

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 18th, 2007

1:30 to 3 PM

By Tele-conference

1. Present by conference call:
Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson, Ann Milne, Christine Harris Taylor, Tom Wirtz, George Hall (secretary)
2. Check in and review of suggested agenda:
No comments.
3. Discussion of May minutes:
Chris will be sending out written minutes for May.
4. Discuss draft application form
Before the meeting, Tom prepared and shared a draft one-page “Qualification of WAM Mediators” application form (attached by reference), characterizing it as a merger of existing documents, suggesting that the committee work to make it user-friendly while keeping it to one page and formatting it so that if it is filled out on line, the applicant can easily tab through the various questions. Committee members suggested additions, such as placing check boxes opposite all required elements, making clear those questions where multiple options for meeting a standard are provided and indicating a need to select an option, especially adding a check box at the top for WAM membership. Everyone appreciated eliminating any mention of “grievance.”

MN Rule 114 briefly discussed regarding concern how WAM might deal with requirement that “qualification” is contingent on applicant maintaining continuous WAM membership and fulfilling educational standard. Carolyn volunteered to assist the WAM board with implementation of this aspect of the application submission. The question arose whether WAM should pay whoever collates the submission and maintains records of those “qualified,” and whether this should also be built into the fee. 45 days suggested as the expected processing period that would be communicated to applicants along with other information on a cover sheet attached to the application form.

Suggestion made that a complete draft application be finalized in time for the August WAM board meeting, along with a short list of remaining issues either to be dealt with by committee, or for which direction would be sought from the board. The decision packet would include a draft cover letter, the draft application form, and standards for tracking. Suggestion made for a one-page summary of key decisions made in the design process for

the WAM Board. Carolyn also mentioned that our minutes are posted on the web for member to read, that she has repeatedly report on our progress to the board as well as to members attending the spring annual meeting.

Sue suggested including a summary of why the issues involved are difficult and important, and volunteered to draft a one-page statement that prospectively could come from the board.

Discussion switched to rationale for having professional malpractice insurance (good business practice, proof of financial responsibility, proof of professional approach to the field, etc.). Complete Equity Markets mediator coverage discussed and question raised whether it could be offered to WAM members, with the suggestion that the WAM pool may be too small and that members should consider joining ACR, as Complete Equity Markets offers discounted insurance to ACR & AFCC members. Everyone concluded that having liability coverage was an important qualification criteria and should not be eliminated. Issue raised whether proof of coverage could be satisfied if an applicant only worked with a community mediation group or similar center who in turn had their own policy, and suggestion accepted this option be added to form. Suggestion also made that related details, such as showing coverage for particular specialties, and how the qualifications roster might portray this, be a followup issue for the committee to work on or delegated to the board.

Recommendation made that we put together a list of outstanding tasks to be completed and see if board wants to tackle them or have us do it, but the sentiment was also voiced that at this point, the committee is not interested in doing more.

Tom agreed to collect all of the suggested changes and provide committee members with a clean draft.

Items for additional board guidance

Question raised about what to do with academics, facilitators, trainers, and systems designers. This qualification process is aimed at practitioners and intended to inform the public who may be seeking a mediator. Admittedly it leaves out others and excludes potential WAM members who may have other, positive skills. Suggestion made to take it to the board and ask whether they want application focused on practitioners or have the committee make it inclusive of others, recognizing the broad complexity of the ADR field.

Other items to be completed

- a. Cover sheet
- b. Process for tracking
- c. Instruction sheet
- d. Design and placement of roster on web site
- e. Frame board decisions on administrative process
 - who will be on admissions committee
 - amount of application and renewal fee (\$100 or something else)

- f. Suggestions for ongoing education
- g. Have board identify other items they desire this committee to prepare recommendations for

Caroline said she would take the draft form to the board, clarify intent on inclusion of just practitioners or whether “qualifications” should be more broadly construed, and discuss the administrative process, application fee amount, and other items.

Sue volunteered to prepare a one page explanation of how the committee arrived at this application form.

5. Teleconference wrap-up:

Tom agreed to accept, collate and circulate application form revisions to the committee

6. Adjourn: Conference call adjourned at 3:00 pm, with agreement to meet again by conference call on July 16th at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Meeting Minutes

April 4th, 2007

1:30 to 3 PM

By Tele-conference

7. Present by conference call:
Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson, Ann Milne, Christine Harris Taylor, Tom Wirtz, George Hall (secretary)
8. Check in and review of suggested agenda:
No comments.
9. Discussion of February minutes:
Minutes accepted as amended.
10. Review assignment list
At the February meeting, Carolyn asked that everyone prepare 1-2 brief paragraphs answering the following questions for distribution prior to discussion at the April meeting:
 - a. Describe a vision of what s/he would like to see as the final outcome of WAM offering Certification; and
 - b. How we can achieve this with the parameters of WAM's certification process.

Members spent the next hour "stepping back" and talking about their visions for the certification system to clarify expectations and search for points of agreement. As later stated by Carolyn in an email to Committee members, this exercise revealed a wide spectrum of perspectives and illustrates why the committee has had difficulty in making progress.

The committee came to some points of agreement including:

1. The system should be inclusive meaning that it invites people into WAM.
2. This is a threshold standard instead of a standard of excellence.
3. Balance is needed between our ability to administer the system, ease of participation and passing the process for "regular mediators," and rigor.
4. A phased implementation can be achieved without having every component of WAM's procedures in place.

5. A phased in implementation will allow the systems to evolve as we learn more about running a certification process. We must recognize the need to be flexible to improve the system over time.
6. WAM needs to develop ways to help people achieve the standards and then continue their professional development.
7. The committee would like to get something in place so we can move on. We will work toward this at our next meeting on May 21.

In summary, all members felt the system should be a) inclusive, and that b) the system should have the capacity to evolve, with a few of the committee also believing that c) WAM should develop ways through provision of training, mentoring, and practice for aspiring mediators to gain greater proficiency and understanding. The Committee suggested compiling a list of outstanding issues to be dealt with by a following committee(s).

11. Teleconference wrap-up:

Committee members agreed to focus on editing the draft certification application forms at the next meeting.

12. Adjourn: Conference call adjourned at 3:00 pm, with agreement to meet again in person on May 21 at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Meeting Minutes
February 19th, 2007

1:30 to 3 PM
By Tele-conference

13. Present by conference call:

Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson (excused absence), Ann Milne, Christine Harris Taylor, George Hall (secretary); Tom Wirtz.

14. Check in and review of suggested agenda:

No comments.

15. Discussion of January minutes:

Paragraphs at bottom of page two and top of page 3 discussed and revised pending opportunity for Sue to provide additional comments.

16. Review assignment list

A brief discussion of committee assignments occurred (refer to “Current Assignment List” as of February 2007).

17. Discussion of “Process for Soliciting and Reviewing Training Program Applications” (a 10-page handout)

Carolyn began the discussion by reflecting on her experience writing and responding to requests for proposals.

Comment made that certification options 1 and 2 of the WAM language (page 1) are not commensurate for everyone, and that we may need to further expand and distinguish between the two. [Breadth and sufficiency of training received in option 1 may not necessarily equate to training in “all components” of the WAM model in option 2.]

Referring to provider certification (top of page 2), different types of training providers (#1. and #2.) are characterized with the thought that however this is worded, we could help WAM get out of the certification business by recognizing accreditation by another body of whatever institutional programs are offered:

- Who are we? (self-anointed?)
- Really just a bunch of mediators with varying degrees of competency and experience
- Reluctant to say who is “in” and who is “out”
- What is our basis for inclusion or exclusion

- If academic or continuing education courses are offered for credit, should not they automatically be recognized?

With respect to types of providers #3. and #4.: (page 2)

- It would be useful if WAM could be involved in some way
- We can't be restrictive
- Recognize our need to promote the profession
- The more loosely we word things, the better off we will be

Fees: (page 2)

- Who will determine fees and whether they are paid?
- Will academic institutions already accredited pay fees to WAM? (not very likely)

Comments about certification of training providers:

- Whatever certification means, does it serve our clients? Are we saying that person receiving certification meets a threshold, or that training meets their clients needs?
- Taking a training program doesn't equate to proficiency
- Are we stuck on training rather than proficiency?
- How do we describe that "this person" has achieved a level of proficiency?

A general discussion occurred about process, fees and role plays:

Referring to earlier discussion about Chris Honeyman's research, Carolyn spoke with Chris about the test design project, learning that development of a standard test has stopped, although criteria for role play has been developed and implemented (used in Pennsylvania). We're not going to be able to purchase a test by which to measure competency, and there does not appear to be an objective method by which to evaluate mediator skills. Comment made that we should research and evaluate what other states are doing.

- This process should be welcoming and not exclusionary
- Invite people into the fold
- We all can learn to improve our practice of mediation
- If we have roll plays observed by WAM members, will this be too difficult to coordinate and accomplish fairly?
- Doesn't 40-hour training include observation and critique of coached roll-plays? If we required this as a separate activity, would we be duplicating training provided by the first 3 providers on page 2?
- But would it not be useful to have applicants meet with a panel of 2-3 WAM mediators to share their philosophy and approach to a case – an opportunity to show their stuff?
- Canada, Maryland and Florida were mentioned, but they have the organizations and institutional resources in place to screen service providers as well as to certify mediators

- Concern expressed that if we irritate enough people, they will start another association without exclusionary tactics and fees (as happened with collaborative divorce)
- What was the assumption when fee system (for accreditation and application) was suggested? [fees are common in other professional accreditation systems]
- Recognized we don't think we could get academics to pay fees
- For private or unaccredited institutions, we're setting up an exclusionary atmosphere
- Would fees likely ever cover costs? Would we have the volunteers available to administer this system?
- How does this square with our primary mission to put out a list of mediators the public would be well-served by?
- But this is the task we took on....
- Sounds like we're starting at the wrong end of the camel....

Discussion reverted back to reviewing fundamental task as group saw it:

- What does it take to put out a list of mediators to the public stating that these mediators can be relied upon, who have demonstrated an acceptable level of proficiency that could help settle a dispute.
- Are we being painted into a corner?
- Can we reframe the question? What do we look for in choosing a mediator?
 - Substantive experience
 - Sufficient demeanor and personality to be credible with parties
 - No prior or future contact with parties
 - Knowledge of issues
 - Other?
- Is it possible to turn these into criteria? But what does "experience" mean and how do we value it? What is the difference between academic, judicial, or other types of experience?

18. Teleconference wrap-up:

Committee members suggested that everyone prepare 1-2 brief paragraphs answering the following questions. for distribution prior to discussion at the April meeting:

- a. Describe a vision of what s/he would like to see as the final outcome of WAM offering Certification; and
- b. How we can achieve this with the parameters of WAM's certification process.

Carolyn agreed to send out article on credentialing approaches, George to circulate article on developing certification programs.

19. Adjourn: Conference call adjourned at 3 pm, with agreement to meet again by conference call on April 2 at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Meeting Minutes
January 15, 2007

1:30 to 3:30 PM
By Tele-conference

20. Present by conference call:

Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson, Ann Milne, Christine Harris Taylor, George Hall (secretary); Tom Wirtz excused absence.

21. Check in and review of suggested agenda:

Ann provided draft application forms for “new” and “grandfathered” applicants for discussion, to be discussed between “training approval system” and “dealing with competencies.” Importance of minutes documenting our conclusions stressed, as while it was thought certification was a doable task, there is a growing realization over how hard implementing this task actually is.

22. Discussion of November 20th minutes:

Minutes accepted and attached by reference. Concluding sentence in item 3 changed to read “Carolyn said she would compile the documents and submit them to WAM administrators.”

23. Training approval system:

Sue provided a discussion paper entitled “Training Issues for WAM Certification,” attached by reference. A spirited discussion ensued over the type of training that may be acceptable (skill-based versus academic content); how to evaluate and measure the credentials of the trainer; should training be integrated versus simply a collage of activities; should training fulfilling minimum hours requirement offered by trainers occur within a month or two or within one year. Comment made that field is changing, and should options other than 40-hour modules be recognized such as on line training offerings, training that meets sporadically or one night a week. Should training offered by an academic institution be measured differently than training offered by such entities as community mediation centers? Suggestion made it isn’t about who does it or how long training occurs but what it is (core competencies + other?) the training includes, and the quality of integration and connectivity. Is it our role to review and approve mediator training offered by Wis Bar or ACR, or do we automatically accept these offerings – where do we start?

Several questions emerged:

- a. Do we differentiate (if at all) between hours of instruction and/or practicum available from a community mediation center affiliated with a circuit court versus, for example, the Marquette DR certificate?
- b. What would trainers say to indicate they meet criteria?
- c. What criteria would be used to “approve” trainers in state versus out of state?

Suggestion made to establish a review committee to, using our criteria, review training providers.

Building a perfect system perceived as not being realistic, yet how do we assure that training is balanced and meaningful? We may find that WAM’s training standards are aspirational as practicum’s are not readily available. What if WAM made it possible to obtain different kinds of practical experience? What if we produce recommendations (such as making practicums and mentoring available) that drive the organization? In this regard, community mediation programs are seen as offering a real contribution.

Question raised whether we’re about helping people to be better trained rather than accrediting training programs? Do we need to offer our training? Is this the only option? Do we make approval difficult for other training programs? What if Arizona Bar submits approval request to WAM?

Do we:

- a. Request that practitioners submit training taken for evaluation? (burden on student)
- b. Request training programs or trainer to submit? (burden on trainer)
- c. Impose any approval for training at all?
- d. Charge a review fee?
- e. Discriminate between pre-approval and approval-after-the-fact?
- f. What happens if a nationally-recognized program does not submit for pre-approval and applicant submits course work (and WAM declines to recognize it)?

Suggestion made we have a responsibility to establish real criteria to apply either to existing curricula or after-the-fact when a course is taken. We need to establish minimum criteria for competency, a floor, in order to avoid either rubber-stamping anyone, or by default limiting acceptance to a select few. This may mean recognizing completion of a cohesive curriculum as well as piece-meal progress through a variety of programs strung-together. But what is the minimum floor we’re seeking, what does the minimum mean? What is the level that members or others are willing to be accountable for at this point, and how does this manifest itself in how people advertise themselves?

All licensing entails standards with measurable cutoffs. How do we word this: Minimum competency requirement for certification in Wisconsin; with so many hours per year of training through WAM, ABA, ACR, or other pre-approved providers; training in other states taken at own risk with credit not necessarily guaranteed. (as research continues on competency/training, this may be re-thought/re-worded. Comments made: Why are we

getting so heavily into other training programs?; and Our charge may include specific direction that we may conclude is neither feasible nor practical to pursue.

Suggestion made that we look at model for basic mediation training, ask training institutions how what they offer addresses the criteria.

WAM could maintain a roster of known training programs that, if successfully completed, would count toward meeting a certification requirement, otherwise applicant might provide evidence of training during certification process to show they met the training criteria. Alternatively, WAM might ask the organization identified by the applicant to provide the information, that also might be used to enable the organization to become “pre-approved.” However, other organizations approve mediator training programs, are we duplicating their work?

An opposite approach is to ignore certification of training programs and focus instead on certifying the mediator:

- a. We aren't setting a standard when it isn't feasible to do so
- b. Trainers elsewhere will likely not come to WAM for approval
- c. If we are offering a certification process for members, why are we worrying about approval of training? Members could submit anything they like.
- d. Put the burden on the applicant to demonstrate competency.

24. Discussion of draft application forms for “new” and “grandfathered” applicants

Refer to attached forms. Filling in the blanks was perceived to be straightforward, but how to weigh hours for a particular type of mediation training versus another as well as total hours spent versus quantity, type, and difficulty of mediation cases engaged in is another matter.

If an applicant performs community mediation, do we differentiate this from other types of (supervised/unsupervised) mediation (most community mediation programs monitor the quality of mediation by engaging in debriefings with the mediator immediately following the mediation, sending evaluative questionnaires to the parties, reporting survey results to the mediators, and convening frequent training programs).

Suggestion made we defer additional work on the forms until other issues are better defined and resolved.

25. Dealing with competencies

Refer to 5-page “Competencies Discussion Starter.” If we ask people how they would behave, that would tell us whether competency exists.

Discussion focused on page 4. Question asked whether anyone knew of validated tests for competency. Marilyn McKnight and Chris Honeyman's test/study for ACR mentioned. Sue said she was able to take the test, and that correct answer was very dependent upon

person's "view." Maryland mentioned as having a role play in which person being certified participates in a demonstration case, and observers have a list of behaviors to be accounted for. Carolyn said she would look at their criteria and also contact Marilyn and Chris for their materials. Comment made that roll play is a least favorite activity, thought to be an imposition beyond value certification will provide.

26. Teleconference wrap-up:

"Certification System Components Worksheet" and assignments briefly reviewed, characterized as a "working document." George will send out the "Protocol" (actually I thought I sent this earlier but will do it again tomorrow).

27. Adjourn: Conference call adjourned at 3:30 pm, with agreement to meet again by conference call on February 19th at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Meeting Minutes
November 20th, 2006

1:30 to 3:30 PM
By Tele-conference

28. Present by conference call: Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson, Ann Milne, Christine Harris Taylor, George Hall (secretary); Tom Wirtz excused absence.
29. Discussion of October 30 minutes: Corrected minutes attached by reference. Discussion of minutes included proposal to post minutes on the WAM web site in order to be publicly available at any time after committee members have had an opportunity to review and approve the text. Carolyn said she would compile the documents, and submit to WAM administrators.
30. Committee protocol: Edited protocol attached by reference. Minor editorial changes made to revised version from the October 30th meeting, including deletion of signature block (presence of committee members equates to acceptance of protocol language governing membership, officers, decision-making, and safeguards for members).
31. Discussion of Certification System Components Worksheet version 10/30/06 (attached by reference): These notes are in addition to committee's suggested editorial changes that Carolyn will compile and send out to accompany the November 20th minutes.

During the discussion, committee members posed questions including whether: Such a system could also apply to training program providers, separate application forms would need to be developed for both new and grandfathered members, criteria and evaluation forms should be developed for reviewers (based on the WAM member application form), should we try to flow chart the process in order to understand how decision elements and other aspects relate (yes), whether application and other forms would relate to any similar existing forms used by other stakeholders such as the courts and WI Intra-professional Committee on Divorce.

Question posed as to how, through form design, we might best address concerns/skepticism of other related specialized professional groups. Example: Is a 40-hour family and divorce mediation training sufficient for certification application? Does conducting a 100-hour public policy mediation count as one mediation, or equate to how many small claims mediations? Committee members concluded that we need to consider specialization, although it was not expressly identified in the original charge, and potentially address this in the section on core competencies. Committee members felt this particular discussion may be related to why certification has proven to be such a challenge.

32. Identify committee member's areas of interest: Committee members briefly discussed areas of interest, with Carolyn saying she would investigate core competencies by looking at what other states have done, particularly with specialties. (did others state any of their preferences – my notes indicate not) The intent is to write up area of interest, identifying and sharing relevance and potential discussion questions several days prior to a committee meeting. Carolyn will share a list of committee members and their research interest prior to the next committee meeting.
33. Adjourn: Conference call adjourned at 3:30 pm, and agreed to meet again by conference call on November 20th, 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Draft Meeting Minutes

October 30, 2006

1:30 to 4:30 PM

TEC Center

3591 Anderson St., Suite 203

Madison, WI

34. Present: Carolyn Peckham (chair), Sue Bronson, Anne Milne, Christine Harris Taylor (by phone), Tom Wirtz, George Hall (secretary)
35. Introductions: Carolyn asked committee members to share how they came to mediation, the role of mediation in their life and the kinds of skills and relevant experience they bring to the committee, the challenges they foresee as well as aspirations for this endeavor, what kind of system they might foresee, and reference documents to be brought to committee's attention.
- a. Implement program that benefits what we have to offer and that makes mediators happy without preference for any professional background
 - b. Includes steps for how to become certified
 - c. If system is inclusive and flexible it becomes meaningless, if it is meaningful it becomes exclusionary
 - d. Aspire without regulation for quality assistance and help everyone to be their best
 - e. Influence whatever supreme court does to regulate mediation
 - f. Concern expressed over why WAM was doing this and who would likely seek certification
 - g. Meet needs and interests of the profession and have credibility
 - h. Assemble manageable system for WAM
 - i. Not concerned that WAM need jump in there first, but rather see that whatever we do is done well
 - j. Concern for what's the right thing for the people we serve and WAM members
 - k. Concern certification may cause WAM to go in other directions
 - l. That certification should bring community mediation centers together
36. Discussion of task timeline: Committee concluded that no deadline should be set, that members needed to be educated about any proposed process as we proceed. Question raised about whether committee might go back to board with a question (or to the membership), and answered by the comment that board prefers to see a proposed scheme for implementing certification.

37. Protocol governing committee operations: See attached amended draft developed by the committee. Caroline explained that a protocol was a device she used to facilitate party engagement. The committee suggested changes reflected in the attached draft, and:
 - a. Recommended that implementation be lodged in the hands of a separate group
 - b. Recommended that this Committee was created only to design and develop forms and procedures, and
 - c. Once task is done, that a certification review committee should be appointed by the WAM Board

38. Meetings and distribution of minutes: Committee agreed to share minutes with WAM Board and Bob and Lee Jordan, and to plan on meeting monthly every 3rd Monday commencing at 1:30 pm.

6. Notes accompanying Certification System Components Worksheet:
 - a. Committee recommends using development of application form as a discussion vehicle for issues surrounding certification, why certification gets stuck over questions such as: Asking for # of cases mediated, # of hours spent per case, etc.
 - b. Committee agreed to investigate and evaluate certification-related information and research from other states such as Maryland and Minnesota.

7. Homework: Caroline distributed the “Self-Assessment Tool for Mediators,” and reference information on a cd-rom for committee to review prior to next meeting.

8. Adjourn: Committee adjourned at 5 pm, and agreed to meet again by conference call on November 20th, 1:30 pm.

Submitted by George Hall, Secretary

WAM Standards and Certification Committee

Inaugural Meeting

October 30, 2006

1:30 to 4:30 PM

At the South Central Wisconsin Workforce Development Board Offices*

Conference Room

TEC Center Building

3591 Anderson St., Suite 203 Madison, WI (608) 249-9001

Suggested Agenda

| <u>Topic</u> | <u>Facilitator</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Review agenda | Carolyn |
| 2. Introductions, aspirations, skills and relevant experiences | Carolyn introduce for discussion |
| 3. Committee responsibilities, roles and processes | Carolyn introduce for discussion |
| 4. Prepare committee task list | Carolyn introduce for discussion |
| 5. Next steps and meeting date | Group work |

WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee

Committee Protocol

Committee Purpose:

The WAM Standards and Certification System Design Committee will be responsible for designing and recommending to the WAM Board the forms and procedures to:

- ◆ Review and approve certification requests of mediators who are members of the Association and to establish a process for decertification of members;
- ◆ Review and approve mediation training programs that satisfy the Association's Standards for Mediation Training; and.
- ◆ Review and approve continuing mediation education programs.

Following Board approval, the WAM Standards and Systems Design Committee will become responsible for implementing the systems.

Committee Membership:

The Standards and Certification System Design Committee shall consist of 6-8 members who represent the diverse backgrounds of the general membership of WAM and are approved by the WAM Board. At least one member of the Committee shall be a WAM Board member.

Committee Officers:

1. A chairperson of the Committee shall be designated by the WAM Board of Directors.
2. The Committee chairperson shall appoint a recording secretary to take appropriate notes and minutes of each meeting. Minutes shall be retained by WAM's administrators.

Committee Meetings:

1. The Committee shall hold monthly meetings to conduct business within its scope of responsibilities.
2. Meetings may be held in person, telephonically, or via electronic media.

3. No meeting shall be held without a minimum of 72 hours prior notice by facsimile, telephone, and/or e-mail transmission to each committee member.

4. Summaries of meeting results will be prepared by the recording secretary and will be provided to members via e-mail prior to each meeting.

Decision Making:

1. All actions of the Committee:

a. Committee intends to operate by consensus.

b. A minimum of 50% of committee members plus one constitutes a quorum.

c. The chairperson can decide whether a vote is necessary.

d. If a vote is taken, actions shall be by a majority vote of the members who are present.

2. In order to conduct any business requiring a vote of the Committee, a quorum must be present.

Safeguards for the Members

1. Any member may withdraw from the committee at any time by notifying the Committee Chairperson in writing.

2. All members shall act in good faith and shall consider the best interests of the WAM membership, the WAM organization as a whole and the Committee member's in decisions.

3. The Committee cannot commit the resources of a member without the member's agreement.

4. If necessary, the committee chairperson is the official spokesperson.

5. Committee members will support each other in the process, including accurate representation of individual members' positions as stated.

6. The Committee may amend this protocol by consensus.

7. Accepting committee membership means acceptance of this protocol.