

Action Committee Thought Force

Panel 61

1/12/2023

Action Committee Thought Force Assignment

- ▶ Conduct a full review of the Action Committee Plan, approved in April 2002
- ▶ Consider the 2015 Action Committee recommendations that were started on a trial basis at the 2015 Fall Assembly
- ▶ Consider what is working and what isn't working
- ▶ Recommend next steps

Thought Force Convened

- ▶ Initial meeting: Why did you sign up for this Thought Force?
 - ▶ Pronounced theme: They're not working and need to be replaced
- ▶ Why did the Area create the Action Committee Plan?
 - ▶ To increase attendance at Assemblies (it did in 2002)
 - ▶ To provide members a venue to participate in service
 - ▶ Designed to align with WSO departmental structure (not anymore)
- ▶ Next steps:
 - ▶ Need something fresh and more effective
 - ▶ Defer review of AC Plan and 2015 trial changes
 - ▶ Proceed to consider what is working and not working

What's working / Not working

Pros

- ▶ Engages GRs
- ▶ Small group is less intimidating
- ▶ Dialogue, 2-way conversation
- ▶ Get to know other Area members
- ▶ Opportunity to participate in service
- ▶ Break from sitting all day
- ▶ Fun (can be)
- ▶ Some projects completed
- ▶ Vehicle for leadership experience

Cons

- ▶ Lose continuity, only twice a year
- ▶ Disparity in committee size
- ▶ Coordinator role diminished, less visible
- ▶ Large block of Assembly time
- ▶ Structure is confining
- ▶ Committee purposes muddy, overlap
- ▶ 'Action' difficult on zoom
- ▶ Little sense of accomplishment
- ▶ Uneven / mixed success

Now what? We're a Thought Force

- ▶ Not our decision to make
- ▶ We're thinkers, not doers - not for us to craft a solution
- ▶ Don't say 'get rid of them' without offering an alternative
- ▶ Our assignment includes making a recommendation

Suggested Alternative: Workshops

- ▶ How is this different?
 - ▶ Not a 'committee'
 - ▶ Widen focus from Action to Service
 - ▶ Coordinator reports to the full Assembly
 - ▶ Coordinator led, in conjunction with any member(s)
 - ▶ Consider new Workshop Coordinator position
- ▶ Retains what's working
 - ▶ Engage GRs
 - ▶ Small group interaction
 - ▶ Opportunity to participate in service

Addresses what's not working

Cons

- ▶ Lose continuity, only twice a year
- ▶ Disparity in breakout size
- ▶ Coordinator role diminished, less visible
- ▶ Large block of Assembly time
- ▶ Structure confining
- ▶ Committee purposes muddy, overlap
- ▶ 'Action' difficult on zoom
- ▶ Little sense of accomplishment

'Try Something Different'

- ▶ Workshop is an event, not ongoing
- ▶ Use sign up to distribute *#/workshop*
- ▶ Coordinator reports to full Assembly
- ▶ Smaller time block for workshop only
- ▶ Simplify structure
- ▶ Workshop topics clear
- ▶ Widen from 'Action' to 'Service'
- ▶ New opportunities

Additional Considerations

- ▶ Workshops
 - ▶ Selection of topics and projects
 - ▶ Area Chair solicits / Coordinators (or any member) suggests idea / Survey GRs
 - ▶ Must be service related (ref. Area Policy VI.C.3.c)
 - ▶ Could be panel discussion, skit, presentation, ask-it-basket, gallery walk, etc
 - ▶ Topics announced on event flyer (attraction)
 - ▶ Elimination of AC Chair positions
- ▶ Some challenges will continue
 - ▶ Uneven / mixed success
 - ▶ Hybrid challenges

Recommendation

- ▶ Action Committee Thought Force Recommendation:
 - ▶ “The ACs are not effective as presently set up; they are not consistently achieving their stated purpose”
 - ▶ “We recommend the AWSC consider replacing the ACs with an alternative on a trial basis

Questions?



Appendix: Purpose

(reference: from AC Plan)

- ▶ **Background:** “Action Committees are viewed as a vehicle for increasing attendance at Assemblies and increasing participation by all groups and members in the Minnesota South Area”
- ▶ **Purpose:** “Provide a time and place where Group Representatives and other members can work together to find ways to strengthen Al-Anon and Alateen”
- ▶ **Goal:** “Assist all members of our groups to help carry our message of hope”