

Main Menu

Select Language ▼

- [Home Page](#)
- [Trustee Guidelines](#)
- [GA Reference Material](#)
- [Keyword Search](#)
- [Download Center](#)
- [Contact Administrator](#)

**Tampa, FL - Fall 2014
Information Section**

[Tampa Conference Info](#)

Rolling Agenda

- [Tampa Absentee Ballots](#)
- [Agenda Information](#)
- [Conference Bids](#)

Submit an Agenda Item

BOT Committees

- [Anonymity](#)
- [Blue Book Revision](#)
- [Conference Oversight](#)
- [Digital Media](#)
- [Hotline Implementation](#)
- [Hotline Files](#)
- [Intergroup](#)
- [International Relations](#)
- [Literature](#)
- [Member Retention](#)
- [Mobile App](#)
- [Online GA Meeting](#)
- [Pressure Relief](#)
- [Prison - Canada](#)
- [Prison - US](#)
- [Public Relations](#)
- [Rules and Procedures](#)
- [Telephone Conference Call](#)
- [Trustee Removal Merit Panel](#)
- [Trustee Website](#)
- [Website Revisions](#)

Trustee Line & Other Features

- [Trustee Line Home Page](#)
- [Login For The Trustee Poll](#)
- [Trustee Poll](#)
- [Trustee Roster - Login First](#)
- [>>Trustee Information Update<<](#)
- [Trustee Website Tutorial](#)
- [Area Event Flyers](#)
- [Local Area Website Guidelines](#)
- [New Area/Trustee Accommodation Fund](#)
- [Local Area Help Flyer](#)
- [Board of Regents News Page](#)
- [Trustee Memorial Honor Roll](#)

Trustee Line for May 2014

A PDF version of this issue to distribute to your rooms, or to print out for easier reading, will be available after 5/31/14.

Thoughts From The Trustees - Current and Past

The subjects listed below are themes that have been submitted by other Trustees. You may respond to any of them, or start an entirely new subject

Item	Subject	Last Entry	Entries
1.	A Question for the Board of Regents Chairman	9:17 PM 5/3	2

A Question for the Board of Regents Chairman

5/2/14 - 10:08 PM

If I may I would like to pose a dichotomous question to the Chairman of the B. O. R.

But first I wish to state where I stand on the question and why I am posing it on the trustee line.

While it seems clearly a dichotomous question with the options of a Yes or No answer, in my opinion there should be a clear and obvious answer and that answer is likely to be ultimately the only acceptable answer.

Furthermore, I believe the question, or a very close resemblance of the question, was asked, of the B. O. R. representative at Houston, by not one, nor two, but at least three current or former members of the executive board of the B. O. T.

I'm unclear if there was any real answer given, it is my opinion that the question was effectively evaded despite three or more attempts, certainly I heard no definitive yes or no answer to this question asked on the floor and these are primary among the simple reasons I am posing the question here and now.

The question relates to the considerable B. O. R. agenda issues discussed.

Q. Is / are there ways that we (Members) can, if we so desire, view the items rejected as agenda items from the B. O. R. agenda.

To clarify, unless I am mistaken (It happens I know) the Chairman of the B. O. R. has sole discretion at present as to which items, submitted by members to the B. O. R. for inclusion on the B. O. R. agenda, are accepted or rejected.

While the question is directed primarily to the Chairman of the B.O. R. and the answer, if any, may or may not be short, I would of course encourage and look forward to any response or thoughts from anyone who has the interest.

Future Conferences

[Upcoming Conferences](#)

Odie. B. - Area 36, Ireland S. East

5/3/14 - 9:17 PM

Odie,

I glad you sent in this submission, as I was the one who broached this subject in Houston. My best description of that part of the Trustee meeting was that I felt I ate a bowl full of green peppers. It's the one food that gives be indigestion for what seems like an eternity. In other words, the answers we got were similar to a magician's slight of hand routine.

What really irritates me is when I began citing facts about why certain things happen with the BOR agenda process and their meetings, and when I also said they were not just questions but situations that happened to me, that the explanation began with ... 'I don't appreciate being attacked...' I wish I had the opportunity to once again comment on that statement, to which I would have said ... Really?

I suppose I can now call it the 'A' word, because God forbid that I bring up facts that others in the program don't wish to deal with or explain. The answer on a more frequent basis is that I am attacking them. It is quite sad. Hey, maybe for Tampa, we can revisit one of Nathaniel Hawthorne's works and I will play the male version of Hester Prynne and wear a scarlet letter 'A', but make this version for being a prodigious attacker. Ok, enough of the sarcasm. Let me address the subject.

For a long time, I have not been a fan of how the BOR conducts itself. My belief is that this is the business and corporate side of GA and that the BOR should consist of people who have qualifications for running a business. We get GA members to take the 9 seats for the positions, but we don't vote for them based on their business acumen. We vote on their GA resume, which generally is about their time in GA and what other positions they have held. Sorry guys, that doesn't cut it in my book, nor should it in anyone else's.

Having said that, the rest of the Fellowship is really left in the dark about the goings on of the BOR, other than a highly abbreviated version of BOR minutes. I have tried numerous times over the years to get a better output of information from the BOR, through its various means of interacting with the rest of the Fellowship. Some things have improved, but they generally don't have a long shelf life. I complain about these things, because I hope for more transparency for the rest of the Fellowship and exposing this makes me the attacker. Well, if I keep getting the run around when I ask questions and get accused of trying to bully the BOR, then is it any wonder that the issues become more prominent?

Many of you might not know that the BOR has what it calls 2 sets of Standing Rules. One is for the ISO and the other is for the BOR. I got a copy of the ISO July 2011 version. My first question is why both of those items are not plastered on the Trustee website in public view for everyone, similar to the BOT Rules and Procedures? Why must these be secret documents?

My version has 33 main items, with some that have subsets. They mostly deal with events regarding ISO. In thinking about the circumstances of when I challenged the then BOR Chair about all these secret rules, I was told that aside from the By-Laws, the BOR operated under Standing Rules. I asked for a copy and was immediately told yes. What I got was the ISO Standing Rules, not the BOR Standing Rules.

One item on those rules is that Current Trustees are always welcome to attend Board of Regents meetings subject to prior notification. Why wouldn't any GA member be allowed to attend? Moreover, why can't GA members from all over the world hear what happens with these meetings? Good question. The answer

we got was that the BOR tried a conference call setup and after a few months there were no callers, so they stopped the conference calls. This was an action that happened because the BOT voted to recommend having a conference call.

The interesting thing is that there are BOR members who are outside the 200-mile limit of the ISO and already have to call in via a conference call. This entire process could be handled specifically with a platform used by the Telephone Meeting Conference Calls that are approved by the Board of Trustees. I will be recommending this platform to the BOR this month. Let's see how far that goes. My feeling is that if others decide to join in on the call, that's fine. However, nothing is lost if they don't. A list of telephone numbers can be given to the ISO prior to each meeting. When the person calls in with that number, it's been pre-cleared. If not, then the call is denied.

Back to the issue of this submission. We all need to see the BOR Standing Rules to know if the Chair is taking liberties that are undisclosed with agenda items and many other matters, or whether these procedures are written into the BOR Standing Rules. I know I am a terrible handicapper, but my belief is that the Chair is making some or many decisions that are not memorialized anywhere. Then I defer to Unity Step 2, Our leaders are but trusted servants; they do not govern.

Looking at the Confidential Trustee Listing, we get both the contact information from the BOT and BOR chairs. If a person is in such a capacity, they should be reachable for direct communication via email. Sadly, the contrast between those 2 Chairs is rather stark in that regard. I would put that on my wish list for 2014 with the BOR Chair, to

1. not have to seemingly always go through the IES to get answers
2. to get more than just a morsel of information when asking a question
3. let's also throw in timely replies

Let me close out this posting by saying that the Chair of the BOR gets a copy of the BOT Confidential Listing. Why that is, still baffles me. Why is it that the BOR information is not available to the BOT Chair? There are just too many breaks in confidence, at least in my book, when the BOR professes that it works with full transparency. I assume there will be more to follow, from others.

David M. – Area 12, New Jersey
