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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 48 | **Yes** | 35% | **Proposal 2018 – 1** | |
| 88 | **No** | 65% |
| 7 | No Opinion | | % | Submitted: Sept. 8, 2017 by Los Altos Hills, CA (CA988) |
| **Issue:** We propose that the ACA fellowship formally adopt the book The Laundry List: The ACOA Experience by Tony A and Dan F as official "ACA conference approved literature".  **History/Reasoning:** At the 2017 ABC, several proposals were offered to incorporate Tony A's steps into the fellowship, into the BRB. It is clear the fellowship desires our founder's words to be more visible and accessible.  **Argument in Favor:** Tony A is the co-founder of our fellowship. His 1991 recorded talk, his writings and especially his 12 steps are important recovery material for many....and, as folks become more aware, the numbers will only continue to grow. His call to unconditional self-love is an unambiguous message of healing. Even groups are actively using his steps and book in meetings. Adopting his book, which includes his 12 steps, is 'just the right thing to do'. Approving this proposal gives Tony, his recovery, and his book/steps the legitimate, rightful place in our fellowship that they so well deserve.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **WSO Analysis:** It is against ACA Traditions to endorse an outside enterprise.  While Tony A. is recognized as our primary founder, this book has been privately copyrighted and is the property of his and Dan F.'s estates.  It is, therefore, an outside enterprise. It is important to note that ACA has an open literature policy, which means that groups may choose on their own to use this book by group conscience, without opposition or censure from WSO.  Further details of ACA's literature policy are available in the BRB.  **Comments:**   * Our group agrees with WSO Analysis * Our group uses Tony A's 12 Steps and would love to have them included in the BRB as well as a workbook. * outside enterprise * Please adopt all of Tony A's information into our recovery. I can not express how much I would appreciate him and Dan F be allowed, It's pivotal * Principles before personalities. * Questioned whether Tony A’s wife was ok with it * Here we go again! * Our group agrees with the WSO analysis. * Sited WSO Analysis * the acoa argument is strained and dated * This is moot because of traditions and ACA open literature policy. * try to buy the right's * we are aware of the copyright issue and we have no right to Tony A's version so we can't publish it. * We suggest working with Dan F.'s estate to see about sharing usage of this book. Also, it would be helpful to know if it is even still in print; it appears that the cost is very high, thus it might be out of print. * We understand it is against ACA traditions to endorse an outside enterprise. His book is copyrighted. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | **Yes** | 10% | **Proposal 2018 – 2** |
| 121 | **No** | 90% |
| 10 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 14, 2017 by Fitchburg, WI (WI127) |
| **Issue:** We propose that we declare November 4th International born whole day.  **History/Reasoning:** To memorialize, dignity and honor Tony A's birthday.  **Argument in Favor:** To Let the world know what the focus of ACA is and who Tony A. Was.  **WSO Analysis:** On page 583 of our Fellowship Text (the BRB) in the section on "Avoiding the Pedestal (Always)" there is reference to an interview with Tony A. from 1992 that describes how he stepped away from ACA for a while because he felt he was being put on a pedestal.  While individual groups are free to do as they wish, the WSO Board feels that celebrating Tony A.'s birthday would not be in keeping with his wishes.  Instead, groups are encouraged to celebrate the "birthday" of the Laundry List on the last weekend of January each year.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **Comments:**   * Have a day commemorating program in Jan - Birthday of ACA; Tony desired low profile in ACA * Individual groups can celebrate Tony A.'s birthday. * Our group agrees with WSO Analysis * Principles before personalities * Putting Tony A. on a pedestal would not be in keeping with Tradition 12 Principles before Personalities. Further, we believe that Tradition 11 Attraction rather than Promotion is more than sufficient in carrying the ACA message. * Sited WSO Analysis * Strongly agree with WSO analysis * Tony A was not a god. He was an ACA, the same as all of us. * Tradition 11 * We do not wish to put Tony on a pedestal. we wish to claim our born whole birthright and bring hope to the suffering adult children yet to find ACA. * We now know that our HP comes first so I feel Tony A should be honored just our of respect and appreciation. He would be fine with that:)) | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 27 | **Yes** | 20% | **Proposal 2018 – 3** |
| 105 | **No** | 80% |
| 11 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 19, 2017 by Arroyo Grande, CA (CA915) |
| **Issue:** We propose that - Include the following statement on all ACA literature: “ACA is a bottom-up, member- driven, 12-Step program. Members create and participate in the service boards which exist solely for, are funded by donations from those members, and derive their mandate directly from that membership. Members supply the manpower, creativity, leadership, resources, and funding for their service boards. Meeting members guide the work of the Intergroups, Intergroup representatives to Regions guide the work of Regions that serve them, and Region Representatives on the WSO Board direct the work of the World Service Board to meet the needs of their participants.”  **History/Reasoning:** First, ACAs in early recovery often feel inferior to others, downplay their abilities, avoid confrontation, and acquiesce to “superior” people rather than taking on the responsibilities of leadership themselves. In that frame of mind, they “look up to” the people who serve on the services boards and seek direction from the service boards to solve the concerns of their meetings. Second, those who live and work in organizations and companies have learned how top-down hierarchies operate efficiently and often attempt to replicate that operational structure into their ACA service. People on the service boards sometimes mistake leadership for governance, too. Further, throughout our program, we have a serious disconnection about supporting the service Boards financially through 7th Tradition contributions and participation. Meeting donations are not being transferred to the service boards to finance the work of the service boards. We also have the problem of not electing group representatives to the service boards.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **Argument in Favor:** A statement defining the bottom-up nature of ACA will remind us that we all have the responsibility to step up and maintain the integrity of our program. Tradition 2 reminds us that God speaks to us through our group conscience, and that our leaders are trusted by our groups to serve them, not be governed by them. The important message in Tradition 3 is that groups are autonomous unless the group decisions affect ACA as a whole by failing to elect a group representative to the service board. Our 7th Tradition reminds us that it is up to us to fund the activities of our program. Our 9th Tradition reminds us that the service boards and committees we create are directly responsible to those they serve.  **WSO Analysis:** The WSO agrees with the core sentiment of this motion, that ACA is a bottom-up organization. To that point, ACA groups have more direct access to our WSO than exists in most other fellowships, starting with the Board's monthly telephone conference, which is open to all ACA members. We also have an Annual Business Conference that can be attended by anyone in the fellowship and to which all groups may send delegates. This is where the WSO Board is ratified and granted its authority by voting delegates. Further, a Service Structure Committee, formed in 2016, is working actively to increase the fellowship's role in ACA service and policy, and all ACA members are invited to participate in that long-range strategic effort.  WSO is, however, unable to support the stated proposal because we feel it poses significant downsides, and could inadvertently cripple WSO's ability to serve the Fellowship.  Examples: 1) The directive that WSO is "funded by donations from (ACA) members" suggests it's improper to use book sales as a source of revenue - a position unique among 12-step fellowships, and one that would radically cut ACA revenue and virtually all aspects of its services overnight.  2) Because the Regional structure is currently being revised, the fellowship is not in a position to have regions direct WSO board policy - it could weaken the existing service apparatus and lead to less effective world and local services for the fellowship, not more.  **Comments:**   * This proposal would be more attractive if it only included the first sentence. * We disagree with the wording that implies the regions have more power than the other board members, and therefore non-affiliated groups. 2. We interpret "member donations" to include literature sales. Almost all literature is purchased by members. * Other 12-Step programs separated publishing from WSO board so net on books did not interfere with power of the purse. Further, ABC once passed the mandate to charge a maximum of 150% of cost of publications (cost plus shipping to distribution center) that some Board since then ignored and then buried; never repealed at ABC, the only group who could rescind that mandate. AA charges close to cost for each book, I believe (or at least they once did). * Our group agrees with WSO Analysis * Our group feels that this is redundant and and doesn't make financial sense because this is already outlined in our traditions * Our group feels there are important in the ballot but cannot support due to WSO comments. Would like to see ballot proposal regarding bottom-up organization and ACAs' responsibility to step up as a motion from the floor at ABC. * Refer to the BRB for principles, traditions, and guidance. * replace word "manpower" with something like "work" * That's why we have the 12 Traditions. * The statement feels misleading and it would be too unreasonable to use it. * The tone of the analysis fuelled our group's discussion, with authoritarian absolutes like "unable to support" and "fellowship is not in a position", and predictions of unsubstantiated dire consequences if the proposed statement were printed. We voted unanimously to have this be examined further. * this proposal would be more attractive if it only included the first sentence * Too complicated & already have in place * Too unilateral, usurps the committee process and by-passess wider fellowship input. * We agree with the intention of the statement, but think it could be worded more smoothly, and could be altered to address the WSO concerns listed. * We don't want authority figures running the show but we do elect those with due process. If power goes to a trustee's head we can un-elect them. * We object to the underlying theme of control in this proposal. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 46 | **Yes** | 35% | **Proposal 2018 – 4** |
| 84 | **No** | 65% |
| 13 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 27, 2017 by Scarboro, Ontario, Canada (CAN332) |
| **Issue:** We propose that web technical support be provided to all ACA meeting and/or groups or a vehicle to connect web expertise with the world wide fellowship. This will assist with future growth. The technical support will include a web template and troubleshooting assistance to support local ACA meetings and events.  **History/Reasoning:** The reality is that technical support is extremely challenging to obtain. It is a skill level that is not available to the average person or fellowship.  **Argument in Favor:** We realize this web support can't be all things to all groups. Rather than each group trying to reinvent the wheel of a website every time they begin, they can have a foundation to build from with support. More people are finding ACA through the web. Multiple website increases attraction to the fellowship.  **WSO Analysis:** WSO does not have the resources, either financial or otherwise, to be able to provide direct technical assistance to ACA groups.  Please note that with volunteer help the WSO is actively developing an enhanced web presence, which will keep us quite busy for a while.  We will be happy to share lessons learned and other web related material as we make progress ourselves. Meanwhile many Intergroups around the world have developed local websites. They may continue to share their Experience, Strength and Hope in web-related endeavors.  We will also continue to do our best to provide resources on the website that help groups carry the message to their local members. This will include posting guidelines, following the traditions, etc.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  Note: Individuals with technology experience are encouraged to volunteer with the Website and Database Committee by contacting [webservant@adultchildren.org](mailto:webservant@adultchildren.org).    **Comments:**   * all meetings are autonomous. * Each meeting shall be fully self-supporting. * Great idea if we had tech support 24/7 and infinite cash to pay for all the techies; OR we could be self-sustaining/supporting by our own contributions and stop waiting to be rescued by the WSO authority figure. * It is not clear to us exactly what the proposal is getting at. * Let's see where we are in April. * Realize the financial challenge - even a common template would be helpful * This is not feasible. * Too early & not enough resources * too expensive * turn over to a committee * Unanimously against. Lot of work for WSO to support this. Also concern that it would be too costly * We believe this is a worthy item for creative discussion for us at the ABC for the grass roots to talk to one another, we don't expect WSO to resolve all our issues but we need a forum to connect. We would like our web people to be able to access one another. We are grateful for the excellent tech support from WSO for the convention, we wish all our fellowship to benefit similarly. * We were guided by Traditions 4 & 7: group autonomy and self-support in voting no. * We would love to see a website template that all groups can copy and use. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 122 | **Yes** | 89% | **Proposal 2018 – 5** |
| 15 | **No** | 11% |
| 6 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 27, 2017 by Greater Toronto Area, CN (IG558) |
| **Issue:** We propose that WSO look into adding intergroup and meeting group web links into the WSO website directory listings on www.adultchildren.org.  **History/Reasoning:** We would like to easily access other fellowships web links for additional information and resources. The current directory on www.adultchildren.org does not contain web links.  **Argument in Favor:** This increases our ability to collaborate and share resources and new ideas as a fellowship. This will increase our healing opportunities with efficiency worldwide. Its grass roots sharing. Web links will afford the different fellowship groups and abundance of opportunities.  **WSO Analysis:** WSO agrees it is a good idea to provide web links on the WSO website for intergroups and meetings to our members to help us find each other better on the web. We think this can be achieved while still following the ACA Traditions.  We expect this to be part of a newly designed website and meeting list that our Website and Database Committee hopes to unveil during the first quarter of 2018.  **Comments:**   * In order to bring more attention to this * In the history/reasoning part we would like it clarified that it is only our fellowship, (Not other fellowships.) * Our interest is ensuring the committee report on efforts, plans and status of this initiative. * taken care of * We believe that increased web presence of individual ACA groups embarks on a slippery slope leading to “promotion rather than attraction.” * We feel the WSO is pedaling as fast as they can. * Would like clarification if intention is to have intergroup and meeting group links limited to ACA, or is it to include other fellowships? * WSO does not have world enough and time to investigate each and every site put up by each and every group that claims to be an ACA group to ensure compliance with our Traditions; ergo, while adding the URLs and e-mail addresses that can be copied and pasted, we don't think there should be any actual links. * Yes, Please o the above | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 29 | **Yes** | 21% | **Proposal 2018 – 6** |
| 106 | **No** | 79% |
| 8 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 28, 2017 by Fishkill, NY (NY099 ) |
| **Issue:** We propose that wherever the phrase "false-self" appears in the A.C.A. literature that it be replaced with the phrase "adapted-self".  **History/Reasoning:** We have found that a great number of adult children find the phrase "false-self" to be judgmental, inaccurate, shaming and counterproductive.  **Argument in Favor:** The term "adapted-self" is non-judgmental, accurately describes what adult children did in order to survive the trauma of a dysfunctional home, is much more amenable to ownership and integration in the recovery process. "Adapted-self" is a much more compassionate term.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **WSO Analysis:** There are inherent challenges in trying to line-edit/wordsmith ACA literature in a large forum of ABC delegates. For this reason, individuals and groups that have ideas for changes to existing literature and submission of new literature are encouraged to contact the WSO Literature Committee through the Contact page on the WSO website.  The Literature Committee has a year-round process for evaluating fellowship suggestions for creating or amending literature. Such suggestions may b sent at any time to litstaff@adultchildren.org, and they will be reviewed by the evaluation subcommittee--a process that often involves detailed editing discussions with the suggestions' authors. Suggestions that gather support are forwarded to the full Literature Committee, and in turn to the WSO board and ABC for final approval as conference-approved ACA WSO literature.  **Comments:**   * "False" is the opposite of "True." * "false-self" and "adapted-self" are both therapists' terms that might be better addressed as "roles" we were reinforced to play, a clearer concept to comprehend. * if "false self" is judgemental, isn't "true self?" * It is clear for what "false self" means but "adapted self" is confusing leaving questions. False self is self explanitory * It will just create confusion. * Like the idea, but process already in place * literature committee business * semantics ... why don't we change all the descriptions and confuse everybody ( satire ) * suggestion to use abused self or neglected self from one member who voted * That this change be made not in the past literature, but in the literature created going forward. * This discussion needs to happen at the WSO Literature Committee with input from ACA groups who wish to see it change. * This parsing and analyzing specfic grammar and word meaning is a distraction. We agree with WSO that amending text could be a great distraction. Better left to Pamflet updating & revisions * Totally support the language change from "false self" to "adapted self". Totally agree with WSO that this needs to go through Literature Committee and not try to wordsmith at ABC. * Unanimously against. Not needed. * We agree with WSO; use the literature process for changes. We also want the literature committee to report on this at the ABC. * We are happy already being dealt with by literature committee. * We believe the literature committee is pedaling as fast as they can. * We voted "yes" for this not in regard to the actual proposal, but our group voted "yes" so that a broader discussion on literature could be considered. * While we are open to using the term “adapted-self” interchangeably with the term “false-self,” we feel that there is already a process in place to suggest changes to the BRB. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 100 | **Yes** | 79% | **Proposal 2018 – 7** |
| 27 | **No** | 21% |
| 16 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by New York, NY (NY131) |
| **Issue:** We propose that the WSO utilize online conferencing and voting technologies to provide remote access to the Annual Business Conference, for those not chairing in the WSO. This is so that phone and cyber meeting groups, geographically distant members, those with limited time availability or childcare obligations, or other restrictions, may attend as delegates or otherwise vote on matters of concern to ACA as a whole.  **History/Reasoning:** The ABC is broadcast via audio streaming, however this does not provide interactive remote participation at the conference. The WSO already uses teleconferencing for committee meetings. Currently thousands of US dollars and at least 3 weekdays are required to attend and vote at the ABC. Although the ABC invites individual ACA members and groups, those willing to have a voice at the ABC must have the time, and the financial and physical ability to attend, or they must engage in significant WSO level service in order to obtain financial support to attend the conference. Not all groups or intergroups have sufficient funds to send a delegate to the ABC. This implies that a significant number of adult children and ACA groups around the world, are left out of the ABC. Corporations widely use interactive video and telephone teleconferencing. Both in-person and remote video attendees are able to deliberate face-to-face in an orderly fashion through a moderator, typically with the active speaker's image displayed on participants' monitors. Similarly, remote ABC delegates could video conference and interact with in-person delegates as well. A listen-only connection, such as one that accepts button presses as voting choices, is an example of how voting could be easily extended to recognize registered, non-delegate voters.  **Argument in Favor:** There are inexpensive means available today to allow adult children to be heard. ACA members are willing, but not able, to participate in the bottom-up structure of the ABC. It is the hope and right of all adult children to be counted and heard.  **WSO Analysis:** The Website and Database Committee is currently reviewing technical options that would allow groups to remotely participate in the ABC. This is a major effort and requires coordination with a number of WSO Committees and over 1,700 ACA group representatives. The Committee’s concern is that trying to deliver something to such a large number of groups too quickly could hurt the integrity of the ABC voting process. The Committee hopes to begin piloting some version of remote participation for the Board’s monthly teleconferences after the first of the year that may then be piloted at the Toronto ABC.  Note: The authors of this motion, and others with technology expertise, are invited to join the Website and Database Committee to help with this work. Please contact [webservant@adultchildren.org](mailto:webservant@adultchildren.org).  **Comments:**   * ABC delegates do much more than vote, not all of it practical for remote participation. We do support discussion of steps toward year-round remote outreach & participation. * another issue for committee work * Everyone who has a voice should be heard. * Having a web site of this capability and Maintaining a web site of this capacity will be very costly. * just post the time and date an if they can't be there offer a transcript of the meeting * Like the idea, but process already being addressed by knowledgeable group & need more info from them before we can address as a larger group. * Majority approved. Minority voiced: 1) how would it be possible to hold an effective meeting with input from so many voters; 2) if material was produced at Conference on item how transmitted to other voters remotely * maybe broadcast only * Need to ensure groups do not get to vote twice and individuals claiming to be groups don't get to vote once by using pre-registration sign-offs assigning representation and pin codes or something. * Old proposal. Committee, please give full report on this at te ABC * Our group wants to be sure that attention is paid to security during the consideration of such technologies in order to ensure that member anonymity is protected. * See #5 * This is critical for our sustainability as a global fellowship in the future. * this would be more inclusive for all members to participate * We suggest that the Website and Database Committee investigate whether service could be provided for a small registration fee; or through ZOOM or some other conferencing solution. * While we find the technical logistics of this proposal daunting, we are intrigued by the possibility of remote participation and voting in the ABC. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 40 | **Yes** | 30% | **Proposal 2018 – 8** |
| 94 | **No** | 70% |
| 9 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by Blooming Grove, NY (NY080) |
| **Issue:** We propose a set of 12 steps that more accurately reflect The Problem and Solution of ACA Recovery. The proposed steps serve that purpose: The 12 Steps to Emotional Sobriety for Adult Children: 1) We admitted we were powerless over the effects of alcoholism or other family dysfunction - that our lives had become unmanageable. 2) Came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to our true selves. 3) Made a decision to turn our will and lives over to the loving guidance of God, as we came to understand God, learning to love ourselves with compassion. 4) Made a thorough inventory of lifelong defenses and survival traits employed by our parents and ourselves to better understand the multigenerational nature of our post trauma condition. 5) Admitted to God, to ourselves, to an informed other the exact nature of our childhood abuse and neglect, including related PTSD and unresolved grief. 6) Allowed ourselves to be vulnerable under safe conditions so that our Higher Power could heal the broken heart of our inner child. 7) Humbly asked our Higher Power to assist us with our healing process as we learn to talk, trust, and feel all of our feelings. 8) Made lists of those we harmed and those who harmed us, and became willing to forgive ourselves while praying for others. 9) Worked to repair the damage in our relationships except when to do so would expose us to unsafe people and situations, or cause harm to others. 10) Continued to take personal inventory and to re-parent ourselves with unconditional love. 11) Sought through prayer and meditation to develop our conscious contact with our Higher Power, praying for clarity, inner peace and emotional sobriety. 12) Having had a spiritual awakening as a result of these steps, we tried with humility to carry this healing message to the still suffering adult child, and practices these principles in all our relationships. Michael S. Copyright 9/28/2017  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **History/Reasoning:** In 1984 ACA became an autonomous program adapting AA's 12 Steps written for external addictions. These steps do not accurately reflect trauma recovery and emotional sobriety at the core of ACA recovery as discussed in our literature. Our founder, Tony A., attempted to draft steps that reflected ACA recovery. His steps are copyrighted in a book and unavailable. Many fellow travelers believe they are incomplete for trauma recovery similar to AA's steps. They do not address the complete picture of trauma recovery and emotional sobriety described in our ACA literature.  **Argument in Favor:** If studied in depth one will find that these proposed 12 steps accurately convey the pathway to trauma recovery, emotional sobriety, and relationship repair work for adult children. We believe that these steps match more accurately the content of Chapter 7 of the BRB "The 12 Steps of ACA". The same can be said of the Yellow Workbook. They are written in the language of the BRB as it relates to The Problem, Solution and the Promises of ACA.  **WSO Analysis:** ACA's core writings (the Laundry List, the Problem, Solution, and the ACA Steps and Traditions) play a unique role in shaping our program's identity. Therefore, any changes to these writings should be thoroughly vetted and considered by the Literature Committee, WSO Board, and the broad fellowship over an extended period of time before they are finally presented to the ABC for a vote. This procedure ensures that our core readings cannot be easily changed by any one body, service structure or group, or "in the heat of the moment."  The Literature Committee and the WSO Board have identified many risks associated with this specific proposal of an alternate set of 12 Steps, and therefore cannot support its adoption. Such sweeping changes to the steps would raise identity questions among potential newcomers from other recovery fellowships as to whether "ACA is really a 12-Step program." Recovery clubs that only serve 12-Step programs might question whether ACA meetings qualify for space.  Additionally, the process of making wholesale changes to the Steps could send ACA down a road of repeated tinkering with the Steps and other core writings at future ABC meetings that would quickly destabilize ACA's identity and unity of purpose.  At the same time, the Literature Committees recognizes that there is substantial interest in helping members apply the 12 Steps in a gentler manner suited to the needs of adult children--with a greater emphasis on self-love and non-shaming. Much as the BRB already does with the Fourth Step, new explanatory language on the Steps could help ACA members practice them in a more self-loving manner. The authors of this motion are invited to join the Literature Committee to help integrate such gentler language throughout our literature.  **Comments:**   * A good example for what might be done. An integrated step list would be a very good contribution. * amazing the number of people that think they know more than the book ... not surprising though considering the number of control freaks in ACOA * as only some of us use/relate to the term "God," why is it predominantly used? mix it up (e.g., Great Spirit, Goddess, Divine Creator, etc) or stick with generic "Higher Power." Also, we are concerned re. copyright . . . what the heck? * Get the funds to buy the right's to all Tony's stuff... * I don't like "Michael S." Copyright included...or any person's name...its a very potential legal and damages issue. * Minority did not wish to speak opinion although requested * Once again this twicking of the grammar is a complete distraction along with ripple effects of use of Club and rental space for meetings. * One of our members finds this proposed version much to be preferred over both the current ACA 12 Steps and Tony A.'s 12 Steps. * Our group does favor changing the BRB 12 Steps to be either Tony A's 12 steps or steps more like them. * Sited WSO Analysis * Still think "restore us to clarity" is better maybe use both words there. Persons we have harmed bugs me. remove that? The rest is great!!! * Suggestion received for a new pamphlet/trifold to share these steps. * The analysis sounds absolute, authoritarian, and critical. If the analyser speaks for the entire WSO, why are we asked to vote when the analysis indicates the fellowship has no decision in this matter? In contrast, the proposer's words resonated with our group. * The steps are the steps! * The steps in the workbook cover what these proposed in steps are suggesting. This is too much to read at a meeting and too in-depth, especially for a newcomer to hear at their first meeting who might be raw with emotion. This is covered in the steps as you work them. * These 12 Steps to Emotional Sobriety provide the Structure that accurately reflects the Process of Recovery expressed in our literature. To quote a fellow traveler upon reading them, "This is what we do here to get well". * These are a great fit for ACA’s , new and older members, They are safe and gentle where AA’s steps could be unsafe and hurtful to our newer members with a minimum of Recovery experience. * These steps address adult child trauma better than the current steps adapted from AA and are more complete than Tony A's steps. These steps truly describe what we do to achieve ACA recovery. * This also should be addressed at the WSO Literature Committee level. * This ballot was thought provoking. This a worthy discussion for the ABC. We do not agree to adopt these 12 steps from another program. We believe our inner children need an ACA Inner Child 12 Steps that can help us bridge to the ACA adult 12 steps. Our inner children find the ACA Adult steps are too harsh for them in the beginning. We don't believe this will hurt our fellowship, we believe the ACA inner children are crying out for this and as we can't use Tony A lets create our own ACA Inner Child 12 steps. We believe if we don't do this it will rip us apart just like what happened when Alanon wouldn't accept our laundry list when we first formed and we had to leave that fellowship. We want to stay together as one fellowship and shouldn't have to resort to ACA unapproved ACA 12 steps for our inner children. We are better than that. If this discussion doesn't happen in 2018 we will be asking for it on a ballot or through literature as we appreciate this is a separate idea from the original ballot. As stated in the beginning, a discussion very worthy at the ABC. * We adopted and adapted the 12-Steps of AA to be a 12-Step program, to recognize ourselves as part of the bigger family serving 12-steppers, recognizing we have the solution to emotional insanity from dysfunctional homes - the piece of the 12-Step community solution other programs do not address well. We need to be a 12-Step program; adopting this would alienate us. * We are firmly against these changes to our beloved 12 steps. * We could develop supplemental literature on ACAs unique approach to the steps. * We like the notion of adding loving language in the existing steps. Recommend the authors work with the litcomm to make small but significant changes using the literature development process. * We support changing ACA 12 Steps to more align with spirit of Tony A's words. Believe this should be taken up in the Literature Committee. * We were disturbed that such fundamental changes would be proposed wholesale and unilaterally. Stuff like this doesn't belong on the ballot. * While we find the language of these rewritten steps particularly engaging, we agree with the WSO analysis that ACA program identity and unity would be irreparably undermined. * Wow - this proposed change is amazing and will reflect who we are as a fellowship! | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 67 | **Yes** | 57% | **Proposal 2018 – 9** |
| 50 | **No** | 43% |
| 26 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by Blooming Grove, NY (NY080) |
| **Issue:** We propose that in the event any new information or material is made available before or during the proposal voting process at the Annual Business Conference, this material must be shared with all delegates at the same time with an opportunity for further discussion before any final voting takes place.  **History/Reasoning:** During the 2017 ABC, an unfortunate incident occurred whereby material was introduced into the delegate conference room and circulated to a few but not all delegates. This information was relevant to the proposal but not everyone was aware of it. A discussion should have ensued as to why the material was introduced and how it might affect the vote.  **Argument in Favor:** In order to avoid such mishaps in the future, this proposal attempts to standardize procedures to share all new information with all delegates at the same time so that reasonable discussion can take place and a suitable amount of time can be given to digest the new material.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **WSO Analysis:** This proposal is already being addressed. The 2018 ABC Committee, the Toronto Host Committee and the Delegate Training Subcommittee are taking whatever steps that are within their power to ensure that if someone has pertinent information that would influence the ABC Delegates about a proposal, that they bring it forward immediately to one of these committees or to the Conference Chairperson. Please note, that neither the Conference Chair nor the body can force disclosure of information; it is up to the individual delegates to divulge or disclose relevant information.  If someone chooses to hold back and/or share with only a select few people, who in turn decide not to share that information, we are powerless over these choices.  **Comments:**   * Handout procedures booklet and give explanation at start of ABC. 2. Post procedures in advance on ABC and/or WSO web site * Already being looked at. * house keeping * In supporting this proposal our group hopes that all delegates and WSO volunteers would take appropriate action if confronted with this situation again. * Just confirm status and perhaps in writing future plans confirmed; although Sometimes emergency arises * Our vote was equally yes and no * This belongs in committee, ABC & OPPM. * This is being addressed by WSO and seems to be about something from 2 years ago. In any case, this protocol already exists; errors happen and need to be addressed at the time they happen. * This request seems reasonable and we encourage the ABC to adopt a resolution that all information will be shared with delegates; to address the concern that no one can be forced to disclose information. * Unanimously against * Vote was tied. * We have no direct experience with the ABC and could find no information to inform our vote. * We object to the use of the ABC Ballot Proposal process to air the resentment and grievance of one person or group. * We respectfully feel this has no merit | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 71 | **Yes** | 58% | **Proposal 2018 – 10** |
| 52 | **No** | 42% |
| 20 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by Blooming Grove, NY (NY080) |
| **Issue:** We propose that rules for presentation of proposals at the Annual Business Conference be established in advance so that presenters know how much time they have to present and defend their proposals, and that these rules NOT be changed at whim during the ABC.  **History/Reasoning:** Prior to the 2017 ABC, some guidelines were discussed with Board members and during the delegate training sessions regarding length of time for presenters to make their proposals. Then, at the ABC the rules were changed 3 times within 24 hours causing much confusion and needless frustration.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **Argument in Favor:** This proposal is an attempt to standardize guidelines for presenting proposals giving presenters adequate time to prepare appropriately.  **WSO Analysis:** This proposal is already being addressed by the ABC Committee so that a uniform, published process will be in place before the ABC. As a point of order, however, when a proposal is received by the Ballot Prep Committee, the WSO considers the efforts of the submitting group to be complete.  While Robert’s Rules suggests that authors of a proposal might have time to present their argument at the start of the discussion, the ‘Argument in Favor’ that the group wrote was their opportunity to present their case.  This has been the case because very few proposing groups have been able to afford to send a delegate to the ABC. To do otherwise would seem to give some proposals more weight/importance than others. At the ABC, if a proposing group has a delegate present, they are seated on a level stage with all other delegates, with the same opportunity to give input during the discussion time. They may use their time to defend their proposal if they choose to do so.  **Comments:**   * Add Skype access to all. Just As if they are a delegate present. * control , control , control * Flexibility is sometimes necessary. No do not waste time rehashing last year's problem. The ABC Committee of 2018 has addressed this problem. * house keeping * Rules is rules. Should not be arbitrary. * See #9 * See comments for #9 * Should be discussed at ABC an standardization determined by delegate vote. * Unanimously against * We object to the use of the ABC Ballot Proposal process to air the resentment and grievance of one person or group. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 65 | **Yes** | 54% | **Proposal 2018 – 11** |
| 55 | **No** | 46% |
| 23 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by Blooming Grove, NY (NY080) |
| **Issue:** We propose that presenters of proposals at the Annual Business Conference be given an opportunity to speak first for 5-10 minutes before general discussion begins and be given a chance to make a 3 minute rebuttal before a vote is taken.  **History/Reasoning:** During the 2017 ABC, in the absence of any set guidelines, some delegates who came to the ABC to present their proposals did even have a chance to speak.  **Argument in Favor:** This proposal is an attempt to standardize guidelines for presenting proposals and allowing the speaker adequate time to explain the reasoning behind the proposal and to make counter arguments as needed. It would benefit all delegates to gain a fuller understanding of the significance of the proposal if the presenter has enough time to do justice to his/her proposal.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **WSO Analysis:** See the WSO Analysis for Proposal 10  **Comments:**   * house keeping * See #9 * See comments for #9 * Sited proposal 12 & WSO's Analysis in proposal 10. * The proposals should stand for themselves. Noting the number of proposals from one group looks like one person from that group wants to have the irrevocable spotlight to dramatically "prove beyond a reasonable doubt" how right their proposal is and brow-beat everyone after the fact for stating alternative opinions. We vote NO. * Unanimously against * We object to the use of the ABC Ballot Proposal process to air the resentment and grievance of one person or group. * Within appropriate time guidelines, if delegates are present at the ABC, they should be able to represent their group's proposal. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75 | **Yes** | 62% | **Proposal 2018 – 12** |
| 46 | **No** | 38% |
| 22 | No Opinion | | Submitted on September 30, 2017 by Blooming Grove, NY (NY080) |
| **Issue:** We propose that Robert's Rules be followed consistently and be enforced throughout the Annual Business Conference proceedings, especially during the proposal voting process. Specifically, if there is a call for a vote at ANY time, there must be a majority vote to end discussion before a vote is taken.  **History/Reasoning:** During the 2017 Annual Business Conference the vote to end discussion and proceed to a vote was not enforced uniformly with all proposals. This led to shutting down the discussion prematurely for some proposals when delegates still felt they had something important to share.  **Argument in Favor:** This proposal is an attempt to ensure that Robert's Rules are followed consistently. The leader of the ABC proceedings should be well informed and equipped to enforce these rules whether or not the WSO employs a parliamentarian.  **NOT ON THE AGENDA**  **WSO Analysis:** The job of chairing the ABC is not easy one. The Conference Chair is chosen by the delegates the day of the conference and that person does the best they can.  A clear understanding of “point of order” to correct a mistake in procedure and emphasis on “point of information” to add any additional information to the discussion will add clarity to the process.  Added emphasis on these two clear points of Robert’s Rules will be included in the procedures for the ABC and the delegate training. Keep in mind that we operate ultimately by group conscience with Robert’s Rules used to resolve conflict, per the ACA WSO ByLaws.  2017 was the first year that a professional parliamentarian was hired for the ABC and we will continue to do so to help with continuity and to help the elected Conference Chair conduct the meeting. Everything that happens at an ABC is also a factor of time because all business must be conducted within the schedule. Therefore, if a vote is called, the Chair will do their best to ensure that all variables are taken into account before allowing that to move forward.  **Comments:**   * 2017 ABC employed someone well-versed in Robt's Rules to ensure compliance, so this proposal seems to have dysfunctionality written all over it. * house keeping * is it coincidental that there are exactly 12 proposals? * It seems that the process has time limits that have to be enforced. And that is all about healthy boundaries. * Not necessary * Rules is rules. * See #9 * See comments for #9 * Strict adherence to Robert's Rules can stifle debate.We have seen them used, inside & outside the fellowship, to prevent open discussion. At best they may serve as a reference for the ABC committee in developing the Conference's own rules of order. * there are going to be people unhappy no matter what you do or say ... you can't please everyone * We believe this should be discussed at the ABC level and the process be determined by delegates. * We object to the use of the ABC Ballot Proposal process to air the resentment and grievance of one person or group. * Why isn't substantial unanimity used as outlined in the BRB. | | | |