



AAGT BOARD RETREAT

Board Retreat (Asilomar, California, USA)

Saturday, August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – Monday, September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014

<b>ATTENDANCE:</b>	Gail Feinstein, Patricia Tucker, Burt Lazarin, Dina Miller, Maryanne Nicholls, Ansel Woldt, Nancy Woldt, Bud Feder, Dominique Chabre, Adam Kincel, Marlene Blumenthal, and Michael Sasiain.
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Brad Larsen, Rodney Cole, Anna Bacik, Alex Schlotterbeck, Deirdre Winter, Mark Reck, and Peter Cole.
<b>CHAIRPERSON:</b>	Gail Feinstein
<b>MINUTED BY:</b>	Michael Sasiain

SUBJECT	ISSUE/DISCUSSION POINT	Decision Made	Action Point	Completion Date
---------	------------------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------

**REVIEW ITEMS**

<p><b>1. Reflect, Review and Refresh</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GF welcomed the attendees and began the meeting with breathing and stretching exercise.</li> <li>Board members discussed “what support looks like” for each other, the integration and mentorship of new board members, and the function and role of the board as distinct from the conference planning committee. Conceptualizations of the board role and function centered on supporting the needs of the membership.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>2. Role, Relationship and Responsibility of AAGT to Regional Conferences</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion centered on the need to clarify the relationship between AAGT and regions, the benefits and risks of AAGT being associated with regional conferences in the absence of a formal proposal form, and the need a for regional conference co-sponsorship and post-evaluation protocol.</li> <li>BL highlighted the need to formulate criteria for the co-sponsorship of regional conferences.</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consensus was reached on the need for increased oversight regarding future co-sponsored regional conferences.</li> <li>• GF proposed the creation of a taskforce to formulate guidelines for co-sponsorship.</li> <li>• BL suggested a guideline that co-sponsored regional conferences should consist of substantial gestalt content in the program.</li> <li>• DM suggested the taskforce should consider the different types of regional members and their interests.</li> <li>• AW noted co-sponsored conferences should have evaluations and the results reported to the AAGT board.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>3. Explore Structure of Regions and Function of the Regional Contact Person (RCP)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current RCP structure was explored in terms of its effectiveness and whether it has meet the overarching goal of advancing Gestalt Therapy geographically.</li> <li>• AK reported poor overall attendance of RCPs in scheduled meetings and noted the RCP as a gestalt may be reaching closure. AK proposed to integrate the function of the RCP onto the board as an alternative to the current RCP model.</li> <li>• The structure of regions was discussed along with the theme of regional identity.</li> <li>• BL suggested regions should have a clearly defined purpose, geographical boundary, and membership criteria in order obviate an overlap of regions.</li> <li>• NW proposed prospective RCP leadership should be an AAGT member in good standing.</li> <li>• A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adam Kincel, Maryanne Nicholes, Patricia Tucker, and Burt Lazarin volunteered to be members of the regional task force.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several board members volunteered to be members of a regional taskforce whose aim is to clarify the relationship between AAGT and regions while assisting in clarifying the identities of the latter.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>4. Scholarship and Research Fund</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the distribution parity between the three funds (i.e., scholarship, regional, and research) when the donor does not specify a fund. The notion of scholarship fund donors specifying a specific recipient (e.g., a specific individual, students in general, members of a particular organization, etc.) was likewise discussed in relation to egalitarianism, diversity factors, and individual s group designations. A parity proposal for the research fund was discussed.</li> <li>• BF pointed out distributing money into the three funds by a fixed percentage is not truly an issue since most contributions are designated by the donor.</li> <li>• A consensus was reached on a proposal for the 2014 AGM in which 50% of the designated contribution will go to the designated party and the remaining 50% to the general funds. Additionally, a \$1,000 minimum will be required to designate contributions. This proposal will be held within a 2-year pilot run to determine the utility of designated contributions.</li> <li>• Parity proposal for research fund was discussed in terms of the importance and roles of funds and, furthermore, how to support research.</li> <li>• MR voiced a need to formalize an application process for considering research fund requests and expressed an interest in expanding the size of the research committee.</li> <li>• Parity for the research fund: BL proposed the board match, up to \$500, the amount disbursed to the first three individuals who request and are successfully approved for money from the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board consensus was reached to propose BL's proposal for the research fund.</li> </ul>		

	<p>research grant. The matched money will be allocated from the AAGT general funds.</p>			
<p><b>5. Review Board Positions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the various roles of current and prospective board positions.</li> <li>• The board position associated with information technology (IT) board was discussed on whether AAGT's IT needs required a specific position or could be housed within Communications.</li> <li>• The need for recruiting an editor for AAGT's electronic journal (Gestalt!), in the event the journal is revived, was discussed.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• The current need for two chairs for organizational members was discussed. A motion was made to only have one chair, instead of two, for organizational members.</li> <li>• The need for a Regional Contact Person (RCP) chair was discussed in relation to current regional interest in RCP. AK noted a considerable decrease of interest by RCPs and proposed the RCP board position be liquidated after one year if interest in the RCP remains low within the membership.</li> <li>• The prospective need for an IT position and journal editor will continue to be discussed in future board meetings.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>6. Assess Blind Peer Review Procedure</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the benefits and drawbacks of the current peer review model for evaluating prospective conference presentations, alternate models for evaluating proposed workshops, and the balance between (a) inviting presenters already established in the community and having first-time presenters.</li> <li>• DC suggested the blind review process is not truly 'blind' and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggested modified blind review procedures will be submitted to the prospective 2016 conference planning committee.</li> </ul>		

	<p>highlighted prospective presenters have, in the past, implied their identity in the submitted proposal through the prominent use of self-reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN noted good proposals do not necessarily translate to good presentations.</li> <li>• BF proposed to eliminate bibliography and names from blind reviewers to decrease bias.</li> <li>• AK suggested reducing the number of workshops, reserve slot for first time presenters, and increase number of invited presenters to provide an optimal balance.</li> <li>• A two-tier process was considered in which submissions are (a) assigned an aggregate score by blind peer reviewers that is (b) then added to a sum of scores corresponding to identified variables (e.g., first-time presenters, established presenters, topic, etc.) by a different committee.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>7. Preconference Workshop Presenters</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the current contract and procedures associated with paying preconference workshop presenters, the benefits and risks associated with inviting and not inviting individuals to present, the representation of diversity within preconference workshops, and the mentorship of new presenters.</li> <li>• MB noted invited presenters tend to draw more registrants. Without invitations, some presenters may not attend preconference workshops. DM expressed an interest in increasing membership input into whether presenters should be invited or not for preconference workshops.</li> <li>• BL suggested the amount that presenters receive for a workshop should be based on a formula balancing total expenses (e.g. space rental cost, amenities, etc.) with income from registrations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discussed suggestions will be submitted to the prospective 2016 conference planning committee.</li> </ul>		

<p><b>8. CE Considerations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the relationship between providing continuing education credit for the membership, membership needs, and regional considerations.</li> <li>• DM reported AAGT is currently in good standing with the American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) and proposed exploring additional national certifying agencies and associations to better serve members.</li> <li>• In the event that the membership votes to co-sponsor the 2016 biennial international conference with EAGT, the notion of whether continuing education units (CEU) should be provided was discussed. It was agreed letters of attendance will be provided and the provision of CEU certification for the 2016 conference will continue to be discussed pending the outcome of 2014 annual general membership meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The letters of attendance will be provided for the 2016 biennial international conference.</li> <li>• The provision of CEU certification for the 2016 conference will continue to be discussed pending the outcome of 2014 annual general membership meeting.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>9. Member Listserv</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on the impact of listserv discussions on the membership, the prospective use of listserv guidelines, whether or not the listserv should be moderated, and interest groups.</li> <li>• AK proposed adding a disclaimer to the listserv noting it is currently unmoderated and creating directions for creating interest groups.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>10. Internationality</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion centered on the tension between some members believing AAGT should be strictly a North American gestalt therapy association on the one hand and other members opining it should be an international gestalt therapy association on the other, membership fees in relation to regional socio-economic statuses, and alternate models of membership fees.</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AK highlighted flat membership fees pose an ethical challenge of equity given the discrepant socio-economic statuses of the various geographic regions occupied by members. AK proposed collecting membership fees based on geographic regions.</li><li>• BL encouraged exploring the dues current dues structure and modifying it in alignment with a member's ability to pay. BL further suggested basing membership fees on self-reported income level.</li><li>• Consensus was reached on addressing the current structure of membership dues and proposing an alternate model at the 2014 annual general membership meeting.</li><li>• The theme of internationality and diversity factors will continue to be addressed in future board meetings.</li></ul>			
--	---	--	--	--