverse groups.

The results of this session are:

**Papers from Meeting 10/23/2019**

Board Members compensation  
Support to attend AGMs  
Equity in participation  
Bursaries/subsidy for different countries  
Limits of volunteerism  
Budget clarity  
Some hard copies (tech good –maybe not only)  
Easy dissemination of information  
Earlier deadlines for workshop proposals to know who is presenting  
List of participants earlier  
Friendly greetings to members before business information in communication  
Personal relationship with the office  
What is important to the members—to be ………………………  
Make the website for members not administration  
Find a way to keep the flow of work progressing (on committees etc.) when there is a shift in leadership  
Re-examine international commitment

* *Email meeting intentions/guidelines*
* *Change our own info on website*
* *Revisit board member compensation*
* *Bylaws?*
* *Constructive rules of communication between the members as well as management*
* *Ability of update own profile on website*
* *Up to date workshop list of what members are doing on the website*
* *As a follow up- informing members of how to submit workshops to the website and share on social media (Gabriele and Holly offer support)*
* *Online discussion groups based on topics on website or similar to committees*
* *Change own information listing of teachers and training schools (concern about security)*
* *Fluid, free, professional communication with admin (office)*
* *Member pages that have accessibility and contributions*
* *Streamlined process of registration of AGM- make it easy*
* *Also dues*
* *Prefer different time of year for AGM—week after new year’s/early June/late August*
* *Board members incentive/subsidy for contribution*
* *Revisit Bylaws*
* *Personal access to website*
* *Updated website*
* *Responsive office (calls and emails)*
* *International visibility for ATI*
* *Scholarship money to help diversify training courses/trainees*
* *Web- committee chairs have posting access to their committee area*
* *Members update profile/photo*
* *Conference registration; clearer presentation/options*
* *Clarify individual ATI sponsors’ requirements*
* *Flow chart for steps/timeline for ATI sponsor process*
* *Clarifying common expectations for in-person ATI sponsoring process*
* *Online schedule tool for administration/ committee meetings*
* *Public display of ATI certification process – Drill down for details*
* *Reinvigoration of buddy scheme to mentor and support and support ATI members*
* *Extend international committees remit to include supporting members to establish work in countries where AT is not a recognized profession e.g. Greece---help with insurance and being able to work in those countries*
* *Excite a wider group of members top work as volunteers for jobs needed*
* *Clarity of how decisions are made:*
* *review of what decisions are taken in the organization and where they are made*
* *review of how much autonomy committees have to make decisions*
* *how to delegate decisions upwards*
* *Clarification of bylaws and making membership aware of them*
* *Website is hard navigate*
* *Wish ATI would be more international*
* *Disperse membership*
* *More languages especially at AGMs*
* *Governance- laws differ from country to country*
* *Many ATI policies are decided according to American law*
* *International workshop funds exist, but no one is applying to use*
* *them, and no one knows about them—office needs to put this on the website*
* *At all AGMs workshop for international members—ask International committee to take this on*
* *Translations on the website are hard to find/not easy enough*
* *We should pay translators before board members in order to meet unmet needs of our membership*

***Section IV:***

**Meeting Evaluation**

Debi Adams – Very productive meeting

Irene Schlump – I was a peacekeeper, and I thought there was so much peace and that was great.

Maryse Berninet – Very creative

Joe Kaplan – Surprised and impressed by how many constructive concerns there were about the CCC proposal.

Sarah Barker – Appreciated accommodation of being able to drop her comment and leave due to noise.

Debi Adams – Expert facilitation

Jen Mizenko – Announcement not there, makes her announcement now about needing a new Chair to take over for her

Morgan Ford Brunketurner – I really liked this process of evolving our governance, being able to meet and talk about it in groups and coming from yes

Eve Salomon – Concerned that we don’t have enough time to work out what we are going to do with these suggestions

Delia Rosenboom– Magical process when CCC proposal was brought up, I thought it was really clear, and then there were all these comments

Sarah Barker – Do we have a process for resolving the concerns about the CCC proposal?

Diana Bradley – I would suggest that people gather in a group, group the concerns and find some solutions together.

***2019 AGM #5***

***ATI Conference, Ennis, Ireland  
AGM 5 Minutes Thursday, 11am-12:30pm***

***Section I:***

**Formal Consensus Roles**

* Agenda Planner: Marilou Chacey
* Facilitators: Diana Bradley, Cathy Madden
* Timekeeper: Maria Weiss
* Doorkeeper: Harvey Thurmer
* Notetaker: The Spice Girls
* Public Scribe: Jennifer Mizenko
* Peacekeeper: Poppy Walshaw
* Advocate: Debi Adams
* Language Advocate: Gabriele

Diana Bradley began the meeting.

**Announcements:**

Jen Mizenko: We do have a Continuing Education Policy. The original letter to the membership about this can be found online, along with the current policy.

Cathy Madden: Grouped the ideas from our brainstorming session yesterday. Open invitation for all to join in creating movement on these ideas.

Marilou Chacey asked for another light and lively volunteer. Holly and Peter volunteered.

Catherine Kettrick: The revised PDC proposal is available.

**Meeting Intentions**

read in German by ?

***Section II:***

**CCC Proposal Level III: RESOLVING CONCERNS**

Diana Bradley acknowledged all those who had worked to resolve concerns between meetings.

Irene presented the following changes:

*INSERT CHANGES*

**Clarifying Questions:**

Gabriele Breuninger: Does this offer of translation apply only to sponsorships sessions at the AGM?

Irene Schlump: No, this will apply to all translation needs. All communications must be well translated.

Lucia Walker: Question about timing of submitting annual reports. When and how will annual reports be administered?

Sarah Barker: Do you want this in the guidelines, or can it be administrative?

Lucia Walker: That could be administrative.

Peter Nobes: Does the CCC in #5 consider submitting an article to the *ExChange* as equal in value to participating in other ways?

Sarah Barker: Yes, as the document reads now.

Irene Schlump: We contemplated what involvement means, and this will already be a lot of work for them.

Marilou Chacey: Articles and workshops could be in different languages, so that offers flexibility. Translation is for #6, for meeting participation.

Holly Cinnamon: Activities. Does that belong with #4 or #5?

Gabriele Breuninger: Not sure my concern has been addressed. On #4, How do they stay informed and how will we know?

Irene Schlump: On the annual report, sponsors will explain how they’ve stayed involved and informed.

Sarah Barker: There is an online system where they can indicate if they read the emails and have reports sent to them.

Peter Nobes: Not sure my concern has been addressed about the certifying session fee.

Irene Schlump: In Ardingly, we adopted the proposal that there will be a fee, but the administration and setting of the fee is the Board’s responsibility, not the CCC’s. This is a pending issue that the CCC cannot address.

Marilou Chacey: Concern from Kate: #7 wording would be better read “at least one ATI annual conference every 5 years”.

Diana Bradley: Can we address Kate’s concern and change this language?

Don White: Concern that someone could still be able to sponsor without following these guidelines. It’s about the five-year period. What happens to the candidate who has been qualified by a sponsor who does not remain qualified?

Diana Bradley: I don’t think this would happen

Alison Deadman: Sponsorship ballots go out before the conference, but the election is not complete until after the pre-day sessions

Sarah Barker: Sponsorship election is separate from the conference, so if they do not continue to be reelected, but did a sponsorship at the conference, that work would still count. There is no gap.

Alison Deadman: Clarifying that translators will be provided as needed. The organization could not afford to pay for translators for all sponsorship reviews.

Alison Deadman: Language Concern: The term “sessions” is not clear: It is not a standard ATI term and is not defined in the proposal, so could we replace this with “ATI Sponsor Review Session Fee” which would relate back to the term “review” in the previous paragraph of the proposal

Catherine Kettrick: grammar concern: #1 “All teaching Candidate’s Abilities”; the apostrophe in “Candidates’” should be after the “s”.

Diana Bradley: Are there any concerns about adding 5 minutes to this section?

Catherine Kettrick: Concerned that time will be cut short for the review of the 3 page PDC proposal.

Diana Badley: Okay, a Light and Lively, then.

**Light and Lively**

Led by Matan Rechlis

***Section III:***

**PDC PROPOSAL LEVEL III: RESOLVING CONCERNS (25):**

The following revision was presented:

*Part 1 (The “how”) No. 3*

*When a Candidate is ready to submit their Demonstration of Knowledge, they will submit their response, in whatever form they choose, to the appropriate panel.  A panel member will review the Candidate’s Demonstration of Knowledge. The panel member may choose to follow up with the Candidate to discuss their Demonstration of Knowledge and ask them to revise any portion of it if needed.*

*The panel member will return to the candidate the completed Demonstration of Knowledge with a review form confirming that it is satisfactory. The panel will also keep a copy. The Candidate will send all three Demonstrations of Knowledge, and the completed review forms, to the three ATI Sponsors they have chosen prior to their Demonstration of Teaching Skills.*

*(and a bunch of administrative stuff)*

**CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:**

Catherine  Kettrick**:**We think we’ve addressed all concerns, except for the one about cheating. We at the PDC think collaborative learning is still learning.

Morgan Ford Brunketurner: Cheating is an issue for the Ethics Committee.

Tommy Thompson: With having the Demonstration of Knowledge reviewed by these panel, are we saying the sponsoring member doesn’t have the right to question what they see there?

Catherine Kettrick: No.

Irene Schlump: If there’s something in the Demonstration of Knowledge that the sponsor finds weird, they can return to the student for clarification. If still not satisfactory, can they apply their teaching skills?

Cathy Madden: With the CCC, we are boosting requirements for sponsorship, so maybe these two proposals relate.

Gabriele Breuninger: “The candidate will send all 3 Demonstration of Knowledge to 3 sponsors, but I might not know who my sponsor is: Who do I send it to?

Sarah Barker: Yes, that is correct, sometimes we don’t know who the sponsor will be at the AGM.

Sarah Barker: This is about administration: To whom do I send what?

Eve Salomon: I see we have a great deal of clarity on what panel will access for Alexander’s writings, but not for Anatomy and Ethics.

Joe Kaplan: The only part of the demonstration of knowledge that this proposal is implementing is Alexander’s writings.

Gabriele Breuninger: No specific time frame for

Joe Kaplan: Make sure you make all your submissions well ahead of travel time.

Linda Hein: Is there a drop dead date for the demonstration of knowledge, a date on which a Demonstration of Knowledge expires?

Catherine Kettrick: No.

Linda Hein: Are we sending notice and instructions to the training schools?

Catherine Kettrick: You bet. We’ll do that.

Cathy Madden: Are there any concerns about taking ten minutes to hear concerns?

The facilitator asked if there were concerns about adding ten minutes to this discussion: Ten minutes added.

CONCERNS Continued

Alison Deadman: If memory serves me rightly, we have already approved, in 2004, that sponsors will do this work.

Sarah Barker: That is separated from the PDC’s complete review of the Demonstration of Knowledge. Are the sponsors released from this responsibility?

Debi Adams: I am concerned that we’ll have trouble filling these 15 new positions.

Marilou Chacey: Concerned that we’ve gone from something simple to something very complicated.

Peter Nobes: How will the evaluator be chosen from the panel

Catherine Kettrick: By rotation.

Peter Nobes: Concern addressed.

Irene: Concerned that this says we don’t trust the sponsors we’ve elected to do the work of evaluating candidates.

***Section IV:***

**TIMELINE ON PDC PROPOSAL**:

Peter: How will these timelines be enforced? Who does the enforcing?

Lucia: I’m not quite sure how this lessons the work of the ATI Sponsors. I do see that it makes a lot more work for other people.

Cathy: We may read them, but do not have to.

Don: Concerned about the assessor’s standards. How do they know what is enough?

Catherine: Some questions have very clear yes and no answers (Alexander’s Date of Birth, his book titles, etc.), others have answers which are more personal and

Cathy: Concerned about using the language “teacher trainers” rather that people who teach people who want to learn to teach.

Tommy: Should the committee draft a statement that explains how the panelists will evaluate?

**MEETING EVALUATION (10):**

Peter: I love this process, and I love this organization. Big appreciation for Irene, who delivered her part is her second language!

Rosa Luisa: Appreciated the Spice Girls using their whole selves in their job.

Peter: Noticed the peacekeeper went out, but arranged for a deputy peacekeeper. Seamlessly done!

Sarah: I appreciated Cathy changing her stance upon noticing the reactions of the group, and allowing Joe to speak. Would’ve appreciated more breathing spaces to address and release the tension in the room.

Chistos: As a newcomer, I can attest that this IS a learning process.

Holly: Is there a process by which we can request the peacekeeper ring the bell, or request a light and lively if we feel we need one?

Irene: Beautiful to see such a learning experience in action. Encouraged everyone to take on new roles!

**MEETING ADJOURNED.**

# *****2019 AGM #6*****

## *ATI Conference, Ennis, Ireland AGM 6 minutes Thursday, 10-24-19*

## *Section I.*

**Announcements**

Fiona: No Talent Show tonight!

Andreas: Congress in Berlin!

Don: Will be on the Antiques Road Show

Diana: The fire is getting out of control. Please tend it carefully.

Fiona: Irene will fill in tomorrow morning with a workshop

Irene: I’ll be demonstrating how I work with images to find a unified field of attention.

**MEETING INTENTIONS READ ALL TOGETHER.**

**Formal Consensus ROLES:**

Agenda planners: Marilou Chacey and Bill Conable  
Facilitators: Diana Bradley and Cathy Madden  
Timekeeper: Maria W  
Doorkeepers: Rachel Prabahakar/ Jennifer Mizenko  
Notetakers: Morgan and Holly  
Public Scribe: Sara Goldstein  
Peacekeeper: Susan Sinclair  
Advocate: Peter Nobes  
Language Advocate: Eve  
Formal Consensus Process Advocate: Debi Adams

**2020 Annual Conference Announcement (5): Corrine and Company via video, Linda in person.**

Boone, North Carolina! OCTOBER 18-23, 2020.

Nice views, plenty of meeting space, hotel style lodging, heated swimming pool, airport shuttle, gym with climbing wall, mini golf course.

## *****Section II.*****

**CCC PROPOSAL LEVEL III(5):**

**INSERT REVISED CCC PROPOSAL HERE.**

Irene read the changes we consented to this morning.

Alison found a solution for her concern about translators.

**CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:**

No questions

**UNRESOLVED CONCERNS:**

Debi: Maybe I’m missing something, but I thought there was a concern about the simple majority.

Diana: That was my concern, and I was told that sponsors are elected online, by a simple majority from everyone who votes.

Diana: No more unresolved concerns, so we have consensus!

**Light and Lively: Clara Sandler: Row, Row, Row Your Boat**

Cathy: Remember the finger trick if you start to feel like you need a moment.

## *Section III.*

**PDC PROPOSAL LEVEL III: Joe Kaplan**

Joe presented the newly revised PDC Proposal

INSERT REVISED PROPOSAL HERE.

“We encourage all ATI Sponsors to join all three committees.

**CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:**

Bill: So if I am understanding this, we are asking all ATI Sponsors to join all three panels?

Joe: No, encouraging. That’s the crux. If you don’t join the Ethics panel, you cannot review that submission. It will have already been approved.

Holly: Does this replace the entire proposal we saw earlier?

Joe: No, this is only part 3.

Peter: If there are five people on the panel, and the sponsor is on that panel, isn’t there only a one in five chance that sponsor would be reviewing that portion of the demonstration of knowledge, anyway?

Joe: That’s not what the language says. The candidate can choose.

Candidates may choose their own panel member to review the demonstration should they wish to.

Tommy: Does the sponsor have to be on the panel?

Linda: Admin question.

Joe: We took the admin stuff out.

Linda: Can the sponsor  viewing a demonstration of knowledge, who disagrees with the passing evaluation ask for revision or disapprove endorsement?

Sarah: There would be no reason for us to do this.

Diana: What concern was this change addressing and how?

Joe: Some people were concerned that the sponsors would have too much work to do. This allows them to opt in. Some were concerned about candidates not getting to choose their own evaluators. We’ve made that accessible here, in hopes to make the process more convenient for the candidate

Delia: Earlier, I thought that there were various panel members, and it would be a rotational system, but now you are saying that they will choose from the list. It doesn’t sound anywhere near the same.

Diana: I don’t see in those two paragraphs where it says that a candidate can request their own panelist.

Joe: That’s not in the notes, no. That’s “administrative stuff”.

Sarah: I heard Joe say the administrative part of this will be handled later.

Tommy: Are we saying to the candidate, and to us as a body, that we want the candidate to simply comply with what we think is important irrespective of the sponsor who is entirely committed to the process of evaluating their teaching skills? Are we saying that the sponsor is only committed to evaluating the teaching skills? So now the sponsors are evaluating both the body of knowledge and the teaching?

Joe: No.

## *Section IV.*

**LEVEL II:CONCERNS:**

Cathy: This is the way the PDC has offered to resolve the concerns from this morning. Are there any further concerns?

Holly: I am concerned that I don’t actually know what this proposal says.

Cathy: Would it be helpful to see this portion in its place?

Holly: Yes.

Holly: There are many words in the current proposal that are not terms we already have established in ATI.

Bill: Is the line that says “and a bunch of administrative stuff” actually going to be in this proposal?

Catherine: No. We are asking the membership to trust us in the task of addressing administrative details later.

Joe: According to this proposal we are asking the membership to allow us to address administrative processes. Here’s what we have now, a work in progress.

Debi: Even though sponsors are encouraged to be on the panels, I’m still concerned that we don’t have enough members on the panels to take care of this.

Tommy: This is becoming clearer to me now. I think when a candidate comes in right now, I’m looking at their embodiment of the body of knowledge. Now we have the body of knowledge that they have to speak to before they are sponsored. My concern is that the candidate might not understand that I am looking for embodiment, that whatever I have said must be demonstrated.

Irene: I still have the concern that is a panel of some people who say they want to be on a panel and have some expertise, but they don’t actually. So there is no criteria for selecting panelists.

Joe showed how to join a panel.

Debi: My concern is that we have gotten so far from the original idea.

Maryse: It seems to be very heavy and complicated. I need to ask a question to understand. Does it mean that ATI doesn’t trust the Sponsors or the trainers? I don’t understand why we are choosing this process. I thought that when a trainee is ready for the sponsorship process, he has been taught the anatomy, and he has the knowledge. I feel when we separate and ask for the panels, it means we don’t trust the trainers.

Cathy: I’m wondering if someone would bring us a light and lively so I can meet with the committee for five minutes.

**LUCIA BROUGHT A LIGHT AND LIVELY. CATHY MET WITH THE PDC.**

Cathy: Are there any concerns about closing the meeting and doing the evaluations now so that the PDC and those with concerns can meet to resolve them?

**EVALUATIONS:**

Jen Mizenko: Suggestion that when you present it again, the whole thing is on the powerpoint.

Morgan Ford Brunketurner: A big thank you to the PDC.

Jennifer Mizenko: Excited that the CCC proposal was passed!

Sarah Barker: I want to say that this proposal is showing us how to navigate through the rocky parts of Formal Consensus.

Joe Kaplan: I appreciate all the facilitators and those who are working. It’s hot up there!

Marilou Chacey: I want to acknowledge two women here who have been working since 3:45 pm and it’s now 7:15pm.

Holly Cinnamon: I felt conflicted note taking while being part of the PDC with strong feelings on this topic.

Tommy Thompson: I walked in here late, but what I walked into was beautiful! I sat down and felt peaceful.

Joe Kaplan: If you have a concern, please come tell us. We need all of that info.

**MEETING ADJOURNED.**

# *****2019 AGM #7*****

## *AGM minutes 10-25-19 9:00-10:30am*

## *Section I.*

## *****Announcements(10)*****

Alison: Please vote. Voting closes next month.

Scholarship to honor Linda. We will fund the scholarship for five years from the funds available now. In that time, the hope is that the membership will find new ways to fund this as an ongoing scholarship.

Marilou: Formal Consensus Book

Morgan: I would love it if you submitted proposals to me very early. I have noticed that I’m seriously technologically limited. I also want you to know that you can propose the same workshop more than once. It would be lovely if I could have a committee member or two. Particularly someone with tech skills.

Jen: Continuing Education Committee needs a chair.

Catherine: PDC gathered more concerns. The PDC recognizes this is way to much to process this year, and will be starting a pilot project panel. Looking for volunteers. Email Joe. Particularly looking for current trainee volunteers.

Joe: Tell your friends to join the panel, and tell your students to participate and demonstrate their knowledge.

## *Section II.*

**FORMAL CONSENSUS ROLES and MEETING INTENTIONS(5)**

Agenda Planner: Marilou and Bill  
Facilitator: Jennifer  
Timekeeper: Maria  
Doorkeeper: Eve  
Notetaker: Spice Girls  
Public Scribe: Rachel  
Peacekeeper: John  
Advocate: Rosa Luisa  
Language Advocate: Maryse  
Formal Consensus Process Advocate: Alison

**ADDRESSING ALEXANDER’S RACIST LANGUAGE(15)**

Debi: I had an experience with a young man this summer who wants to train with me, a black man from the South. He said he doesn’t quite know how to reconcile his desire to train with Alexander’s racist language.

Debi presented a statement of admission and restitution from the Daughters of the American Revolution. Her potential student said this statement made him feel recognized. She suggests that we publicly state something similar.

**INSERT DAR STATEMENT ABOUT MARION ANDERSON HERE.**

Cristos: These issues are particularly sensitive in my country (Greece). One solution might be a linguistic team who might bridge historical language gaps.

Lucia: One solution is changing the text. I like the idea of recognizing it as an organization. In this age, it’s urgent.

Debi: Belinda says AMSAT has begun an affirmative action scholarship.

Eve: The board needs to draft a statement immediately and put it on the website.

Sara: A statement needs to happen soon.

Joe: Are there examples of how this has been addressed in texts?

Jen: Yes, in Laban’s writings.

Marilou: I suggest we create a subcommittee that works on this. I’d like them identified now. What about popcorning some words we’d like to see.

Morgan: Could we work with the other certifying bodies on this?

Debi: Yes. ATI could lead the charge.

Alison: Contact AMSAT’s diversity chair, not the board.

Cristos: Mauritz Publishing is sensitive to these issues. Jean Fisher is the contact.

Debi: It’s amazing what we can do in fifteen minutes. Shall we popcorn now?

Catherine: Let’s form the ad-hoc committee now, then popcorn.

Catherine: We need a title.

Joe: This is about language.

Lucia: and racism.

Jen: Can we trust the committee to form a title.

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: Catherine, Lucia, Holly, Morgan, Jen, Lucia, Sharyn, Linda.

**LIGHT AND LIVELY (3): Delia: Pitter Patter**

**ATI COMMITTEES (20): Alison and Holly**

Named committees, brought a committee recognition game.

## *Section III.*

**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETINGS EVALUATION (15)**

Catherine Kettrick: I liked not having to do any work this meeting and getting to play.

Irene Schlump: All the work was very peaceful.

Marilou Chacey: I loved when people came up to volunteer for meeting roles.

Catherine Kettrick: We need different notetakers for each meeting.

Lucia Walker: I’d like to really appreciate the notetakers. I liked that we took fifteen minutes to talk about racism.

Joe Kaplan: Catherine and I received a lot of recognition for our PDC work. Holly and Morgan should be included in that.

Delia Rosenboom: I really enjoyed these meetings. I learned a lot and looked forward to the next ones. Not a phone person. I struggled with using the app and wanted a paper copy at the door. I find it rude and disrespectful when I have to listen to other people’s phone dinging away during a meeting.

Bill Conable: I really appreciate the Formal Consensus Process and how constructive it is.

Joe Kaplan: Feeling that something that’s happening here is harder than it needs to be.

Irene Schlump: How beautiful the Formal Consensus Process is! I need to feel that you don’t think I’m undervaluing your work, and I need to feel that my work here is not undervalued. I would like to have a discussion of philosophy and what’s happening in the greater world.  I’d like to have more ethical/ philosophical work within our work.

Lucia Walker: I like not having the C.O.W. process.

Sarah Barker: I like that we are coming to our serious work with a sense of humor.

Lucia Walker: I’m having a big, big feeling of being proud. It is amazing what we do together.

Holly Cinnamon: I appreciated the flexibility we started to find in the process, including light and lively activities in a more flexible way.

Sarah Barker: People came back to the meetings after breaks more quickly. Good Behavior!

Eve Salomon: I LOVED the app! I really loved the app!

Morgan Ford Brunketurner: Whether or not we use the app, it was lovely to have the whole conference on a website.

Marilou Chacey: This is about the meetings.

Peter Nobes: I hated Holly’s quiz.  If he’d sat on the other side, he would’ve liked it.

## *Section IV.*

**ENTIRE CONFERENCE EVALUATION**

Marilou Chacey: I’ve attended conferences where cell phones were not allowed at all. I’d like us to think about how and when we are using cell phones here.

Sarah Barker: I liked using the app first thing in the morning when I was planning my day. I liked looking at documents outside of meetings. I never used it in the meeting room.

Lucia Walker: I also found it useful outside, but find things hard to read online. Having paper copies would be nice.

Jen Mizenko: Appreciate Fiona’s flexibility on the fly.

Sarah Barker: Room dividers just don’t work.

Debi Adams: Schedule had a nice flow. I really appreciate a good piano.(NOTE FOR SITE COMMITTEE)

Peter Nobes: My friend really liked having a proper bar and dance floor

Janet Rarick : Loved being able to walk in the country. Day trips were amazing and appropriate.

Cristos Noulis: As a first-timer, I felt very welcomed. Frustrated that so many workshops I wanted to attend happened at the same time.

Maryse Berninet: Fourth meeting. It’s exhausting to translate. I want to talk about my French fellows. With language issues and expenses combined, this journey is difficult for us.

Peter Nobes: Like having next year’s conference as a surprise on the last day.

Catherine Kettrick: I would like ATI to commit to having interpreters. If we need to raise dues to do that, then we raise our dues.

Alison Deadman: If we can commit to translators, we can be more flexible with who can present workshops.

Delia Rosenboom: This has been lovely. Fiona is a rock star. I feel welcomed and accepted and at home here.

Sara Goldstein: Could we not have someone to be wandering around the meeting putting hands on people who need it?

Jen Mizenko yielded the floor to Alison, Fiona, and Rosa Luisa.

Fiona led a silent ceremony transferring Board Chair responsibility from Alison to Rosa Luisa.

MEETING ADJOURNED.