

Questions from Canada [Answered by John Cooper, Chair WGI]

1. What are the implications of a change at this point in time when only parts of the restructuring proposal are being addressed and not the whole?

The implication is that the MOs will have the decision-making power on the restructure - legal, organizational and business. The only change we are asking for now is that the world will have country representation instead of regional representation which doesn't seem to be working to provide representation for all countries. You may recall Brian devising a proportional system using data of the number of Certificated people in each country at that time. (2010 Nashville).

So given the numbers many MO's had just one seat, but Canada had 2 and USA 3. Does this matter? Well when we do not have majority rules and seek consensus it probably doesn't except that a large number of MO's do not have direct access to board meetings, planning nor a welcoming opportunity to provide feedback and input. They just receive. It's why the Boston uprising led to the USA war of Independence –“No taxation without representation!” .. lost by the Brits probably because they were fighting Napoleon. (and when USA invaded Toronto).

We have new Member Organizations. Operationally some MO's are now doing better than those granted a seat on the original board.

So I absolutely believe that all MO's with a sufficiency of members should have a voice at the board.

2. List the specific reasons for such changes since they move away from the original structure?

There are two reasons. The board is hopeful that with each MO having a representative on the board, they will have a voice and participate with other MO members.

Finances were another specific reason. We are suggesting the MOs pay the cost of sending their representatives to the in-person board meetings. Other than salary, the in-person board meetings were WGI's largest expense. At least one model was calling for biennial meetings, instead of annual, before and/or after the national conference. In this case, individuals would be paying their own transportation and MOs would only need to pay for meals and hotel rooms during the meetings.

3. The changes in representation on the Board appear to suggest a significant increase in the size of the Board and in future would continue to increase. We would like to know how this increase will be managed in terms of effectiveness?

It has also been discussed that the board would mostly function by committees and the full board would only need to come together to ratify what committees have worked on – I remember Maureen explaining how very large groups can address pre-set agenda items and then vote from knowledge, and being more likely to vote for an item with pre-reading and input from the committee developing the proposal. (Was it Toastmasters?)

A lot of clarification can occur if meetings are not just 4 weeks apart.

Each board member would be required to serve on certain committees that would meet regularly to do the work of the committee. The full board would meet quarterly, biannually, or annually to vote on the proposals being brought by the committees. Currently, with the entire board working on and discussing almost every decision, it is difficult to reach consensus but we seem to be much more productive in small committee groups. This was one of the benefits of getting together every year. We broke up into small committees and worked day and night to complete tasks.

4. Will Member Organizations have access to the complete re-structuring proposal, before being asked to vote?

Yes, that is the main reason for voting for the MO referendum recently sent out. Once each MO has representation on the board, then that board can determine how they want to restructure. The re-structuring proposal contains all the information we are discussing. A self -assessment of where each MO sits against the suggested MO Stage criteria can be a great discussion point. Bette told a world MO meeting where she thought NZ would sit – they have few active members and thought that inactive faculty should not be counted – they would become stage 2 if they could argue about their history otherwise would be Stage one. NZ does want to stand alone and not share one seat with Australia.

Perhaps the only two MO's to share a rep was when Bette was elected for Australia and NZ!

John

14/12/2020 (12.30am here)