

## MIDWEST ZONAL FORUM

May 28, 2011

Detroit Lakes, MN

### **I. Opening**

- A. Moment of silence 10:10 am on Saturday
- B. Introductions
- C. Reading of the Servant Worker's Prayer-Les
- D. Roll Call: All regions were represented by an RD, RDA, or both except Greater IL, Metro Detroit, MN.  
Administrative
- E. 7<sup>th</sup> Tradition collection
- F. Reading of the 1st Concept (JJ)
- G. Special Business/Review-Adjust Agenda

### **II. MZF - Trusted servant reports**

- A. Co-Facilitator A – Verbal report.
- B. Co-Facilitator B – Vacant
- C. Secretary – No cost. I apologize for not snail mailing minutes or having additional copies at our meeting. The last couple months seemed to fly by. I was not able to bring the printer because our car was packed tight. I will try to put instructions to email in next report.
- D. Treasurer – Electronic receipt given and the format was discussed. Check signing – usu have 4 potential signers and now we only have 2 signers. \$1,179.86 is the balance as of 4/30/11. Treasurers Report: The register and fund flow is attached. My reimbursement is covered with the web contact's request. I had not yet sent Frank to the checking account as a signer so I did not have to get him removed. We will have the same issue this meeting with signing trusted servants checks, the requests will be submitted by the Co-facilitator and Web Contact and will be signed by the Secretary and Treasurer. As requested, I have developed an electronic receipt and am requesting approval from the MZF at this time. I will finish bringing the MZF "history" on the web page up to date. In loving service, Lynn M
- E. Web Contact – Since the MZF met in March 2011 there have been 369 visits to the MZF website by 301 individual visitors. 73.98% of the views were first time visitors to the site. The 301 visitors viewed 1548 separate pages on the site.

During the past two months we have experienced delays in getting information uploaded onto the site –our updated mailing list in particular. This resulted in a significant delay in distributing the minutes and inconvenienced some members who continued to have email routed to incorrect addresses. I have some ideas for improving this process. In past discussions the Webservant and the owner of the company that put up our site have indicated they can enable the Secretary and the Web Contact to upload information themselves. I will press to make this happen...sooner rather than later.

Our site's discussion boards continue to be underutilized. There was discussion about posting instructions for using and subscribing to the discussion boards to the mailing list to encourage increased use. Unfortunately it is not clear who volunteered to perform this task. It may have been me. If so, I apologize. In any case I will do it along with instructions on how to immediately unsubscribe to the MZF Mailing list, since that appears to have been a point of irritation recently among some members.

Prior to our next meeting I will convene a formal web-based Web Committee meeting to begin discussing increasing the effectiveness/usefulness of our website. I will extend an invitation to participate to the mailing list and in addition I have some people in mind throughout the Midwest, some of which have participated in the MZF Web Committee, whose experience strength and hope would be helpful. In the mean time I welcome any suggestions on how we can make more effective use of our website. ILS, Bob M.

### **III. Regional reports**

- A. **Chicagoland** – Remy gave his report. Kathy was Skyped in and participated in the meeting. (Emailed report).
- B. **Greater Illinois:** Not present
- C. **Indiana:** Michael.
- D. **Metro Detroit:** Not present
- E. **Michigan:** Les, will send
- F. **Minnesota:** Not present.
- G. **Ohio** –Dave- Buckeye region has on and off participating with the MZF but is planning on attending the Indiana and are considering rejoining the MZF.
- H. **Wisconsin** – Bill
- I. **Upper Midwest:** Jeremy
- J. **Other visiting regions-** None

## MIDWEST ZONAL FORUM

May 28, 2011

Detroit Lakes, MN

### **IV. Subcommittee/Adhoc Reports**

No Adhoc committees at this time.

### **V. Prioritized list of topics for discussion (out of order – see below)**

### **VI. Basic Services**

A. Approval of minutes-approved without corrections.

B. Elections

-Co-Facilitator #2 goes until the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting after the conference, – Nominated JJ and accepted. Harold nominated and accepted. JJ was elected.

C. Financial decisions – None. Donation for meeting space will be \$200. Reimbursement to the administrative committee will pretty much wipe out our funds. This was an expensive trip to have the MZF meeting.

D. Next 2 meetings

1. IN – Indianapolis- September 16, 17, and 18, convention is our next meeting. (Flyer is on the website <naindiana.org>. Per discussion topic below we will be presenting a workshop on the Service System Project Proposals.

2. OH – Perrysburg, OH on 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> of February 2012 expecting 150-200 for the CAR/CAT workshop. Backup is in Columbus the week of the convention which we would rather not do. Someone from NAWS will be there to help facilitate the workshop. Four agendas were proposed by Dave. The following agenda was agreed upon:

### **VII. Topics/ Discussion**

Prioritized as follows

#1 Service Structure - Need another workshop about the March 2011 – Discussion took place and it was decided that it was not prudent or practical for the MZF body at this time to have another meeting separate from the Indiana convention to discuss this.

#2 Rural recovery workshop- Original workshop was 90 minutes - How should we change the workshop to fit in our time slot with the logistics of the “meat locker”. Suggested that the large group discussion be for 20 minutes and then have 3 ten-minute sessions on filling “black holes”.

#3 Drug court surveillance – We can ask local courts or law enforcement/probation to adhere to our tradition “we are under no surveillance at any time”. The definition of “surveillance” seems to be misconstrued. We know that at the facilities where we have meetings at, we volunteer to be at a meeting where monitoring is possible, such as meetings in treatment centers. Perhaps develop a statement that local communities can use to communicate with local law enforcements. NAWS has put out a bulletin of that nature. Suggested that a local PR meeting be set up inviting professionals to talk with about creating an environment where law enforcement understands where NA members come from. Possibly show them a mock NA meeting so they know what we are doing.

#4 Amend 4.01 participation (Skype) electronic web meeting – Being able to text as well as Skype in so voting by ballot can be texted in. Use a service like Freebinar or Web-X. One problem we had today is connection in and out and several members Skyped in are competing for bandwidth. We would need to look at alternatives other than one person at one computer. We need someone to organize texting. Make an attempt to choose a facility where video chat is possible. Survey monkey provides a service that you could do the voting there. So far this weekend the Skype communication has been distracting because of breaks in communication and being able to hear both ways. Our guidelines says that all attendees are participants so a whole gamut of issues surface. Right now it seems like it was too interruptive. An external microphone and speaker would make today a little easier. We could limit web participation to a certain number of people. We would be opening a door to setting limits and how would we do that. It was an interesting experiment but we may want to think cautiously unless we are prepared for this. We could test outside the MZF. We should move this forward because it is a form of communication that is being used and could save people money. We could limit locations and if multiple people want to web in they could go to a particular location. Bob has put this as an agenda topic on the MZF website (mzfna.org). We may have to purchase equipment down the road. MN uses for PR conference call, H&I conference call, and the regional meeting via teleconference with an area that was located far away. Should we amend guidelines to include participants via web or teleconference? Maybe; maybe not. The consensus is that the MZF does want to keep looking into facilitating attendance electronically, via the Web Contact.

## MIDWEST ZONAL FORUM

May 28, 2011

Detroit Lakes, MN

#5 What does the MZF do?-IP or some informational piece- if we do this we should base it off our website. It should come through the MZF first. Do we want a handout or booklet? A half-page to hand out whenever we meet to hand out. Have these handouts available. Maybe the secretary could keep a supply. Put an audio on the website saying what the home page of MZF says. Instead of a half page, have it a quarter sized page. Maybe going the other direction of a tri-fold with printing on both sides on colored paper and get 500 copies to get out that is eye catching with a logo and more information. Maybe put our history of what we have already done. The IP Na resources in your community- similar to that format talking about our resource pool.

**Consensus to include in the IP is a short history of the MZF from the PowerPoint, the bullet points from the website, website address of the MZF, a bullet point about the discussion board, list of regions that participate.** Dianne will create a draft, a two-sided, one sheet of paper, tri-folded. Using our resources, both time and money, will be considered if and when we decide to use the IP. If we do this we could just send out a file and have regions decide if they want them printed. We could have it on the website to download for those who want it. There is power in the written word/flyer.

#6 Consensus (how to do it) Questions regarding how consensus based decision making is structured. In particular, using the “block” can stop an idea from going forward. There are different forms of consensus decision making. Roberts Rules would have been 2/3. The concern is one area being able to block something that everyone else wants. A block stops the proposal from going forward for the time being, not forever. The discussion continues. WI Policy facilitator is proposing that one possibility is to change the word “block” to “not supporting”, and any stand aside would be a yes vote, and that there has to be two or more blocks to stop the proposal from going further as is. One block would be a no vote. Other regions stated that they still use Roberts Rules of Order (MN, IN (almost to the point of consensus), ND, OH). Those that do use consensus are mixed in supporting that way of decision making. Discussion and sharing took place on the pros and cons of doing business this way at the different levels of the service structure; group, area, region, MZF, NAWS.

#7 7<sup>th</sup> tradition at business meeting – At the MZF we pass the basket because we are not a funded level of service. It is an individual choice. Why should people give when they are already giving their time. The basket is not just about money.

#8 TS Nomination/Profile Form – Lets move forward and get what we have on the website. No oposals.

#9 Trusted servant rotation – term limits Please talk with Bill what is happening in your region.

### **VIII. Closing business (Announcements, Next Meeting, Hugs, Prayer...)**

Meeting adjourned Sunday at 3pm.