
Amnesty International USA

Fall 2009 Resolutions Packet Northeast Regional Conference

November 14, 2009
Boston, Massachusetts

Table of Contents

Resolutions

1	Resolution on Refugee Casework	3
2	Local Group Development	7
3	Changing the Timing of the AGM	11
4	Section-to-Section Assistance	14
5	Emerging Human Rights Challenges	19
6	Partnering with External Institutions	22
7	Defining Membership and Growth	27
8	ICM Resolutions and Agenda	32
9	AIUSA Resolution Submission Procedure for the ICM	36
10	Amending <i>The Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process</i> to Allow Drafting Committees and an International Working Party	40
11	Advancing the International Youth Strategy in AIUSA	44

Supplemental Documents

About the Resolutions Process, Who's Who, and Definition of Terms	49
Acronym Guide	54
Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process (MRP)	56
Let's Plenary	back cover

NOTE: Background, arguments for and against, and resource implications are drafted by the National Resolutions Committee with the input from resolutions sponsors, members, the Board, and staff.

Resolution 1: Resolution on Refugee Casework

Sponsor: Barbara Sproul

[A] WHEREAS Amnesty International since its inception has viewed work for refugees as part of its core mission, and its current International Strategic Plan states as a human rights goal C2 “Defending unprotected people on the move;”

[B] WHEREAS, work for individuals and particularly on behalf of applicants for political asylum has proved successful in the past and has allowed AI to prevent people from being unlawfully imprisoned and has forestalled other human rights violations;

[C] WHEREAS, heroic efforts by certain Country Specialists saved the refugee program from total abolition, by putting in place a roster of volunteer Country Specialists, and a commitment of ten hours weekly of paid staff services;

[D] WHEREAS, even that level of support has recently been called into question;

[E] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. AIUSA hereby affirms its commitment to assisting individual refugees and to supporting applicants for political asylum at all stages, including appeals, of an individual’s case.
2. This assistance shall include, though not necessarily be limited to, helping applicants to obtain legal counsel, furnishing testimony of expert witnesses, submitting *amicus curiae* briefs, and furnishing funds for relief as needed.
3. The Board of Directors shall ensure that work on such cases shall be adequately staffed and shall direct the Executive Director to prepare and submit a plan ensuring that AIUSA will render effective assistance to refugees and asylum applicants.

Background:

This resolution seeks to affirm a commitment to work on the cases of individual refugees and asylum seekers, including obtaining legal counsel, expert testimony, *amicus curiae* briefs, and relief funds. The resolution also calls for resources to support this work, including a plan from the Executive Director to accomplish these goals, as well as staffing. Work on behalf of refugees is longstanding in AI and AIUSA. A refugees is, according to the 1951 UN Convention on the Status of Refugees, a person “owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.” Amnesty International “sometimes uses the term ‘refugee’ when

referring to people who have fled their countries to escape persecution or serious human rights abuses, including those who have not been formally recognized as refugees[,]” such as asylum seekers (AI Handbook ORG 20/001/2002). The newly-adopted Integrated Strategic Plan is concerned with “Unprotected People on the Move” in C2. (Strategy Map, Circular 45) and elaborates on the work of AI in this area regarding access to the legal system, the ability to challenge their status or return to the country from which they fled, physical protection, and “challeng[ing] the routine practice of detaining people.” Additionally, the March 2009 report *Jailed without Justice: Immigration Detention in the USA* details human rights concerns for immigrants and asylum seekers detained in the United States.

AIUSA has worked on behalf of individual refugees and asylum seekers, as well as for the rights of refugees in general, including multiple AGM decisions regarding refugee work. AIUSA had a Refugee Program for many years, as well as a Refugee and Migrant Rights Steering Committee. In addition to work on the overall human rights concerns of refugees, AIUSA addressed individual cases.

AIUSA discontinued the Refugee Program and the full-time Refugee Casework Coordinator as a result of restructuring. For the period which statistics are available (approximately 2003-2008), the Refugee Casework Program “addressed an average of five hundred cases per year. This includes only cases that receive ‘substantive’ attention from the program, usually including individualized country conditions research specific to the protection claim” (Refugee Casework Transition Q and A, January 2009). Additionally, the program responded to another approximate five hundred cases with standardized referrals for legal services or information. Eighty-five percent of the cases on which the program worked were for people without attorneys. A case without the involvement of Country Specialists was estimated to require seven to eight hours; cases involving Country Specialist involvement, usually sixty to eighty cases annually and including, along with expertise, a letter of support, doubles to fourteen to sixteen hours. Referrals for cases came from attorneys, advocates, listservs, outreach from the Refugee Program to detention centers, and word of mouth (Refugee Casework Transition Q and A, January 2009). The Refugee Casework Program was the only provider of gratis “systematic case support for refugees” (Refugee Casework Transition Q and A, January 2009).

Following the closure of the Refugee Casework Program, the Refugee and Migrant Rights Steering Committee although formally de-constituted, has continued its involvement in AIUSA work in the area of refugees and migrants. Additionally, AIUSA Country Specialists formed a six-person AIUSA Country Specialist Refugee Casework Committee (CSRCC). This committee, comprised of Country Specialists with experience in refugee casework, continues assistance to refugees, but only with those represented by counsel. The program is administered by CSRCC, which has created a casework resource kit, provides training for Country Specialists that have volunteered to work on refugee issues, mandated ethical standards, provides oversight, and reports to the Board. Staff support currently includes a staff member who spends ten hours weekly assisting with the administration of the program, such as maintaining records of whether or not a Country Specialist has agreed to take the case and finding a Country Specialist willing to provide assistance.

AIUSA does not provide legal counsel because AIUSA does not necessarily have attorneys, either staff or volunteer, who can assist with cases. This resolution calls for AIUSA to assist in the finding of legal counsel or supporting refugees and asylum seekers in both cases and appeals. Currently, the AIUSA website provides a link to the US Department of Justice listing of pro bono legal service providers. In regard to the *amicus curiae*, or friend of the court briefs, called for in this resolution, the International Secretariat (IS) has a legal team that takes up amicus briefs in very specific and narrow cases around the world. In the past, AIUSA's Refugee Program had asked for and received permission from the IS to submit an amicus brief in a refugee case in the United States.

Additionally, relief funds, the provision of which called for in the resolution, can be available in AI. Relief funds may be available to persons whose cases fall within AI's mission and must be applied for through the appropriate co-group on behalf of an individual. The procedure for this is unchanged.

Arguments in Favor:

This resolution is crucial to reaffirm AIUSA's commitment to individual, refugee casework. This work on behalf of individuals resonates with members and the public. Inadequate resource allocation to this work is a signal that AI and AIUSA are not strongly supportive of individuals. The commitment of volunteers to continue work on behalf of individual refugees after the discontinuation of the program shows the extent to which this work is important in AIUSA. More support is needed to fully address individual casework. Limiting help to those who already have attorneys is a significant barrier to assisting refugees, especially since the majority of Refugee Program work was on behalf of those without legal assistance. AIUSA's casework currently helps those in the least need of it. Legal briefs and greater assistance in obtaining counsel are crucial to helping refugees and asylum seekers address their human rights concerns.

Individual casework is foundational work in AIUSA. One of the first AI Prisoners of Conscience was a refugee. AIUSA has had multiple AGM Decisions stating its commitment to this work and work on behalf of the human rights concerns of all refugees and asylum seekers. In AI, the signs of success in C2 of the current ISP, Unprotected People on the Move, of the current ISP specifically mention refugees and asylum seekers. When AIUSA cuts back on this work, people may remain in detention or be returned to their home countries to face human rights violations. It would be hypocritical of AI to work towards overall policy improvement for migrants and refugees in its current campaign, while allocating fewer resources to individual cases. It is against the foundation of our work to discontinue work on behalf of refugees and asylum-seekers.

This resolution is strategic and necessary for refugee and asylum work to regain its lost prominence in AIUSA. It is necessary to ensure concrete refugee work is a reality in AIUSA. It does not ask for specific staffing or resource allocation. All it asks is that AIUSA commit to helping individuals, as it has in the past, and that the Board of Directors and Executive Director be accountable in ensuring this takes place. Furthermore, AIUSA should take full advantage of its skilled and vibrant base of volunteers who can provide assistance, but some staffing may be necessary. This resolution does not mandate how the goals will be accomplished. Requesting a

plan for implementation is necessary to ensure “effective assistance.”

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution is too operational. Seeking to mandate how AIUSA will work on behalf of refugees is not within the purview of members. AIUSA does assist individual cases through the CSRCC and limited staff support. Requesting more resources such as assistance in obtaining legal counsel, filing briefs, and “adequate staffing” would undoubtedly mean increasing resource allocation, especially staff to this work.

This resolution fails to recognize that AIUSA is in a financial crisis. While no one disputes that refugee work is important, there are no additional resources for this ongoing work. Requesting that casework be “adequately staffed” seems to be a call for increased resource allocation and staffing, which would divert resources from other AIUSA work.

AIUSA cannot provide more help in regard to legal services unless it is prepared to have staff actively recruit pro bono attorneys for cases or hire staff attorneys. It would be a liability to offer legal assistance without working under the specific direction of an attorney. Finding outside legal services would require significant time and energy.

This resolution is unnecessary. This resolution is not based on priority work in AIUSA. The section should focus its energies on priorities. Furthermore, the furnishing of *amicus* briefs has not been widely done and the effect of making more requires consultation with the IS. AIUSA already provides access to experts if a Country Specialist is willing to take up a case and relief funds are possible just as they have always been. The issue of how to administer casework in the absence of a staff-based program would be examined by Staff and the Board. AIUSA volunteers are to be applauded for demonstrating that volunteers have the expertise and professionalism to conduct sophisticated human rights advocacy in the name of AIUSA without the constant oversight of Staff and their work plan should be respected.

Resource Implications:

Implementation of this resolution is highly dependent on the interpretation of “adequately staffed.” If this is interpreted to mean fulltime work, this would require the hiring of at least one fulltime staff member, costing a minimum of \$75,000 for salary, benefits, and modest travel and incidentals. This figure does not include program overhead costs.

If the resolution were implemented with the expectation that staff would investigate partner organizations and pro bono law firms to take on cases--in addition to initiating special fundraising, etc., AIUSA would have to hire additional staff (aside from the full-time Refugee Casework Coordinator, the resource implications of which are listed above), for approximately \$70,000 per additional staff member. This sum would include the salary, benefits and a modest budget for incidentals. This figure does not include program overhead costs.

Resolution 2: Local Group Development

Sponsor: Barbara Sproul

[A] WHEREAS AIUSA's historical strength and area of bedrock commitment to Amnesty International and its goals has and continues to be membership in its local groups;

[B] RECOGNIZING that through shifting roles and priorities AIUSA has let the number of these groups diminish and their importance decrease;

[C] **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that AIUSA recommit itself to the centrality of local groups to AI's mission and;

[D] **THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that AIUSA will implement a program of group development such that we have (i) 325 effective local groups by January 1, 2012; (ii) 400 effective local groups by January 1, 2014; and (iii) the volunteer leaders necessary to support them;

[E] **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Executive Director submit to the Board and the Regional Planning Group

(i) by September 1, 2011, a definition of an "effective local group" and a plan for achieving these goals and

(ii) by January 1, 2011, and every six months thereafter until AIUSA has 400 groups, a progress report (including any adjustments to the plan).

Background:

AIUSA currently has between 230 and 233 local groups in communities across the five regions of AIUSA. AIUSA has had local groups from its inception. Local groups, unlike student or campus groups in AIUSA, have a complex chartering process that is a multiphase, long-term endeavor. Once established, a local group does not have to re-register or charter itself yearly, in contrast to campus groups, which must re-register with AIUSA each year. Local groups are provided for in the Statute of Amnesty International. It specifically mentions affiliated groups in a Section or Structure as “[g]roups of not less than five members may, on payment of an annual fee determined by the International Council, become affiliated to AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL or a section thereof.” Additionally, the number of groups in a Section or Structure can be used to determine the number of votes each Section or Structure receives at the biannual International Council Meeting.

In AIUSA, it is difficult to ascertain how many groups are truly functioning at any given time. Each region currently has its own criteria for what constitutes a functioning local group. Although no formal reports from AIUSA in the 1980s are available, many people in AIUSA's

leadership in the 1980s report the maximum number of local groups during that time to be between 425 and 600. Available reports from AIUSA and AI show a decline in local groups over several years. According to AI Membership Statistics 1994, AIUSA had 370 local groups (ORG 40/03/94). In 1999, AIUSA had 299 local groups (1999-2000 National Vitality Report) and 238 by 2004 (2003-2004 National Vitality Report). The 2008 Activist Report lists 246 local groups. To date, it is reported that we have between 230-233 local groups, a drop from last year's figures.

Attendance among groups also varies greatly, with some of the most active groups averaging twenty-five members at a monthly meeting while others average three or four members. The 2008 Activist Report estimates five to six members per group. AIUSA local groups were the primary way in which individuals participated in AIUSA. Campus groups, which now make up the majority of all groups in AIUSA, were approximately 84% of all groups in 2008 (2008 Activist Report). The development of campus/student groups became a focus of AIUSA in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Longtime members of local groups have reported that many long-established local groups had greater participation in the 1980s than today. AIUSA does not have accurate demographic data available regarding membership in its groups.

Local Group development is a longstanding focus of AIUSA. For example, 1994 AGM Decision C1, titled "Membership Development," concerns implementing recommendations from the Membership Developing Task Force to strengthen volunteer activism in AIUSA, specifically for local and student groups considered "essential to volunteer activism" (1994 C1). Nineteen ninety-five AGM Decision C7 pertains to Group Health and strategies for empowering local activism. The National Vitality Report is an analysis of group health in AIUSA. Surveys asked for group self-evaluations to obtain a snapshot of student and local groups and their membership, leadership, skills, and needs. These reports have not been done for four years. The 2008 Activist Report is a numerical breakdown of all individual members and groups in each state and region, with estimated group size estimates.

AIUSA is developing a strategy for group involvement. The recent AIUSA group development goal presented by Staff (but not yet discussed by the Board) calls for a 5% increase in each region. A national growth of local groups by 5% would increase local groups by approximately twelve groups. The goal of four hundred groups by 2014 would be an increase of approximately 73% over current local group numbers. AIUSA has a network of volunteer leaders in each region called Area Coordinators, who work with members and groups. Area Coordinators have in the past started additional groups in their areas.

Currently, AIUSA Regional Offices each have field organizers on staff to work with members, including student and local groups, in their assigned states. To date, there are eight (8) Field Organizers in AIUSA, with three (3) open positions. Regional Directors are covering states or key cities to fill in the gaps. The AIUSA Organizing Unit is also hiring two positions, whose primary role is to undertake some analysis to identify the issues facing local groups, evaluate the US grassroots landscape, and provide recommendations/solutions to AIUSA for growing the activist base. Field Organizers have experienced an 80% turnover; the entire field organizing staff will be trained in December 2009 on a common model for engagement and leadership identification as well as common operational procedures for Staff.

AIUSA no longer has national training staff focused on training both field staff and activist members on leadership engagement and member development. Staff and resource cuts made by the organization have necessitated a complete ongoing reassessment in the Organizing, Membership and Campaigns Department of AIUSA and how it engages members. The results of this review will have an impact on how AIUSA can meet the needs of a variety of activists, including local groups.

Arguments in Favor:

Local groups, once the bedrock of AIUSA, are phasing out due to neglect. Local groups are not thriving. The decrease in the last decade alone of approximately fifty local groups and the decrease of 140 in the past fourteen years illustrate this problem. Without a clear plan for development and resource allocation, new local groups will not emerge and existing ones may falter. A development plan can be effective. When AIUSA sought to develop student groups and dedicated time and resources, they flourished.

Local group members have the potential for long-term, active involvement in AIUSA, making them an essential resource for AIUSA's continuing success. Student and youth membership is by definition temporary; however, local groups can retain members for decades. Similar to AIUSA's engagement in individual membership drives during 2008 and 2009; local groups are a proven mechanism for member retention and can be utilized as a method to continue engagement among youth members leaving campus groups. Furthermore, local groups can have a strong, ongoing presence in their communities due to their ability to establish long-term relationships. Local group development should be done in concert with AIUSA youth work. AIUSA has strong student groups and seeks greater youth involvement in AIUSA, including retention of youth. Local group involvement is an excellent mechanism for continuing involvement in AIUSA after a member ceases to be part of a youth or campus group.

Local groups need assistance to succeed. Staff is currently developing a plan and this resolution builds on that work. Staff has noted that they can identify criteria for an effective local group by 2011. Developing these criteria is crucial to accomplishing the goals of this resolution. The numbers in this resolution are meant to be a source of accountability in efforts to develop local groups. The goal of four hundred local groups would still be below the number of local groups once existing in AIUSA and below the reported 1980s goal of achieving five hundred functioning local groups. Without these specific requirements, it will be difficult to determine to what extent this plan is implemented and what successes have been achieved. The requirement of regular reporting not only holds Staff and the Board accountable, but also can motivate AIUSA members to become active participants in the development of local groups. It will create broad knowledge of the plan in AIUSA and foster member involvement in achieving the goals.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution is not the best way to target the problem of dwindling local groups. It is operational and prescriptive, setting out goals that may in fact prove cumbersome to, rather than

augment, the current staff plan for group development. It includes arbitrary targets without a clear, prior assessment of the existing local groups, which should be coupled with an assessment of the local group model; such an assessment would assist in not only growing new groups, but also retaining and expanding them while building activist leadership among these groups. The setting of specific targets for development of local groups in AIUSA should not be decided in the vacuum that is this resolution; rather, targets for group development should be set as part of a comprehensive review of the current strengths and weakness of groups and the utility of the group model.

Staff is more familiar with the resources and challenges of AIUSA. This resolution does not address the reality that AIUSA is in a severe financial crisis. With the recent reduction in AIUSA Staff, there may not be sufficient Staff and resources to implement this plan. Developing local groups takes considerable staff time, largely falling on Field Organizers. There are several of these positions currently open, but even if filled AIUSA has eleven Field Organizers in five regions. That is not enough to this development plan would mean an approximate 73% increase in local groups over current levels. The staff resources, as well as trained volunteer resources, required to achieve this would be high.

This resolution will be difficult to implement because it is not clear that the local group model is a viable structure for AIUSA. Asking for a 73% increase in the number of local groups may not be a strategic use of energy and resources. Local groups are not phasing out because of neglect, they are simply phasing out. Society has changed and AIUSA should adapt our activism models to reflect this shift. The height of the local group model was in a time before ready access to online resources, making group participation the primary method of engaging with AIUSA. Attracting people to a monthly meeting for years is challenging and running a local group is too difficult for many members. Even then, local group members may not ever join AIUSA as national members. This energy would be better spent attracting national members, engaging members in online activism, and promoting periodic events. The recent increase in connecting with membership online has decreased the need for local groups.

Resource Implications:

It is unclear what resource allocation would be necessary to achieve the numeric growth goals set forth in this resolution. Until the Organizing, Membership and Campaign Department complete criteria of and a plan for an “effective local group,” it is undeterminable what resources would be required to meet the numeric growth goals.

To grow local groups by 73% by 2014 to reach the goal of four hundred groups, AIUSA will need to allocate Staff time and organizational resources to local group development in addition to current plans. Current plans include filling open Field Organizer positions and the two new positions in the Organizing unit focused on AIUSA grassroots activism, reviewing local groups, and working with volunteer leaders. These current plans will likely not suffice to meet the 73% growth rate by 2014 and additional resources will need to be allocated to meet these goals. It is possible that an additional Field Organizer would need to be hired in each region, with a total cost for salary, benefits, and materials of approximately \$500,000 for all.

Resolution 3: Changing the Timing of the AGM

Sponsor: Todd Schwarz

[A] WHEREAS the AI International Council meets mid-August of each odd-numbered year;

[B] WHEREAS the AGM must approve any AIUSA resolution submitted to the International Council;

[C] WHEREAS the deadline for submission of resolutions to the International Council Meeting is in mid-January; therefore, the AGM cannot approve resolutions in advance of that date;

[D] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that by 2013 the Board shall schedule the AGM between September 1 and December 15 each year and regional conferences in the spring.

Background:

In accordance with the Bylaws of AIUSA, AIUSA holds an annual meeting of the members, the Annual General Meeting (AGM). The AGM was generally held in June of each year in AIUSA on university campuses. In 1995, the AGM moved to hotels, which often lower the overall cost, are more accessible for persons with disabilities, have business facilities readily available, and offer several venues for presentation in one location, among other advantages. This shift to hotels eliminated the need to hold the AGM in the summer when campuses were empty. Additionally, holding the AGM in the summer was seen as a barrier to student/youth participation and as a rationale for changing the timing of the AGM. The last AGM held in the summer was the 1997 AGM in New Orleans, LA. Starting in 1998, the AGM moved to the spring, usually held in March or April. This move was a result of the 1995 Board review of regional conferences and the AGM. For these reasons, regional conferences moved from the winter to fall and the AGM from the summer to spring, allowing AIUSA to better accommodate student members. Moving it within the academic year has maximized funding opportunities for student groups, which are more available during the school year, especially from their academic institutions.

There has been discussion in AIUSA of the timing of AIUSA's AGM related to the international decision-making timeline. For international decision-making, the timing of the AGM determines when decisions from AGM can be forwarded to the ICM, which is held biannually. For example, the next ICM will take place in August 2011, with the deadline for ICM resolutions set for January 2011. Only the AIUSA Board of Directors is empowered to submit resolutions on behalf of the Section to the ICM; however, AIUSA members are permitted to submit resolutions to the AIUSA resolutions process, which direct the Board of Directors to submit a particular resolution to the ICM. In order for an AIUSA resolution to direct the Board to submit such a resolution to the ICM, the resolution would need to be submitted for consideration at a regional

conference approximately two years in advance of the ICM and passed by the next AGM. For example, such a resolution bound for the 2011 ICM, would need to be submitted by September 1, 2009 to be on the agenda of an AIUSA Regional Conference. This timeline means AIUSA members should submit resolutions designated for the ICM essentially two years in advance of the next meeting.

Other Sections and Structures hold their AGMs throughout the year. In 2009, there have been AGMs held every month except November. The fall months have the fewest (one in September, two in October, none in November) with most held in the spring (eleven in March, twenty-two in April, five in May). (*Calendar of International Meetings 2005-2009*)

The Bylaws of Amnesty International USA define the AGM as the venue for decision-making through resolutions in AIUSA. They state that during this meeting members shall “hear and discuss the Treasurer's report, and consider resolutions, hear requests to review decisions made by the Board, and make recommendations concerning policy...” AIUSA resolutions to the International Council Meeting must be submitted to an AIUSA AGM in advance of the international meeting.

Arguments in Favor:

Changing the timing of the AGM would make submitting resolutions to the ICM easier. This moves the AGM more in line with the international decision-making schedule. Such a move allows for AIUSA to better engage with the international movement. Currently, AIUSA members must submit resolutions destined for the ICM to AIUSA regional conferences two years in advance of the ICM to create a binding AIUSA decision before the ICM resolution submission deadline in January. This timeline effectively prohibits AIUSA members' engagement in formal international decision-making. Moving the AGM to the fall, would shorten this timeline, and foster broader engagement of AIUSA members in international policy setting and decision-making.

Moving the AGM to the fall of each year would facilitate student participation in decision-making by giving them until the spring to compose resolutions, as opposed to having to create them immediately upon convening in the fall. A resolution could be submitted to the regional conference in the spring, the AGM in the fall, and the ICM in the summer, streamlining the process. It allows for thoughtful consideration of ICM decisions before new resolutions are due. Currently, members have approximately two weeks to evaluate ICM decisions before submitting a resolution in time to make the next ICM deadline.

In addition, this aligns the conference with the beginning of AIUSA's fiscal year, which could make the AGM an excellent forum for training and workshops on specific AI campaigns. Having campaign workshops at an AGM held in March or April does not facilitate work on those campaigns by student groups, as the academic year ends shortly after the AGM, and as such any actions and events cannot be executed until student groups reconvene in the fall. Having the national meeting of the members in the fall would give students nearly the entire school year to work on campaigns and utilize the lessons acquired at the AGM.

Arguments Opposed:

Changing the timing of the AGM and regional conferences could make it difficult for student groups to organize attendance for both the regional conference and AGM. It could also limit student group participation by splitting the process between two academic years, especially since student leadership often changes from year to year. If a student group begins in September, it would be difficult for them to make it to a national meeting in October or November, which is most likely further away, and therefore more expensive to attend, than a Regional Conference. It could be disempowering for groups to learn that, right after registration in the fall, it is too late for them to plan to attend the AGM. The current system builds momentum throughout the academic year. The regional conferences provide excellent training opportunities for student groups and new members, and better prepare members for the AGM. The current scheduling develops momentum in the section.

Since the cumulative total of members attending the regional conferences is higher than that attending the AGM, the training and workshops there reach more participants, making the regional conferences essential for building activism in AI. Leading the academic year with the lesser attended of the two conferences would impact the ability of members to educate themselves about AI and effectively organization for human rights activism.

This would also result in eighteen months between AGMs during the transition year. This resolution requires a reorganization of the entire AIUSA calendar. Revising the resolution process for resolutions destined for the ICM would eliminate the need for this resolution, and present a far simpler solution.

Resource Implications

The cost of the AGM would most likely be unaffected by the time of year. Reservations for the AGM sites are made several years in advance and the AGM could not be moved before 2013. This would also require rescheduling the timing of the Regional Conferences. Impacts, positive or negative, on attendance and the associated costs and revenue are unclear at this time. Impact on the availability of hotels in desirable AGM locations is unclear. Temporary resource allocation may be necessary to educate AIUSA members of the initial change and to update AIUSA materials.

Resolution 4: Section-to-Section Assistance

Sponsor: Group 11

Presenter: Steve Abrams

[A] WHEREAS part R3 of the AI Integrated Strategic Plan calls for “Distributing our resources strategically,” but sets up an overly centralized system;

[B] WHEREAS direct partnerships between individual Sections and Structures can allow for greater creativity, effectiveness, efficiency, and effort and thus human rights and AI’s development in parts of the world where it is less established;

[C] **BE IT RESOLVED** that the AIUSA Board of Directors shall ask the IEC to include in the Assessment to Distribution system a provision that each Section or structure shall receive a credit against its assessment for all resources it expends on providing financial or technical assistance to developing sections or structures.

[D] **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that, absent progress towards acceptance of this principle, the AIUSA Board of Directors shall submit a resolution to the 2011 ICM that calls for implementation of this principle.

Background:

This resolution asks the AIUSA to seek a provision in the Assessment to Distribution system for sections and structures to receive credits against their assessments for assistance to developing AI sections and structures. Decision 24 of the 2003 International Committee Meeting (ICM) asked the International Executive Committee (IEC) to propose a new mechanism for allocating the international budget for growth and mobilization. After the December 2004 IEC meeting and receipt of comments from sections and structures, the International Mobilization Trust (IMT) was established as the new mechanism for distribution of international resources to sections and structures. The IMT’s mission is to “provide resources for growth to selected sections and structures, and associated networks and pilot projects initiated by the Secretary General by making grants in line with the AI’s strategic plan.” In line with principles of good donorship, the IMT is committed to “WASTRELS,” i.e., (1) Willingness to fund the unpopular; (2) Accountability; (3) Sustainability; (4) Transparency; (5) Responsiveness; (6) Equity; (7) Learning; and (8) Strategy. (Circular 27, 2005 ICM, AI Index: ORG 30/008/2005).

In 2005, the IMT had up to £1.3m per year to spend on grants, i.e., 5% of the international budget. Grants are made to those Sections which demonstrate contributions to AI’s strategic goals of mobilizing people and building a dynamic architecture for the organization. Currently, Sections and Structures seeking funds from the IMT must complete an application. The assessment of the application involves consideration of the “health” of a Section or Structure and the extent to which it has taken reasonable steps to minimize risks. Moreover, a progression plan is created to chart an organization’s planned work and growth over the period of a grant, which is not to exceed three (3) years. In addition to providing the grant, the IMT is also tasked with

building up information and knowledge about available training and consultancy. (Circular 27, 2005 ICM, AI Index: ORG 30/008/2005).

Also in 2005, the International Council (IC) asked the IEC to undertake a review of the contribution system and report back to the next ICM. (2005 ICM Decision 29, Assessment Contribution). The current assessment system allocates approximately 75% of AI's income to national Sections and 25% to the international budget. The international budget is used to fund AI's international entities (such as the IS) and the IMT. (Circular 7, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 50/001/2009, page 3). Decision 20 of the 2005 ICM decided that the allocation of the budget to the IMT would be equivalent to at least 10% of the international budget.

Decision 20 of the 2005 ICM also instructed the International Secretariat (IS) to provide information about possibilities and projects for AI development in the global South and East. It further directed Sections and Structures to include a chapter in their strategic and operational plans "on how they will contribute, by means of funding, resources and/or knowledge, to growth and mobilization in the South and East." (2005 ICM Decision 20, AI's International Commitment to the Organization's International Mobilization and Growth).

In Decision 21 of the 2007 ICM Decision, the IEC was tasked to develop a proposal that would "enable the principled, transparent, effective and efficient distribution of AI's resources and activities so as to maximize AI's human rights impact." Similarly, Decision 22 of the 2007 ICM sought to explore various systems to work towards improved global approaches to planning and prioritization and "to enable a shift from assessment to distribution." (2007 ICM Decision 22, Enhancing AI's Financial Architecture).

The IEC appointed the Assessment to Distribution (A2D) Taskforce as a means of implementing 2007 ICM Decision 21. The A2D Taskforce stated that "all income raised by AI entities should be treated as belonging to the movement. Additionally, among its recommendations, the A2D Taskforce recommended that within two years, Sections should contribute 30% (rather than the current 25%) to the movement's income for allocation to the global financial envelope. Ultimately, the A2D Taskforce recommended that by the end of the next International Strategic Plan (ISP), i.e., by 2016, Sections will contribute 50% of its income to the global financial envelope. (Circular 7, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 50/001/2009).

In light of Decisions 21 and 22 from the 2007 ICM, AI Mexico proposed resolution 22 at the 2009 ICM, titled "Mexico Collaboration and Exchanges Amongst Sections, Structures and National Departments." (Circular 12, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 51/001/2009, page 55). Resolution 22 sought to encourage sharing and partnership between Sections, Structures, and national coordinating bodies of the international movement and to require an evaluation of those partnerships in the IMT's report to the IEC. In addition, the explanatory note to resolution 22 stated: "There are some sections and structures which have resources and want to form partnerships... there are other sections...that need resources and do not know how to obtain them...in both cases, the resources in question are not necessarily or predominately financial but rather organizational skills and experience, technological know-how, and knowledge and tools..." Consequently, depending on the circumstance, some Sections and Structures may have a greater use for non-financial resources.

What ultimately emerged from the 2009 ICM was Decision 15, captioned “From Assessment to Distribution.” That decision covers the period of 2010-2016 and states that AI will shift its spending from the current proportion of 70:30 to a goal of 60:40. In other words, 60% of gross income may be spent locally (instead of the current 70%) and 40% of gross income will be contributed to the global budget (instead of the current 30%). It further states that AI will devote up to 10 million Euros during the ISP period to finance projects in areas where AI has little or no presence.

Decision 15 also states that the additional contributions will fund five general areas of AI activity: developing Sections, international function costs, contributions to the costs of self-sufficient Sections and Structures, IS operating costs, and AI Sections and Structures’ operating costs that are not self-sufficient. No further information is provided in this decision regarding where and how the assessment money will be spent. This decision does, however, task an “interim A2D taskforce” to provide advice on the development of the new assessment system and distribution issues. Consequently, the IEC is to propose a revised assessment and distribution system for decision at the 2011 ICM.

For calendar year 2009, four Sections – Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Germany – agreed to pay part of AIUSA’s assessment. Specifically, those Sections are paying \$4.6 million of the \$12.6 million assessment that AIUSA owes to the IS. AIUSA plans to repay those Sections. This assistance prevented the layoff of a significant number of staff in May 2009. (AIUSA Board of Directors Minutes, June 26, 2009, page 12).

In addition to the assesment system, Sections are free to collaborate and offer assistance to one another. For instance, AIUSA’s Committee on International Development, now renamed the Intersectional Cooperation Committee (ISCC), has funded projects proposed by developing Sections and Structures around the world for more than ten years. These projects included a focus on membership growth, capacity building, training, and fundraising. Specifically, the ISCC funded innovative projects like the AI Paraguay bicycle team that was used for membership recruitment and campaigning. The ISCC has also funded projects in AI Chile, AI Uruguay, AI Poland and AI Portugal. However, the AIUSA budget crisis has resulted in the suspension of funding to the ISCC.

Arguments in Favor:

This resolution incentivizes self-sufficient sections to provide non-financial aid directly to other sections. A crucial flaw in A2D is that there is no provision for the distribution of non-financial resources, thereby failing to account for the great amount of non-financial aid that many developing sections need. As demonstrated by the explanatory note to AI Mexico’s proposed resolution 22 at the 2009 ICM, many developing sections and structures need non-financial support, rather than financial resources to aid in their growth. In some instances, technological know-how and organizational experience is far more important to a developing section’s membership growth, activism campaigns, and fundraising. By permitting sections to receive a credit against their assessment to the IS for direct assistance, both financial and non-financial, to another section, self-sufficient sections are encouraged to provide both types of resources. As

such direct assistance to other sections will aid in their development, this resolution carries out the intent of the ISP.

This resolution will make assistance to other Sections less costly. Sections will be able to save money that would normally go towards the assessment if they receive a credit for any assistance – financial or non-financial – that they provide to other Sections or Structures. Moreover, Sections will be more likely to provide resources to other Sections that it can best serve. Self-sufficient sections will be able to provide such assistance without the fear that its service to another section may render it unable to pay its yearly assessment to the IS.

Moreover, direct section-to-section assistance will permit more effective and efficient aid to developing sections. For instance, some sections are more useful to other sections due to their geography or national language. As such, neighboring sections are usually in the best position to determine how each can best help the other. Such a system is far more effective and efficient than sections going through the additional step of sending a lump sum amount to the IS so that it may redistribute those finances according to how it determines the money is best spent.

The current A2D system strips all sections of their autonomy to determine how they can best be served or be of service. For example, if AI Mexico determines that it needs technological assistance and AIUSA determines that it can provide the requested assistance at a minimal cost, those sections should be permitted to engage in the transaction and be credited accordingly. Such assistance meets the goals of A2D, which includes growing AI's total income by 35% during the next ISP and helping growth in developing sections. (2009 ICM Decision 15). As written, A2D currently demonstrates a lack of trust within AI by requiring each self-sufficient section to pay an assessment to the IS, which will in turn, determine its distribution. The direct assistance credit espoused in this resolution entrusts sections to autonomously determine how they can best assist or be assisted in working towards the ISP goals while, at the same time, ensuring that each provides the requisite amount of contribution to the global movement.

Finally, large assessments on many of the self-sufficient sections, including AIUSA, hinder their growth and profitability. As a result, a larger Section's ability to aid developing Sections is diminished. This resolution provides a way for Sections to decrease the amount they must pay towards the assessment while promoting assistance to the Sections that need it.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution is the wrong approach to intersectional collaboration and assistance. Framing intersectional assistance in terms of deductions in the assessment sends the message that only wealthy sections may be able to offer assistance to sections in the Global South. It is a paternalistic and inequitable way of distributing resources in one, global movement. Sections and Structures on the receiving end of these resources may doubt the sincerity of a Section's offer of assistance because of the assessment deduction. Intersectional cooperation is an emerging theme in the global movement of AI, but this proposal sends a reactive message about working together.

This resolution will result in inefficient spending of financial and non-financial resources. A central body to distribute AI's resources is necessary to ensure that the overarching goals of the movement are being met. With so many sections, structures, and networks, AI must have a mechanism to ensure that duplicative efforts are not made and the most important goals are being met first. For AI to make an optimal human rights impact, there must be coordination and cooperation across the movement. This resolution will permit AI to operate as a decentralized organization, which will inevitably result in less effective work.

Moreover, this resolution contradicts the ISP, to which the entire movement committed, which includes the commitment to act as one movement. As such, no section should have the right to give resources unilaterally to other sections without cooperation. A system of Section-to-Section direct assistance without a form of checks and balances is not strategic and, in fact, risks being counter-productive.

Furthermore, if passed, this resolution will reflect a negative image for AIUSA within the global movement and to the 2011 ICM. First, it portrays AIUSA as being selfish in its motives. Instead of working together to impact the global movement, AIUSA appears to prefer to spend the majority of its money on its own priorities by seeking to decrease its assessment. Sections such as AIUSA should continue to make donations directly to other sections on a voluntary basis without regard to whether it receives a "credit" to its assessment. Second, AIUSA may discredit itself to other sections of AI by rejecting A2D at a time when AIUSA is currently benefitting from the principles of A2D and proactive Section-to-Section assistance not relying on reductions of the assessment.

This resolution will be difficult to put into operation as there are currently no guidelines or system to determine the amount of "credit" a section should receive against its assessment for non-financial assistance to another section. A consistent and fair methodology for equating a dollar figure with a non-financial service would need to be developed and agreed upon before this resolution could take effect.

Additionally, a centralized mechanism to coordinate the pool of resources is necessary to ensure the maximum financial benefit out of those resources. For example, "if just a half of the 50 million Euros in cash that AI holds was invested at a 2% higher yield, we could earn a return of 500,000 Euros more to support our human rights work." (Preparing to move from Assessment to Distribution, Financial Action up to the 2009 ICM, FIN 10/002/2008, page 12). Therefore, the current system of pooling resources and having the IS distribute those resources is fundamental.

This resolution will decrease accountability. AI can more accurately demonstrate how finances are being used if one central body, rather than multiple bodies, is used to collect and distribute the resources.

Resource Implications:

Minor administrative costs, including additional paperwork expenses, are associated with implementing this resolution.

Resolution 5: Emerging Human Rights Challenges

Sponsor: Todd Schwarz

[A] WHEREAS the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) passed at the 2009 ICM includes a category for Emerging Challenges (E3 of the plan);

[B] WHEREAS the Secretary General published Circular 16 2009 and Circular 17 2009 on two possible area of emerging challenges mean to be used as background in preparation for the 2009 International Council Meeting (ICM);

[C] WHEREAS circulars published as background information are not discussed and voted on by the ICM;

[D] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the AIUSA Board write to the IEC and Chairs Forum by July 15, 2010, asking that they

- (i) develop guidelines for membership approval, including a role for the Chairs Forum and Sections and Structures, when AI moves into areas of emerging challenges and
- (ii) submit a proposal to the 2011 ICM.

[E] BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, absent progress towards submission of guidelines to the ICM, the AIUSA Board of Directors shall submit a resolution to the 2011 ICM that is substantively consistent with this resolution.

Background:

At the 2009 International Council Meeting (ICM), AI passed the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP). The ISP includes E3, a provision to address emerging human rights challenges. E3 of the ISP states that AI will work on “responding effectively to emerging challenges and opportunities.” The ISP further explains that “climate change, geopolitical shifts, economic changes, technological and scientific progress, as well as conflict and social upheaval, are bringing intense, grave and unpredictable consequences as well as unexpected and important opportunities for human rights.”

On the issue of emerging challenges, the ISP directs AI to:

- Develop, maintain and regularly review a research programme of the highest quality, which will ensure strategic coverage and will receive adequate funding.
- Develop and maintain a strategic capacity to scan the world and analyze emerging threats and opportunities;
- Respond effectively and rapidly to critical emerging issues, drawing on support from the entire movement and its partners, and adjusting its plans, priorities and resources accordingly;
- Be a leading contributor to the human rights community’s engagement, proactively and strategically, with emerging global issues and actors.

- Develop an adequate strategy and mechanisms for crisis work on conflicts, particularly intractable conflicts with regular upsurges of violence.

In connection with the E3 of the ISP, two circulars were distributed at the 2009 ICM that contain background information concerning emerging challenges. Specifically, Circular 17 addressed technology, scientific developments, and human rights. It highlights the human rights implications of advances in science and technology and generally asks the question: “What can and should AI do about it?” (Circular 17, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 51/006/2009). Circular 17 concludes with critical questions for human rights thinking and possible implications for AI.

Circular 16 from the 2009 ICM contained background information concerning the environment and human rights as an emerging challenge. It specifically addresses climate change, the environment and human rights. Again, the paper asks the question: “What can and should AI do about it?” (Circular 16, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 51/004/2009). Like Circular 17, this circular concludes with critical questions for human rights thinking and possible implications for AI.

Arguments In Favor:

This resolution is necessary to prevent abuse of E3 of the ISP. This section of the ISP contains general and far-reaching language that permits Sections to define arbitrarily an “emerging challenge” without a membership vote. Historically, Sections have moved to work on an issue that they see as an emerging challenge by bringing a resolution and having the membership vote on that resolution. However, since the movement has adopted the ISP in its entirety, Sections may begin work on an issue that it deems as falling under the umbrella of E3 of the ISP, while at the same time, avoiding AI’s democratic process.

Additionally, this resolution is necessary for E3 of the ISP to be implemented consistently and to avoid confusion throughout the movement. Without concrete guidelines defining an “emerging challenge,” a Section may begin work under the pretense that it is an “emerging challenge,” which the ISP directs it to address, while other Sections may not consider such an issue to raise to the level of an emerging challenge.

This resolution is also necessary to ensure that a checks and balance system is in effect for the work that individual Sections undertake. Otherwise, the ISP’s ability to work together as an increasingly global movement will be at risk. Individual Sections need guidelines to ensure uniformity and accountability. In addition, AI’s effectiveness will increase through this unity. AI will undoubtedly conquer key issues at a faster pace if each Section has the same frame of reference.

Furthermore, this resolution is needed to ensure continued trust and accountability in the international movement. Terms like “emerging challenges” are not clearly defined or operationalized in the ISP and circulars referencing these topics.. The AI membership has not had enough opportunity to debate and decide mechanisms for tackling “emerging challenges.” Without this opportunity, some efforts to address challenges emerging during an ISP, could seem imposed on the movement and not viewed as democratic. Addressing this problem through

defining and operationalizing “emerging challenges” can only alleviate future concerns over the implementation of E3.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution is based on a misconception. By thinking about emerging challenges, AI is not committing itself to new programs of work. Rather, AI is simply committing itself to determine what the emerging challenges mean to AI’s work. Deciding to take on new areas of work would still occur in the normal decision-making process.

This resolution undermines the concept of an emerging challenge. The challenges at issue are “emerging” because they are not yet direct issues of concern. Rather, they are challenges on the horizon, which have not yet become apparent. It is impossible to craft guidelines to define an “emerging challenge” when AI does not know what issues lie ahead. Moreover, such attempted guidelines are likely to exclude key challenges for which AI is currently unaware, but which may become important to the movement in the future.

This resolution is unnecessary. AI does not need concrete guidelines to determine an “emerging challenge” when it is already bound to abide by AI’s mission and core principles. It is unlikely that an individual Section will begin work on an issue that is in line with AI’s mission and the ISP in general, but that would not be agreeable by the movement as an “emerging challenge.”

This resolution is grounded in distrust and, accordingly, sends a negative image of AIUSA to the next ICM. With so many Sections, Structures, and networks, AI must trust its elected leaders and hired staff to maintain AI’s mission, while following the principles agreed upon in the ISP. Consequently, AI USA membership should trust the IEC to raise issues with AI that it considers to be “emerging” and therefore, worthy of discussion among AI members to determine their potential impact. Passing this resolution will cause AI USA to appear distrustful of its fellow Sections, elected leaders and staff.

Resource Implications:

No immediate resource implications for AIUSA.

Resolution 6: Partnering with External Institutions

Sponsor: Todd Schwarz

[A] WHEREAS Part P2 of the AI Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) calls for “[b]uilding effective partnerships” to “bring together the necessary resources and expertise to create the leverage we need to be more effective” and for “a comprehensive set of tools to build and evaluate new partnerships, including sharing of lessons learnt, selection criteria, best practices, risk assessment, impact assessment, brand management and impact evaluation.”

[B] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the AIUSA Board of Directors shall write, by July 15, 2010, to the IEC and Chairs Forum to recommend to the 2011 ICM that AI:

- (1) continue its traditional ban on partnering with, or receiving money, except that specifically designated for human rights education, from any government, where receipt of the money advances AI's mission and does not compromise AI's actual or perceived impartiality or independence.
- (2) allow only current forms of partnering with corporations, if such activities
 - (a) advance AI's mission and do not compromise AI's actual or perceived impartiality or independence and
 - (b) are subject to the promulgation of guidelines setting forth those permissible limits, which shall to the extent applicable incorporate the principles below.
- (3) partner with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), only
 - (a) where such activities advance AI's mission and do not compromise AI's actual or perceived impartiality or independence; and
 - (b) subject to the promulgation of guidelines setting forth those permissible limits, which shall incorporate the principles below.

[C] BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that guidelines for partnerships and other relationships with external institutions shall include the following principles, as they are applicable to the institution.

- (1) Core Principles:
 - (a) AI shall engage in only those partnership activities that
 - (i) advance AI's mission,
 - (ii) create a significant benefit to AI,
 - (iii) consume AI's resources in proportion to that benefit, and
 - (iv) preserve AI's impartiality and independence.
 - (b) AI shall partner with organizations whose purposes and goals are in alignment with the AI statute and ISP. In particular, AI shall not partner with any organization that advocates or uses violence.

(c) AI shall not partner with any organization that creates even an appearance of compromising AI's impartiality or independence.

(2) Appropriate Institutions:

(a) The guidelines shall identify criteria for appropriate partner institutions.

(b) The guidelines shall identify the circumstances, if any, under which it is appropriate for AI to partner with an organization that focuses on a single country.

(c) The guidelines shall identify the circumstances under which, even if the organization is a strong candidate for partnership and the activities would benefit AI, the organization's identity would distract from other work or create a risk to AI's reputation.

(3) Partnership Agreements:

(a) Each partnership agreement shall be in writing.

(b) Each partnership agreement shall be limited in time to no longer than three years, although such agreements may be renewed as long as they are subject to the review procedures outlined below.

(c) Each partnership agreement shall provide that AI can terminate the agreement unilaterally if implementation fails to comply with the guidelines.

(d) Each partnership agreement shall specify:

- (i) a liaison with the other organization;
- (ii) the responsibilities of each organization;
- (iii) the resources each organization will invest in activities under the agreement; and
- (iv) how liability for any loss is apportioned.

(4) Review of Partnership Agreements:

(a) Neither the IS nor any Section/Structure shall implement a partnership agreement until the IEC or Section/Structure board, as appropriate, approves it.

(b) All IS agreements shall be submitted to the Chairs Forum (CF) for information and the CF shall call to the attention of the IS and IEC any provision that is inconsistent with the guidelines.

(c) All Section/Structure agreements shall be submitted to the IS and the IS shall call to the attention of the Section/Structure and IEC any provision of any Section/Structure partnership agreement that is inconsistent with the guidelines.

[D] BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, absent progress towards submission of this policy and appropriate guidelines to the ICM, the AIUSA Board of Directors shall submit a resolution to the 2011 ICM that is substantively consistent with this resolution.

Background:

Amnesty International (AI) has forged partnerships with other entities and organizations in an effort to create more leverage for human rights change. One example of a successful partnership was evident in AI's work with the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) and Oxfam as part of the Control Arms Campaign. The partnership greatly increased the effectiveness of AI's work. While AI brought human rights policy and research expertise, Oxfam brought specific campaigning techniques and the IANSA contributed its global reach with links in more than 100 countries. Another AI partnership that proved to be effective and successful was AI's work against police violence in Brazil and against violence against women in Albania. In that instance, AI's reputation and brand put human rights issues on the public and political agenda in a way that local organizations could not. (Circular 22, 2009 ICM, AI Index: POL 50/008/2009, page 2).

AI's work on the human rights crisis in Darfur, however, demonstrated the necessity of effectively managing partnerships. Though public awareness was increased by the Coalition that AI joined, AI struggled to establish its more nuanced messages on the conflict. (Circular 22, 2009 ICM, AI Index: POL 50/008/2009, page 2).

In 2009, the importance of partnerships became more pronounced. The Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP), adopted at the 2009 International Council Meeting (ICM), calls for AI to strengthen the human rights movement by "building effective partnerships." Specifically, P2 of the ISP directs AI to focus on strategic partnerships across divides and disciplines as "[t]hrough partnerships we can bring together the necessary resources and expertise." P2 goes on to state that "while respecting its independence and impartiality, AI will [b]uild relationships with others that are mutually beneficial... and aligned to the human rights outcomes we seek; ... [and] [d]evelop a comprehensive set of tools to build and evaluate new partnerships, including sharing of lessons learnt, selection criteria, best practices, risk assessment, impact assessment, brand management and impact evaluation." (P2 of Circular 45, 2009 ICM, ORG 52/004/2009).

It should be noted that the ISP defines "partnerships" as it "is used in the English sense of the word signifying cooperation and relationships with different parties as occasion warrants, and does not necessarily imply the existence of a long-term alliance or a contract."

Circular 22 from the 2009 ICM provides background on partnerships and notes that partnerships with various entities may aid in our work, including partnerships with NGOs, governments, and corporations. However, AI recognizes that effective management of those partnerships is crucial. To aid in that effort, Circular 22's guidelines recommend, in part, that AI be clear about roles and decision making, establish reciprocal transparency and accountability, structure the relationship but build in flexibility, and know when and how to enter and to leave partnerships. (Circular 22, 2009 ICM, AI Index: POL 50/008/2009, pages 4-5, 7).

AI has guidelines in place for accepting funds from outside entities. The IEC adopted the Revised Proposed Guidelines for the Acceptance of Funds and Fundraising by Amnesty International in November of 1999, which note that AI's general principle is that it does not accept direct national government support in an effort to maintain credibility of the movement. Indirect government support is permitted, subject to the funding guidelines. (AI Index: FIN 21/03/99). Additionally, AI has specific guidelines in place for accepting funds from corporations, which provides procedural safeguards for entering into corporate relationships, including the use of reporting mechanisms, record retention, ethical screening, and annual reviews. (AI Index: ORG 20/001/2008). The IEC also adopted a statement of principles, titled "Managing to Protect AI's Image," which specifies a list of criteria to follow when determining whether accepting funds from a particular source will negatively affect AI's image. (Circular 25, 1999 ICM, AI Index: FIN 21/005/2003).

In April 1992, AIUSA's Board of Directors adopted "Public Identification with AI and Cooperation With Outside Groups." The 11-page set of guidelines provide specific direction and/or requirements for AIUSA to form formal partnerships and informal partnerships. The guidelines note that informal partnerships may include the receipt of advice on lobbying and/or speaking at meetings or public events. Additionally, the guidelines specify procedures for entering into formal partnerships. Importantly, it lists the types of groups that may be acceptable for AIUSA to formally cooperate with and be publicly affiliated. Generally unacceptable groups include "Revolutionary Groups, Solidarity Groups, [and] League of Women Voters."

Arguments in Favor:

If AI is to partner with other organizations, it is crucial that it has clear guidelines for this work. This resolution fulfills the mandate of the ISP by developing guidelines to put the ISP into operation. Though the ISP clearly states that AI should "build effective partnerships," it does not indicate how sections should do this. It does, however, specifically state that AI should build effective partnerships while maintaining "its independence and impartiality." The guidelines set forth in this resolution will ensure that AI remains a unified movement respected for its impartiality by providing a clear and consistent interpretation of the ISP's intentions.

This resolution's concrete guidelines for effectively partnering with NGOs, governments, and corporations are more important to AI now than ever before. Traditionally, AI's focus has been on civil and political rights, e.g., death penalty. The organizations with which AI partnered on these issues typically had goals that were easily determined to be consistent with AI's objectives. However, as AI moved into cultural, social, and economic rights, the nuances of various partnering organization's goals become more difficult to discern. For example, if AI partnered with an organization to promote healthcare as a fundamental human right, AI may have also inadvertently partnered with that organization's political agenda towards healthcare reform. Accordingly, concrete guidelines are required to minimize the growing risk that some partnerships will result in diverging interests.

This resolution will ensure that AI is taking maximum measures to protect its well-established reputation and brand. AI's reputation and brand are the most valuable assets that AI possesses. Without these, AI would lose revenue, members, and most importantly, its ability to affect change on global human rights issues.

While the guidelines stated in this resolution are more prescriptive than some within AI, additional protections are necessary to ensure that Sections and Structures are forming partnerships in a consistent way that will not pose a risk for AI's reputation or brand. Because AI's most important asset is at stake, AI needs a formal and specific process to protect the movement. The guidelines in this resolution are clear, succinct, and are sensitive to AI's intent to expand partnerships. These are badly needed; and without them, AI's reputation and work could be at risk.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution is too prescriptive and legalistic. The lengthy and complex guidelines will discourage important partnerships from forming and/or will cause AI to lose some of its current partnerships. Accordingly, the likely result of implementing this resolution will be directly counter to the ISP's goal of "building effective partnerships."

This resolution is unnecessary. AI has adequate guidelines in place for partnering with governments, corporations, and NGOs. AI has had effective partnerships in the past by utilizing its current guidelines. Moreover, there is no indication that AI has needed more formal or concrete guidelines in its past formation of partnerships. This resolution is reactive and will have the effect of limiting partnerships rather than helping AI form mutually beneficial ones.

Moreover, this resolution is redundant because the task of developing guidelines is already set forth in the ISP. Specifically, P2 states that AI will "[d]evelop a comprehensive set of tools to build and evaluate new partnerships." Because the IEC is already tasked to create guidelines, asking the IEC or Chairs Forum to implement AIUSA's proposed guidelines would be inappropriate. For AIUSA to seek to impose so many specific rules on partnering could also be interpreted by the international movement as an unwillingness to work within the ISP and the new arenas into which AI has moved.

This resolution may discourage organizations from partnering with AI due to a fear of the partnership becoming public knowledge. For example, certain local NGOs may be subject to prosecution if their affiliation with AI becomes known. The strict guidelines in this resolution formalize partnerships in a way that may tend to publicize the partnership. In other words, an organization's partnership with AI will undoubtedly be brought to light due to the great deal of paperwork and "red tape" that it must go through in forming the partnership.

This resolution is moot unless and until a strict definition of "partnership" is developed. The term "partnership" remains different in various sections due to cultural and linguistic differences. Specifically, it is unclear whether the guidelines stated in this resolution apply to informal partnerships among AI local and student groups and other organizations or joint projects between an AI section/structure and another organization.

Resource Implications:

This resolution does not have immediate implications for AIUSA because it calls for decisions at the international level. Future resource implications of guidelines for partnerships cannot be determined at this time.

Resolution 7: Defining Membership and Growth

Sponsor: Barbara Sproul

[A] WHEREAS each Section/Structure and internal department applies the definition of memberships (as in Article 15 of the AI Statute) differently;

[B] WHEREAS these differences in applying the term membership undermine AI's ability to have a credible count of members, affecting internal governance, growth, and potentially external credibility;

[C] WHEREAS the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) passed at the 2009 International Council Meeting emphasizes (ICM) growth and renewing membership;

[D] WHEREAS Decision 14 of 2009 ICM asks the IEC to develop a comprehensive Strategy for Growth and one-way growth is measured is in terms of membership

[E] WHEREAS Decision 10 of the 2009 ICM asks for a comprehensive strategy for growth;

[F] WHEREAS Amnesty International (AI) identifies itself, in terms of section, structure, and international membership;

[G] **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the AIUSA Board write, by July 15, 2010, the International Executive Committee, the Chairs Forum, and all Sections/Structures to

(a) develop a standard definition of membership that all Sections, Structures, and internal AI departments will use, taking into account the different levels of involvement among those who donate money, take action, are members of groups or networks, and are volunteer leaders;

(b) apply this standard definition of membership in all communications (such as *The State of the Movement Report*, *The State of Youth Report*, *The International Mobilization Trust Report* and other documents) both internally and externally;

(c) present a resolution to the 2011 ICM to create one Amnesty definition of membership; and

(d) review and clarify documents relating to International Members for consistency, such as 2009 ICM Decision 10, Article 15 paragraph 2, Code of Conduct for International Members and others as appropriate.

Background:

This resolution would require the AIUSA Board to advocate that the movement develop a standard of membership applicable at all levels of AI and apply this definition be used in all reporting, specifically in regard to international members. If the AIUSA Board is unsuccessful in those efforts, the resolution additionally asks the Board to submit a resolution calling for the creation of one standard.

The 2009-2016 Integrated Strategic Plan, adopted at the 2009 International Council Meeting (ICM) calls for “Building new constituencies and renewing membership” in R1 of the Strategy Map. (ORG 52/004/2009). In AI, individual membership is defined in Article 15 of the Statute as:

15. An individual member of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is any person who contributes to the advancement of the mission of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, who acts in accordance with the core values and policies of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, and who has been recognized and registered as a member by an AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL section, structure or affiliated group by virtue of payment of annual dues or having been granted a dues waiver.

Individuals residing in countries, states, territories, or regions where there is no section or structure and who are not members of an affiliated group, may, on payment to the International Secretariat of an annual subscription fee determined by the International Executive Committee, become international members of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL. In countries where a section or structure exists, individuals may become international members of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL with the consent of the section or structure and of the International Executive Committee. The International Secretariat shall maintain a register of such international members.

The Statute further recognizes affiliated groups, such as local groups. While this currently stands as the definition of individual membership, numerous standards are used in other reports. *The State of Youth Report* offers no working quantification of membership, acknowledging that “counting youth membership is difficult because of inconsistent membership definitions and statistical process across the movement.” There are also inconsistent definitions of membership and voting rights within AI, especially regarding youth. For example, in 18% of sections and structures, youth have limited voting rights, and in 12% of sections and structure, they have no voting rights (*State of the Youth Report 2009* FIN 10/005/2009).

In AIUSA, for example, the AIUSA Bylaws defines individual members “as members of AIUSA upon payment of annual membership dues or upon having been granted a dues waiver” and “shall be recognized and registered by AIUSA staff to whom the Board delegates such authority” (Bylaws of Amnesty International USA, as amended January 26, 2008). The AIUSA Bylaws further recognize member groups in AIUSA, for example, local and student groups.

The 2008 Activist Report for AIUSA documents similar issues in defining membership in AIUSA. While dues-paying members are easily tabulated, actual participation is measured in uncertain terms, resulting in totals categorized as “(non-scientific) total # [number] of members” (*2008 Activist Report*). There are categories, such as online members, distinguished from dues-paying members without explanation. Student membership is calculated by noting the lowest and highest estimate of members. For example, the case of California calculates youth membership at 3,475, the average of the lowest (1,390) and the highest (5,560) possible numbers

of student members, making the information approximate at best (*2008 Activist Report*). AIUSA, in its own reporting, utilizes multiple definitions of membership.

The resolution is to review and clarify the documents, decisions, and the AI Statute regarding membership. The resolution specifically mentions International Members, who are AI members not affiliated with a section or structure. The 2009 ICM decided to amend the Statute to extend representation at the ICM to international members. Article 16 of the AI Statute was amended to include a delegate to the ICM from the international membership, as well as additional delegates based on the number of international members, with the appointment of one additional representative for at least 250 members and a maximum of five representatives if there are more than 80,000 (*Circular 46 ICM Decisions 2009 ORG 52/003/2009*).

The International Executive Committee (IEC) has been empowered, in consultation with the Chairs Forum, to create a system by which international representatives will be chosen for the ICM (*Circular 46 ICM Decisions 2009 ORG 52/003/2009*). Furthermore, the 2009 ICM Decision 10 amended the AI Statute for section and structure representation at the ICM. No delegation may exceed a total of six members (*Circular 46 ICM Decisions 2009 ORG 52/003/2009*). Voting rights for sections and structures at the ICM are unaffected by this change in delegation size. (*Circular 46 ICM Decisions 2009 ORG 52/003/2009*).

This resolution calls on the AIUSA Board of Directors to advocate for a uniform standard of membership used throughout the movement and, failing success, to submit a resolution to the 2011 ICM. Any resolution the Board submits to the ICM must be affirmed by the AIUSA AGM, whether by binding or non-binding decision (1998 AGM Decision 2). If this resolution becomes a decision of the 2010 AGM, the timeline for international advocacy of this issue and resolution preparation should also take into account the timeline for resolution submission for the 2011 ICM. Decisions of the 2010 AGM will be forwarded to the Board for implementation for the June 2010 Board meeting. The deadline to submit resolutions to AIUSA's process will be September 1, 2010 and the deadline for resolutions to be submitted to the ICM will be in January 2011.

Arguments in Favor:

This resolution is necessary to resolve inconsistencies with how membership is recorded and defined within AI. This makes AI documents difficult to interpret accurately. For example, the *State of the Youth Report* for 2009 shows a decline in youth membership. This contradicts the *State of the Movement Report 2009*, which indicates an increase in youth membership. A clear standard for membership would help eliminate this kind of internal discrepancy. Furthermore, this conflicting information makes it very difficult to assess the current state of membership, or develop and implement strategy to increase it.

Uniform definitions of membership are necessary if AI is to grow, as decided in the ISP. Creating a common base for all sections would unify language within AI. Better accounting of membership is needed, and this resolution can help this be accomplished by forming a solid basis for planning growth and development. Accurate and consistent accounting of current and future

participation is the only way AI can document, measure, and develop a strong membership base throughout the movement. Furthermore, this resolution would address discrepancies in reporting membership across international sections, making representation at the ICM based on a universal standard.

This resolution will help clarify democratic representation at the ICM. Since membership in part determines representation at the ICM, it is essential that the same standard be applied across sections. Not only are there problems with existing categories, but also new categories, such as e-members, are emerging without a clear accounting for their status or how they will be represented at the ICM. For example, the ICM recognizes 9,000 members on social networking sites and 84,500 e-members, both of which are defined as those who “have taken more than one action for the movement” (*State of the Movement Report 2009* FIN 10/005/2009). This is a vague definition, and one that differs greatly from that used in other AI documentation. The 2009 ICM decided to extend representation to international members, who are members of AI not affiliated with an AI section or structure. As AI moves into new practices and means of participation, standardized definitions are required to account for them accurately. The current discrepancies raise valid questions of how these members are going to be represented at the ICM, and can distort representation. A clear definition would eliminate these questions and ensure that a single standard across the movement, and that there are mechanisms in place to account for new practices.

Uniform definitions of membership are crucial to AI’s plan for success. Renewing membership and meeting target growth goals are part of the Signs of Success for R1 of the current ISP. Without a clear definition of membership, it is difficult to plan effective strategy to move toward this goal. If AI is to be successful in building and renewing members, as envisioned by the ISP, it has to be committed to consistent reporting and understanding of membership across the movement. Otherwise, there is no point in producing reports containing disparate information and membership definitions.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution calls for too strict a definition of membership, which may actually inhibit AI’s growth. People participate in AI through various means, some of whom are not accounted for under the Article 15 of the AI Statue, yet are considered in accounting for participation in different sections and structures. Even some AIUSA’s activists, who are essential for forwarding the mission of AI, may not be accounted for in the membership definitions of the Statute. A strict definition of membership might create a hierarchy among members by differentiating between those who contribute financially and those who devote time to forwarding the goals of AI, for example. This might actually have the effect of discouraging participation. Furthermore, a strict accounting for membership will minimize participation in AIUSA by failing to account for the numerous individuals who dedicate their time, but choose not to pay dues. Since only 25% of those participating in AI are dues-paying members, it is clear that the majority of current participants would be excluded by a strict definition of membership. (*State of the Movement Report 2009* FIN 10/005/2009).

This resolution is unnecessary. There are no inconsistencies in the definition of membership in AI. Discrepancies, if any, are a matter of data collection and reporting. AI has a clear definition of membership and reports this. A review is unnecessary and will create additional, unnecessary bureaucracy in an already complex system. Furthermore, enforcing a specific definition of membership will hamper sections and structures abilities to recognize various levels of participation. For example, AI Australia acknowledges members, who pay the required annual dues, and Human Rights Supporters, who do not pay the full amount but contribute to the success of AI. Additionally, sections and structures with campus/student groups, as well as local groups may have activist in the section involved in AI work, but who are not national members in the section.

Given the different international legal requirements for creating sections of AI, membership also carried diverse legal requirements. Since each section must comply with its host country's standards, there may not be a definition that complies will all nations' standards. Diversity and acceptance of difference are necessary parts of AI; therefore, AIUSA's demanding adherence to a single standard, particularly one currently defined by monetary contributions, could actively work against the stated ISP goal of increasing activism in the Global South and East.

Resource Implications

No immediate resource implications for AIUSA.

Resolution 8: ICM Agenda and Resolutions

Sponsor: Todd Schwarz

[A] WHEREAS AI is a democratic organization responsible to its members through national Sections and Structures;

[B] WHEREAS the Sections and Structures should have the right to propose any resolution to the International Council (ICM) meeting and have a say, through the Chairs Forum, in setting the agenda of the ICM.

[C] **BE IT RESOLVED THAT** AIUSA shall propose to the 2011 International Council Meeting that Paragraph 27 of the Amnesty International Statute be amended to include the language in capital letters:

27. The agenda for the meetings of the International Council shall be prepared by the International Secretariat under the direction of the Chairpersons of the International Executive Committee, **INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL AND CHAIR OF THE CHAIRS FORUM STEERING COMMITTEE AND SHALL INCLUDE ANY RESOLUTION FROM A SECTION OR STRUCTURE THAT MEETS THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION.**

[D] **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the AIUSA Board shall contact other Sections and Structures to seek the requisite number of co-sponsors.

Background:

This resolution seeks to increase membership involvement in the agenda of the International Council Meeting (ICM), AI's global governance body, through involving more closely the Chairs Forum Steering Committee; International Executive Committee (IEC), which is AI's global governance board; and the ICM Chair.

Additionally, this resolution would amend the Statute to clarify that any resolution meeting the procedural requirements for submission would be submitted to the ICM. These requirements are set out in *The Standing Orders of the International Council Meeting*. This resolution also seeks to amend the Statute to officially include the Chair of the Chairs Forum Steering Committee in the agenda-setting process of the ICM.

The International Council, meeting biannually, is the supreme governing body of Amnesty International and is comprised of delegates from AI sections, structures, and the IEC. Meeting biannually, representatives of pre-structures, international candidates, IS staff, and invited guests come together. The IC decides on AI strategy, political, financial and organizational issues for the forthcoming years, as well as is a venue for intersectional dialogue. The International

Council Meetings are not open to the press or public. Attendance is strictly limited to those invited to participate. As it stands in the Statute of Amnesty International, the agenda for the ICM is prepared by the International Secretariat under the direction of the Chairperson of the International Executive Committee, but is done in consultation with the Chairs Forum and the involvement of the ICM Chair and the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). The International Secretariat employs an Agenda Coordinator as well as an ICM Coordinator as part of the Organization Liaison Unit (OLU). They are the staff people who work with PrepCom. The IEC chooses a liaison to work with PrepCom as well.

The role of the Chairs Forum Steering Committee (CFSC) is to present proposals to the IEC and section/structures for their consideration; to prepare meetings of the Chairs Forum in cooperation with the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson of the next ICM and organize follow-up; to manage Chairs Forum activities between meetings; and to meet at least twice a year between Chairs Forums. The CFSC also advises and is accountable to the Chairs Forum and will regularly report on its work to consult, when appropriate, the Chairs Forum (ORG 41/007/2006).

The role of the Chairs Forum is to contribute to international decision-making on policy matters that require consultation and leadership with the movement during the two years in between International Council Meetings. The Chairs Forum, comprised of chairs of AI sections and structures, meets annually. The Chair of the Chairs Forum is the ICM Chair. Among its functions are “to contribute to the development and implementation of the Integrated Strategic Plan and other international decision-making” and “to advise the IEC or decide, as appropriate, on whether policy related, mandate-like substantive decision-making or potential controversy should be delayed and referred to the next ICM” (ORG 41/011/2004).

The ICM PrepCom currently consists of the Chair, Alternate Chair, and three additional members who serve as working party chairs of the ICM. These positions are filled several ways. The Chair and Alternate Chair are directly elected by the preceding ICM. The additional working party chairs are nominated by their Section or Structure for the position. The Chair chooses who will serve based on language and knowledge of the issues of the particular working party and each Working Party is also staffed with a rapporteur (nominated by sections/structures, chosen by the ICM Chair). During the ICM, the PrepCom is comprised of both the chairs and rapporteurs (ORG 50/003/2008).

According to *The Standing Orders of the ICM*, the ICM agenda consists of decision-making sessions (i.e. working parties and the voting plenary), plenary sessions for addressing issues before the entire movement, questions for the IEC and Secretary General, and addressing Section and Structure accountability. Sessions for regional meetings or addressing specific issues, such as a presentation of the Dignity Campaign at the 2009 ICM, forums for the international candidates, and other sessions are also on the agenda. Decision-making at the ICM, as in AIUSA, is done through the consideration of resolutions. Sections, Structures, and the International Executive Committee are all entitled to write resolutions to be submitted to PrepCom for inclusion on the agenda.

The ICM format has evolved to the current structure. As AI now works through the ISP, the PrepCom, together with the IEC and IS, have developed a new vision for the ICM (ORG

50/008/2006). More discussion time has been introduced to the schedule and less emphasis on sessions, which consider resolutions. However, *Circular 2: A Vision for the 2009 ICM* stated that more formal decision-making time would be necessary than in 2007 due to the consideration of the Integrated Strategic Plan (ORG 50 004 2008). The 2009 ICM scheduled four one and a half hour sessions for Working Parties held during three days of the ICM. The Voting Plenary Sessions were held on the final day of the ICM (ORG 50/016/2009). The 2009 ICM was shortened from previous ICMs.

Unlike the decision-making process in AIUSA in which all resolutions properly submitted by the submission deadline to the National Resolutions Committee, are placed on the agenda to be considered at a regional conference, a resolution submitted in accordance with deadline and formatting guidelines can be determined to be out of order by the PrepCom if it concerns work on a particular country and has not been previously discussed by the IEC (ORG 50/002/2006).

Additionally, resolutions on the agenda focus on “strategic” concerns as opposed to operational matters. Definitions of the terms “operational” and “strategic” can be somewhat relative; therefore, established PrepCom practice is to encourage strategic resolutions as the ICM has requested. The PrepCom has the authority to rule operational resolutions out of order, but generally allows the ICM itself to make these determinations when the agenda is adopted at the beginning of the meeting or in the working parties. Statute Amendments, although they may be submitted by any Section, Structure, or the IEC, must “be supported in writing by at least five sections before the opening of the ICM” (ORG 50/015/2009).

For AIUSA to have this resolution considered at the 2011 ICM, it would have to gain the written support of a minimum of four additional Sections/Structures.

Arguments in Favor:

Amending the Statute is necessary to ensure an agenda focused on decision-making and the inclusion of resolutions from Sections and Structures at the ICM. AI is a membership-driven organization with the ICM as the biannual, decision-making meeting. Since there is less time devoted to decision-making at the ICM, the agenda needs to ensure this trend does not continue. The 2009 ICM was shorter than usual, further marginalizing Sections’ ability to make decisions, illustrating another problem with the current practice.

Adding the Chair of the Chairs Forum Steering Committee (CFSC) to the agenda-setting conversation is an important mechanism to engage Sections in setting the ICM agenda. The CFSC, representing Sections and Structures can help the IS, PrepCom, and IEC have a better understanding of the agenda needs of the ICM. Membership voices are more likely to be heard and represented at Chairs Forum that at the IEC or the International Secretariat. Including additional voices in agenda-setting could only improve the ICM. The ICM is the supreme governing body of AI. Everything possible must be done to ensure this meeting reflects the concerns of AI’s global membership.

This resolution is necessary to ensure that all resolutions should be accepted at the ICM. AI Sections and Structures should be trusted in what they submit to the ICM. All resolutions should be on the agenda. Delegates from sections and structures will evaluate what should ultimately become the decisions of the meeting.

Arguments Opposed:

The ICM already accommodates resolutions submitted in accordance with *The Standing Orders*. Even though *The Standing Orders* bar operational resolutions for ICM consideration, the PrepCom practice is to allow the ICM to decide whether or not to take them up. This is already a fair process. If the ICM cannot reject any operational, country-specific, or otherwise improper resolution for consideration, the ICM schedule, which is always tightly packed, may become overloaded with inappropriate resolutions. The ICM tries to limit the resolutions on its agenda to strategic instead of operational. Leaving operational decisions to the members is not good governance.

There is no need to amend the Statute to include the Chair of the Chairs Forum Steering Committee and the ICM Chair in the agenda creation for the ICM. The ICM Chair is already involved. Adding more individuals to the committee setting the agenda will only make the process more drawn out and complex. If there is a problem with the current agenda, a better strategy for addressing this would be for sectional boards to contact the IEC and IS with their concerns. This should be attempted before formally amending the international statute.

If ICMs are to conduct meaningful business, there must be some planning of the agenda in a way to maximize the time and resources available. There are better ways to insure adequate membership input, such as having a resolutions committee that vets resolutions for such things as relevance and redundancy.

Resource Implications:

There are no resource implications for AIUSA.

Resolution 9: AIUSA Resolution Submission Procedure for the International Council Meeting

Sponsor: AIUSA Board of Directors

[A] WHEREAS, the International Council meets in August of odd-numbered years with a submission deadline for resolution in January of that year, and

[B] WHEREAS, AIUSA has resolution deadlines in September, thus requiring that International Council Meeting resolutions be drafted a few days after one Council Meeting to have an opportunity to be binding and submitted by the section for the next Council Meeting, and

[C] WHEREAS, the many issues before the Council are not well known two years before the meeting,

[D] **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that resolutions for the International Council Meeting will automatically be put on the Board's agenda for consideration as an ICM submission within one month of passing at least three regional conferences in even-numbered years, and

[E] **THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that such resolutions appear before a working party and the plenary at the Annual General Meeting so that the section can receive further input.

[F] **THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the *Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process* will be amended to reflect this change.

Background:

This resolution seeks to create an alternate procedure for AIUSA to determine which resolutions to submit to the biannual, international meeting of AI, the International Council Meeting (ICM). The deadline for the submission of resolutions from Sections and Structures to the ICM is usually early January of the year of the ICM. The ICM is usually held in August and is the venue for delegates from AI Sections and Structures to come together to discuss the international movement of AI and to make decisions.

Only the AIUSA Board of Directors is empowered to submit resolutions on behalf of the Section to the ICM. Because the Board of Directors must submit resolutions to the ICM by January of an ICM year, resolutions have to be submitted to AIUSA's resolutions process by the resolutions submission deadline of the resolutions cycle before the ICM, if a member wanted to bind the Board to submit a particular resolution to the ICM. For example, issues resulting from the 2009 ICM that AIUSA members would like to take to the international movement at the 2011 ICM by binding the Board of Directors to submit a resolution, would follow this timeline:

September 1, 2009: AIUSA member submits a resolution (or September 15 for students)

October/November 2009: AIUSA resolution considered at AIUSA Regional Conferences.

March/April 2010: If the resolution from October/November 2009 was passed, the AIUSA resolution is considered at the AGM.

June 2010: If the resolution from March/April 2010 was passed, the AGM Decision is forwarded to Board of Directors. It is binding, unless overturned by two-thirds vote of the Board within one year of passage at the AGM.

January 2011: AIUSA Board of Directors submits resolution to 2011 ICM.

August 2011: ICM considers AIUSA resolution.

This timeline is a result of the AIUSA process and the international process, which are not currently aligned. When resolutions intended for the ICM arose from members in 2008 and passed regional conferences, the Board decided to submit those two resolutions to the ICM by the January 2009 deadline, even though these resolutions had not passed the AGM. After the AGM, the Board requested from the Preparatory Committee for the ICM (PrepCom) to amend its submitted resolutions. The PrepCom agreed despite it being outside of the established deadline.

However, the only mechanism by which a member can seek to bind the Board to submit a resolution at the present time would be to submit a resolution by the September deadline of an odd-numbered year, within a month after the ICM of the same year, so that it could be submitted to the ICM two years later.

This resolution would create an alternate procedure, in addition to the one described above. A resolution that a member intends to submit to an ICM could be submitted by the resolutions deadline directly proceeding as follows in this example for the 2011 ICM if this proposal were adopted:

September 1, 2010: Resolution submitted by AIUSA deadline (September 15 for students).

October/November 2010: Resolution considered at AIUSA regional conference(s).

November/December 2010: If the October/November 2010 resolution passes three Regional Conferences, it is put on the agenda of the Board of Directors for consideration for ICM submission.

January 2011: Resolutions submitted for 2011 ICM.

August 2011: Resolutions considered at 2011 ICM.

Arguments in Favor:

Changing the way AIUSA resolutions can be submitted to the ICM is crucial to allowing members to have an opportunity to propose changes to the international movement. A deadline that is nearly two years before the ICM and only two weeks after the previous ICM is unreasonable. In 2009, the report of the 2009 ICM was not even available when the Resolution Submission Deadline occurred. If this process does not change, the only people in AIUSA who will be able to submit resolutions to the ICM will be members of the ICM delegation, the Board, and a handful of members deeply engaged in AIUSA and AI policy. The engagement of members envisioned by the recent Resolutions Review Committee and resulting Board-adopted changes to decision-making in AIUSA, cannot be fully realized if resolutions intended for the ICM are submitted only by members aware that they must submit them two years in advance. This may seem to be a barrier to engagement.

The eighteen-month period between a submission of a resolution to a Regional Conference and the submission of the same resolution to an ICM is highly burdensome and impractical. In addition, there is not enough detail known about what AI plans to discuss at an ICM that far in advance, for an appropriate resolution to be prepared and submitted to a Regional Conference eighteen months earlier. Having to submit a resolution eleven months in advance of the ICM is challenging enough for members.

This resolution only formalizes the process used to submit AIUSA resolutions to the 2009 ICM. In January 2009, the Board submitted two resolutions that had been passed by Regional Conferences in 2008, but had not yet been approved at an AGM. Although these resolutions passed, the fact that their submission was in violation of the timeline was an argument against them at both the Regional Conferences and AGM. This resolution would prevent the two-year timeline from being used against resolutions submitted only a year before the ICM.

Creating a new avenue for ICM resolution submission in AIUSA is far easier than changing the timing of the AGM, if the current timeline is a concern. Additionally, if the Board submits a resolution from a Regional Conference to the ICM that is later defeated at an AGM, the Board can withdraw the same resolution from the ICM in advance of the meeting.

Arguments Opposed:

The AGM is the venue for decision-making in AIUSA for a reason. There is a danger that Regional Conferences may pass highly contentious or conflicting resolutions, so that the Board will not really have the direction that it needs in deciding whether to submit the resolutions to the ICM before they are considered by an AGM. If changes are made at the AGM, there is no guarantee that PrepCom will allow amendments. Depending on their willingness to make changes months after the submission deadline in determining our own process is disrespectful to their work and to the ICM.

This resolution changes nothing. Members have successfully submitted resolutions for the ICM under the current system. There is no reason to change it. Currently, if a member wants to bind the Board to submit a particular resolution to the ICM, the only way to do so will still be to

submit a resolution two years in advance, right after the last ICM. This resolution only formalizes the process of having the Board consider a resolution for ICM submission shortly after the regional conference. A resolution is unnecessary to achieve this and simply adds an additional layer of bureaucracy to the decision-making process of AIUSA. The process is complex enough. If the underlying concern is about having sufficient time to consider issues related to the most recent ICM and the upcoming ICM before resolution submission, perhaps rethinking the timing of AIUSA's Annual General Meeting would be better than creating more complexity in AIUSA's decision-making process.

This resolution could lead the Board to submit a malformed or inappropriate resolution to the ICM, which could harm AIUSA's reputation within the international movement because it provides insufficient time to consider the international implications of the proposal. Since some regional conferences are not scheduled until mid-November, the resolution's requirement that it be forwarded to the Board within one month, the Board may have only from mid-December to early January to make a decision about whether or not to submit a resolution. Given that this time of year contains two national holidays, and religious holidays for some members of AIUSA, it would be difficult for the Board to come together during this period for a decision.

Resource Implications:

No additions in staff or extra funding would be needed.

Resolution 10: Amending the *Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process* to Allow Drafting Committees and an International Working Party

Sponsor: AIUSA Board of Directors

[A] WHEREAS, the AIUSA Board of Directors adopted the recommendations of the Resolutions Review Committee at its June 2009 meeting;

[B] WHEREAS, these recommendations included empowering Working Party Chairs to form drafting committees between Working Parties and the Voting Plenary on contentious resolutions at AIUSA conferences;

[C] WHEREAS, these recommendations also included having an international working party at the AGM in ICM years to discuss significant resolutions before the ICM;

[D] WHEREAS, implementing these recommendations requires amendments to the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process; and

[E] WHEREAS, recommendations which require amendments to the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process must be submitted as resolutions;

[F] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Resolutions Review Committee (RRC), AIUSA adopts the following amendments to the *Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process*:

- Section 5 is amended to add “J”:

J) Drafting Committees may be formed by decision of the Working Party Chair at regional conferences and the AGM on contentious resolutions. The Working Party Chair appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee from attendees of the said Working Party, who is to bring proposed compromise language to the Voting Plenary of the same conference. Resolutions for which Drafting Committees are formed at conferences are not voted upon at the Working Party, but forwarded directly to the Voting Plenary of the same conference at which point compromise language from the Drafting Committee is considered. Drafting Committees can be formed by the NRC between regional conferences and the AGM to bring compromise language to the AGM on contentious resolutions and resolutions which passed more than one regional conference with textual differences. The NRC appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee and members of the Drafting Committee from among interested members. The Secretary of the Drafting Committee is responsible for bringing proposed compromise language to the assigned Working Party of the AGM.

- Section 3, C, 1 is amended to add “d”:

d) In ICM years, the Board submits ICM resolutions to the NRC for addition to the agenda of a strictly internationally focused Working Party. These resolutions are Non-Binding, but automatically meet the criteria for submission of Non-Binding Resolutions to the AGM articulated in these Standing Rules.

Background:

At its June 2009 meeting, the AIUSA Board of Directors adopted the Resolutions Review Committee's recommendations to strengthen AIUSA decision-making. The Resolutions Review Committee (RRC) conducted a fifteen month review of decision-making and resolutions in particular; their final report and recommendations, *Democracy Forward: Creating a Culture of Decision-Making Success* (hereinafter "*Final Report*"), was presented to the Board of Directors and adopted. Changes to decision-making and related structures and processes are being implemented in AIUSA as a result of this Board decision.

While most of the recommended changes will be accomplished through administrative policies and general changes in practice, two recommendations, to create drafting committees and an International Working Party, require specific amendments to *The Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process*. *The Standing Rules* were decided by the 2007 AGM; *the Standing Rules* can only be amended through the membership resolutions process.

RRC Recommendation 10 would allow for the creation of drafting committees in AIUSA. The RRC noted in their *Final Report* that during decision-making sessions at conferences, contention over a resolution or an aspect of that resolution may be too difficult to resolve in the allotted session. Members representing differing viewpoints on an issue sometimes try to create compromise language during the Working Party or between the Working Party and Voting Plenary, which they can present as an amendment. Additionally, members may choose to work on amendments between the Regional Conference and the AGM. However, there is no formalized process for bringing together opposing sides on contentious issues in order to seek compromise on a point either during a conference or between the Regional Conference and the AGM.

The International Council Meeting has formalized a process. The RRC noted that

At the International Council Meeting, drafting committees are sometimes formed to allow text to be redrafted in an effort to reach consensus language. The RRC identified that contention on an issue/resolution can sometimes be a barrier to members engaging in decision-making on AI's central issues. The nature of the decision-making process can limit an open flow of dialogue, and drafting committees, along with other recommendations herein, will situate options for thoughtful and responsible consensus building within the decision-making process.

Rec. 10 Drafting Committees

Rec. 10.1 Working Party Chairs are empowered to form drafting committees between Working Parties and the Voting Plenary on contentious resolutions at AIUSA conferences. The Working Party Chair appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee from the body and connects him or her with others interested in participating in the Drafting Committee. The Chair announces the time and location that the Drafting Committee will meet so that others in the Working Party can participate. The Secretary of the Drafting Committee is responsible for bringing compromise language to the Voting Plenary the next day, at which point the Drafting Committee is dissolved.

Rec. 10.2 The NRC is empowered to form Drafting Committees between regional conferences and the AGM to bring compromise language to the AGM on contentious resolutions and resolutions which passed more than one regional conference with textual differences. The NRC appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee and members of the Drafting Committee from among interested members. The Secretary of the Drafting Committee is responsible for bringing compromise language to the assigned Working Party of the AGM.

The second change to *The Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process* proposed by this resolution would be the addition of the International Working Party. The AGM is the venue at which resolutions are discussed and decisions of the Section are produced. Because the ICM is a biannual meeting, every-other year at the AGM in the spring, AIUSA has received many of the resolutions submitted to the ICM by the International Executive Committee and Sections and Structures. Rationale for and text of the recommendation is as follows:

Consistent with Rec. 28, policy discussion and consultation need be more prevalent and prominent in AIUSA. Additionally, the RRC found that the majority of AIUSA members are unaware of policy questions facing the international movement. Our research regarding decision-making in other AI sections revealed that many sections provide broadly for consultation and discussion of strategic policy questions facing the movement, particularly questions facing upcoming ICMs. One section in particular receives input from almost all groups in the section on questions facing the ICM; one strategy this section employs to procure such wide discussion and consultation is consultation on international policy questions at the section's AGM.

Rec. 30 International Working Party

In ICM years, there is an international Working Party at the AGM. The Board will select, in consultation with the ICM Delegation and COMRA, and forward a significant amount of ICM resolutions to the NRC for addition to the decision-making agenda. Such resolutions will proceed through the International Working Party and Voting Plenary consistent with procedures related to binding AIUSA resolutions, but will be advisory only.

The International Working Party was piloted at the 2009 AGM. The resolutions and resulting decisions were non-binding, meaning they are advisory only to the Board of Directors.

Arguments in Favor:

Drafting Committees and an International Working Party would create more dialogue and engagement in decision-making. Crafting language to communicate ideas and finding agreement can be protracted. Opposing sides on a contentious issue may not realize the issue over which they clash until the Working Party or Voting Plenary. If it is possible to compromise, the Working Party or Voting Plenary is not the best place for the type of dialogue this may require. Additionally, contentious issues may not be resolved before they are added to the agenda of the AGM or competing versions of the same resolution from different Regional Conferences may

have been passed. Contentious debates may arise as to how to create a coherent decision and a committee could be working between the Regional Conferences and the AGM to come up with new, compromise language. Furthermore, more members can be involved in the crafting of resolutions and fewer time constraints will be involved. This will also streamline conference execution, reducing the likelihood decision-making sessions would run over.

The International Working Party would create necessary additional space the AIUSA AGM for the consideration of issues facing the international movement. Although the Board has a breakfast time discussion of the ICM and conducts consultation, breakfast session is conceived of as informative and does not lend itself to debate on the merits of particular international proposals from outside AIUSA. The International Working Party would provide a venue to do just that. Because these decisions are made in advance of the ICM, the Board can reflect member input when giving directives to the ICM Delegation. More avenues for the discussion of issues facing the international movement of AI can only enhance the engagement of AIUSA members and facilitate their view of themselves as part of a worldwide movement.

Arguments Opposed:

Drafting Committees are contrary to transparency and open debate. There is nothing to prevent members from working together to create amendments. Allowing the Chair to have the authority to create Drafting Committees that will meet outside of the resolutions sessions moves the debate out of the open and into the backrooms of conferences. Decision-making will become less transparent.

There is a danger that the Working Parties and Drafting Committees will tend to consist of the same experienced people, thus limiting instead of expanding the number of AIUSA members involved in decision-making. Newer members may be discouraged from participating if only a select few decision-making participants are actually involved in the crafting of language. Working Parties may cease to have open dialogue and debate under this model.

There is also the danger that members will become disillusioned with the internationally-focused Working Party because any of the resolutions that they approve will be non-binding and also because the Board sets AIUSA's positions for the ICM. International resolutions can be complex. There is already a session, usually in the form of an extended breakfast session at the AGM, to explain both the ICM and the issues on the agenda there.

Resource Implications:

The International Working Party to the AGM every other year, may require the scheduling of a Working Party in addition to those necessary for AIUSA resolutions. This may or may not require the allocation of additional conference room space at the AGM and the necessary technology (LCD projector, microphones, projection screen, and laptops) for that session, depending on the scheduling of Working Parties and the number of available conference space.

Resolution 11: Advancing the International Youth Strategy in AIUSA

Sponsor: AIUSA Board of Directors

[A] WHEREAS the Integrated Strategic Plan recognizes the value of youth engagement and calls on AI to “renew itself through engagement across age groups and with younger people in particular and by sustaining the participation and value of the current active generations;”

[B] RECOGNIZING that Decision 5 of the 2009 ICM calls for “ensuring that youth expertise that already exists across the movement is fully recognized and developed, shared among all AI entities, and integrated into broader work of the movement;”

[C] NOTING AIUSA’s commitment to youth engagement;

[D] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that AIUSA commits to engaging Youth at all levels across the Section, including developing:

- Processes for building and identifying youth skill-sets and expertise in AIUSA
- Cross-cutting retention strategies throughout AIUSA
- Youth engagement and retention strategies within networks and working groups within AIUSA

[E] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED to advance these goals within AIUSA through:

- Developing mentorship strategies in AIUSA that will foster long-term engagement, expertise and retention among youth
- Making individual, national membership and renewal of youth an integral part of the AIUSA section growth strategy

[F] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that AIUSA will be an active participant in advancing the Youth Strategy with other AI sections;

[G] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that AIUSA will work with other Sections and Structures to foster intersectional youth cooperation and engagement.

Background:

This resolution seeks to build on AIUSA’s work with youth to advance the International Youth Strategy. The resolution calls for AIUSA to foster long-term engagement among youth members and develop specific human rights and organization expertise to build and grow AIUSA. The 2005 International Council Meeting (ICM) adopted Decision 18, “International Youth Strategy.” The purpose of the decision was to enhance “human rights impact through advancing the central

participation of young people in the protection and promotion of human rights for all...” The International Youth Strategy sought to increase engagement, activism, and participation among youth. It also directed all parts of the movement to develop plans within the stated framework, allocate appropriate resources, and report results to the Chairs’ Forum and the 2007 ICM.

With the help of the International Youth Strategy Development Committee, the IEC circulated a draft strategy for movement-wide consultation in 2005. The strategy followed the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) timeline, and thus, was intended for AI’s work during 2005-2010. The strategy covered three inter-related areas: the participation of young people in AI; AI’s engagement with young people and youth organizations; and activism for, by, and with young people towards human rights impact. (International Youth Strategy, AI Index: ACT 76/001/2005). The overall stated youth strategy vision is to “enhance human rights impact through advancing the central participation of young people in the protection and promotion of human rights for all, by engaging them in upholding universal human rights values, by empowering them to take action in their local and global communities, and by integrating them at all levels of our organization.”

ICM 2007 Decision 11 called on Sections, Structures, and the IEC to ensure a more robust implementation of the International Youth Strategy. It also directed the IEC to appoint an International Youth Advisory Board to report to the 2009 ICM on the implementation of the International Youth Strategy.

ICM 2009 Decision 5 tasked the IEC with updating the International Youth Strategy for the next ISP period, or for the period of 2010 to 2016. Moreover, the IEC is instructed to prioritize coordinated youth work, recognize youth expertise, and establish clear lines of accountability for Sections and Structures to the International Secretariat (IS) in the delivery of youth work.

Circular 26 from the 2009 ICM provided a State of the Youth Report, which showed global and regional trends of the work done for, by and with youth across AI since the adoption for the International Youth Strategy in 2005 (Circular 26, 2009 ICM, AI Index: ORG 50/009/2009). The report noted that the definition of youth ranged from twelve to thirty-three years of age, depending on local custom. Moreover, 65% of the fifty-six sections and structures surveyed have a youth program in place. The report recognized that while youth remains an essential constituency, the movement has yet to fully implement its stated recognition of young people as a priority group through local and international operational planning.

AIUSA has a history of work with youth. AIUSA has had in the past national staff and volunteer leadership specifically focused on student and youth engagement. Specific examples of youth programs are the National Student Program, several years ago, and the more recent National Youth Program called for in 2003 AGM Decision 6. This decision called for program staff, a youth steering committee appointed by the Youth Action Committee, and youth-specific materials. Additionally, 2003 AGM Decision 5 sought to increase youth representation in AIUSA volunteer leadership structures. Additional examples include volunteer leadership like the National Youth Advisory Committee (formerly the National Campus Advisory Committee) and youth-focused leadership trainings. The 2005 *Membership Mobilization Department Activist Growth and Development Blueprint* outlined the development of the National Youth and Student

Program and outlined a strategy for expanding youth involvement and retention in AIUSA. A key part of the strategy was the centralized distribution of materials to local youth groups, freeing up regional staff to provide more extensive training and organize assistance to groups. (AI Index: ACT 76/003/2006). It also sought to develop a strategy development for long-term youth engagement, taking youth from high school groups through to a young professionals initiative, to local group engagement. This program and related activist structures do not currently exist in AIUSA. In 2007, youth engagement became part of the function of the National Training Program, which has also since been restructured.

Restructuring and the current economic climate have impacted Staff and programming. AIUSA is currently hiring a national youth coordinator to focus on the development of youth and help rebuild both the strategy of engaging youth and the national structures that support youth engagement. AIUSA Staff have identified areas of work necessary to support youth engagement such as training, human rights education, mentorship programs between youth and non-youth activists, group efficacy, and reinstating youth-focused committees like the National Youth Advisory Committee. New youth programming in AIUSA is in the early stages of development.

The 2008 Activist Report indicated that AIUSA has one of the largest numbers of student groups among all AI sections with approximately 1,321 student groups in 2008. The National Vitality Reports prepared in the former AIUSA National Field Program report 1401 student groups in 2004, 1570 in 2003, and 1582 in 2002 (*National Vitality Report*, 2004, 2002). However, AIUSA does not have a high retention rate among youth after they leave campus groups or otherwise age out of the category, as local group participation has declined in this period and rates of national membership have remained relatively static.

For advancing the current international youth strategy, other sections have adopted clear plans. For example, AIUK's plan to have youth groups at 90% of universities is the kind of concrete goal AIUSA needs within our Section to be part of the movement. (AIUK 2009 Active Membership Sub-Committee Strategy Implementation Report Student Strategy). Similarly, the Danish Section of AI adopted its own clear youth strategy. Specifically, it chose five out of the nineteen goals listed in the International Youth Strategy on which to improve and upgrade its work. (Youth strategy, Danish Section, Approved by the Danish Board November 2008).

Arguments in Favor:

This resolution is necessary for AIUSA to conduct its own youth strategy in concert with the international strategy. By this resolution's concentration on increasing AI's loyalty with its youth, youth in AIUSA, in turn, will be motivated to continue a long-term membership with AI. Additionally, identifying and developing skills within AIUSA's youth will make AIUSA a stronger and more vibrant section. The emphasis on building expertise among youth is crucial to AIUSA's ability to grow the membership and continue to indentify new activists passionate and skilled in which AIUSA depends on members. Identifying future leaders in AIUSA is key to the section's continued success. Moreover, this resolution will ensure that AIUSA's growth remains consistent with other sections committed to youth participation.

This resolution will promote more efficient engagement, participation, and activism among youth. AIUSA has strong youth participation, but unlike other sections, does not have as aggressive and clear plan. The Youth Strategy is an excellent opportunity for AIUSA to become a leader in advancing the international strategy and fully engaging youth, both as youth and as long-term activists and future leaders of the movement. Proactively advancing the international strategy will also help AIUSA youth have more a stronger connection to youth throughout the international movement.

AIUSA is successful at engaging youth members, but retention is an ongoing problem. Without a coherent strategy focused on recruiting and long-term membership, youth recruitment will not result in growth in membership or engagement for AIUSA. This AIUSA youth strategy is focused on building skills in youth while engaging them both as activists and national members, deepening their commitment to AI.

Arguments Opposed:

This resolution does not include goals that are measurable, nor does it call for AIUSA to develop a comprehensive youth strategy. Many other sections have a youth strategy, which they report and monitor. For example, AIUK's youth strategy aims to have student groups at 90% of UK universities and they report to have achieved having student groups at 61% of UK universities. (AIUK Section, "Active Membership Sub-Committee Strategy Implementation Report, Student Strategy"). Accordingly, this resolution fails to address concepts that are important for developing a successful youth strategy, such as measurable goals.

This resolution is unnecessary. AIUSA has an excellent track-record of youth engagement based upon proven methods. AIUSA's youth work is already robust in light of the large growth in the numbers of youth members and campus groups. AIUSA is not bound to have a sectional youth strategy. It already fulfills the spirit of the international youth strategy and will continue to do so in its work with youth engagement. AIUSA is already working on promoting membership throughout the section and engaging members. This resolution will lead to an inefficient strategy in AIUSA.

AIUSA has had several youth strategies and programs over the years. The 2005 Blueprint also identified youth member retention as an important issue, for example. Previous work in earlier time periods such as the 1990s did as well. However, youth retention has not been achieved. Similarly striving for the same goal has not worked. It is not clear that this strategy would achieve better results. Additionally, while growing and deepening youth involvement is important, AIUSA should recognize that this strategy is for a group whose status is inherently temporary. To deepen member involvement, retention, and strengthen expertise, AIUSA will need to adopt strategies to achieve this for all members.

Resource Implications:

Exact expenditures necessary to implement this resolution in AIUSA are unclear at this time, and largely depend on how this resolution is implemented. A staff position for youth work has

already been allocated. The cost of necessary training, volunteer structures, materials, and additional programming are unclear. Implementing this resolution may or may not require human and material resources in excess of planned allocations.

About the Membership Resolutions Process

Why Resolutions?

Amnesty International is a grassroots organization. Any member or group of members has an opportunity to impact the mission, method, policy, organization or allocation of resources. Resolutions are a means by which individual members or groups of members can influence policy on a regional, national, or international level. The purpose of a resolution is to make a statement to either direct a change in policy, a change in the method for instituting policy, or a change in AI's organizational structure. A resolution can be as simple as asking staff to clarify current procedures, or as complex as requesting a change in AI's mission.

Initial Considerations

A resolution should be written only after consideration of the following:

1. *Identify the issue:* The sponsor should identify the specific problem that he or she would like to be addressed.
2. *Identify the ideal outcome:* The sponsor should formulate a specific solution to this problem and be clear about what should change and how that change would work. The sponsor considers whether the idea can be handled only by a resolution (i.e., certain policy and/or mission issues), or if it can be handled through discussion with a Regional Office, a Board member, or a volunteer leader.
3. *Learn about the issue:* The sponsor should learn what AI/AIUSA has done on this issue in the past. The resolutions database should be consulted to ensure this issue has not been addressed in a previous AGM decision. If the idea concerns a mission or policy issue, discussion with staff, Board members, or an affected co-group member, at an early stage is advisable in order to guarantee the most effective resolution possible.
4. *Ask for change:* The sponsor should ask for the change from the Board, relevant staff, and/or relevant volunteer leadership structures.
5. After completing these steps and if the response to the request is unsatisfactory, only then should a sponsor submit a resolution.

6. *Focus on substance rather than implementation:* The focus of the resolution should be to put forth an idea for change in program priority, policy, or approach, but the resolution should avoid mandating specific staffing or budget proposals (i.e. avoid mandating the creation of a new staff position or requiring the expenditures of specific sums of money). The Board and staff should be afforded flexibility in resolution implementation and be able to focus on intent and rather than the administrative details it may require.

Resolutions at Regional Conferences

Once a resolution is formulated, the author (sponsor) submits it using the Resolutions Submission form and following all guidelines. The resolutions submission deadline is September 1, with an extension until September 15 for members of a registered student groups. The National Resolutions Committee (NRC) will assign resolutions to Working Parties, organize and combine resolutions when necessary, and prepare background information. The NRC works with the sponsor to further develop the resolution for consideration at the regional conferences.

At the regional conference Working Party, the resolution is debated and voted upon. If passed, it is forwarded to the regional conference Voting Plenary for a final vote.

At the Voting Plenary, all resolutions are again discussed and voted upon, including late resolutions. A late resolution, subject to a ruling from the NRC, may be introduced directly to a Working Party or to the Voting Plenary of a regional conference after all other business has been attended. If it passes the Voting Plenary, it goes to the AGM, as do all the other resolutions that passed the regional conference Voting Plenary session.

Resolutions at the AGM

All resolutions, which are adopted by the regional conference, will automatically be placed on the agenda of the Annual General Meeting (AGM) by the NRC. At the AGM, the resolutions will follow in the same process as the

regional conference, going first to the Working Parties and then to the Voting Plenary.

A Non-binding Resolution may also be introduced directly to the AGM either during a working party or at the plenary, if time permits. If such a resolution passes at the Voting Plenary, it is considered a Non-Binding AGM Decision, which is still forwarded to the Board for consideration but is in no way binding on the Board.

Resolutions Forwarded to AIUSA'S Board

Resolutions passed at the Voting Plenary of the AGM are passed to the AIUSA Board of Directors for implementation. The Board may overturn a resolution by a two-thirds vote. Each year the Board submits a report to the membership on the implementation of the previous year's resolutions.

The International Council Meeting (ICM)

The implementation of resolutions with implications for the international movement requires that the Board submit a resolution on this topic to the next ICM. The International Council meets biannually to consider resolutions submitted by Amnesty International sections. The process of consideration is similar to that at the AGM: there are working parties, and voting plenary sessions. Resolutions which pass an ICM are submitted to the International Executive Committee (IEC), which is responsible for implementing them and reporting on their implementation.

Parliamentary Procedure

AIUSA uses *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* for decision-making in both Working Parties and the Voting Plenary. The purposes of these rules are (1) to establish a clear process understood by all; (2) to ensure that all views are fairly represented; and (3) to make decisions as efficiently as possible. A chart of commonly used motions and a guide for the session are attached to this packet.

Who's Who in the Membership Resolutions Process Voting Sessions

The People in the Room:

Members: Working parties and voting plenary sessions are internal meetings of AIUSA. Only voting members of AIUSA and authorized delegates of student and local groups may make motions and vote. Participants are asked to come prepared by reading the resolutions packet. They should be respectful of others, willing to voice their opinions, and even more willing to let others voice theirs. Participants should follow the order set by the Chair, asking for information, proposing amendments, or making arguments at the times they are requested. Everyone is asked to remember that it is the clarity of intent that is the goal; amendments should be offered on substance, not form (e.g. grammar).

Sponsors: The authors of the resolution at a regional conference. The sponsor usually introduces the resolution and speaks on its behalf at the Regional Conference Working Party. However, when the floor begins consideration of the resolution, the assembled body owns the resolution and not the sponsor. Resolutions at the AGM do not have individual sponsors.

Resource People: When there are questions about what AI is already doing on a specific issue, or about the financial or personnel implications of a resolution, there are usually a handful of volunteers, Board members or staff who are best able to provide the answers. When possible, an effort is made to foresee who will be needed in any particular discussion and to have them be present. The Chair should know who these resource people are and be able to call upon them if questions arise.

The People Up Front:

Chair: The Chair is an AIUSA member who is well versed in the resolutions process and parliamentary procedure. It is the job of the Chair to make sure that the people in the room know what is going on, keep track of where they are in the process, and ensure that all substantive points are heard while avoiding spending time on

redundancy and minor grammatical points. A good Chair will make the process clear, keep the discussion moving, and get finished on time. It is **not** the job of the Chair to direct the outcome of debate on a resolution. The Chair only has authority to rule on points of order. A Working Party or Voting Plenary may have two Chairs, who usually alternate resolutions.

Rapporteurs: Rapporteurs are the secretaries of the plenary session. Resolutions are usually displayed on a screen. One Rapporteur works with the LCD display, inserting proposed amendments, so that everyone knows exactly what is being debated. All amendments that pass remain, as does a note as to the final vote. The other Rapporteur sits next to the Chair, keeping detailed notes on the session, including the stated purpose of the resolution, the basic substance of any amendments proposed, and arguments for or against an amendment or the resolution. Precise language of all amendments, as well as the vote tallies on each amendment and on the resolution as a whole, are also noted. After the Working Party or Voting Plenary is over, the Rapporteurs compare notes and make sure that they have an accurate record of the debate and votes. The Chair will approve the final notes and submit the notes and the final resolution language to the National Resolutions Committee.

Working Party Rapporteurs also prepare a brief report to read for the Voting Plenary as each resolution from that Working Party is presented, so the participants know what was considered. The report is a summary of the issues addressed and amendments made to each resolution that passed (including the important amendments that may have failed).

Runners: Runners are volunteers who do exactly what their name implies: they run to get whatever material or human resources the Working Party or Voting Plenary requires. This job could entail running to get markers, or tracking down a resource person who needed to answer a point of information. Runners also count votes and report the count to the Chair.

Definition of Terms in the Membership Resolutions Process

Abstention: A voter does not vote in favor or against a motion, but still wants that opinion to be recognized. An abstention is not a vote, and hence is not factored either way into the vote results. Abstaining may indicate confusion or disagreement with the procedure on the part of the abstainer.

AGM (Annual General Meeting): The principal decision-making body of AIUSA. Resolutions passed by majority vote of AIUSA members present for the voting process determine the general program and policy of AIUSA.

AIUSA: Amnesty International of the U.S.A., or the U.S. section of Amnesty International.

AIUSA Staff: At the Board's direction, the staff implements AGM and Board decisions, and coordinates the day-to-day work of AIUSA.

Amendment: A proposed change to a resolution. This proposed change must be debated and voted upon. If passed, this change will be incorporated into the resolution.

Note: Amendments to amendments may be proposed, but amendments to amendments are not allowed.

Note: Friendly amendments must be debated and voted upon, unless adopted by unanimous consent.

Board of Directors: Elected by AIUSA members, the Board develops policy and sets priorities for the work of AIUSA. It oversees the implementation of AGM decisions, and makes decision on issues arising between AGMs. If the Board judges a resolution to be contrary to AI's mission or policy, or prohibitive because of financial implications or impossible to implement for other substantial reasons, the resolution may be overturned by a two-thirds vote of the full Board.

Bylaws: The document that outlines the purposes and structure of AIUSA.

Chair / Co-Chairs: the person(s) who impartially direct the working party or plenary. A Chair does not offer opinions or take part in debate on any questions. He or she **recognizes** speakers; rules them **out of order** (if, for example, someone else is recognized or speaker talks too long, etc.); makes procedural rulings, etc. making sure discussion runs smoothly and that the rules are followed.

Floor: The body of people assembled who are participating in the voting plenary or Working Party sessions.

ICM (International Council Meeting): The supreme decision-making and governing body of Amnesty International, comprised of representatives from all AI sections and meeting every two years. Resolutions passed by an Amnesty section, which would have international consequences, are considered at the ICM.

IEC (International Executive Committee): Elected by the International Council, the Committee supervises the work of Amnesty International. It makes major decisions on issues or international importance that need to be resolved between ICMs. The IEC also oversees implementation of ICM decisions.

IS (International Secretariat): The central office (located in London) of AI and staff who coordinate the day-to-day work of AI. They outline overall objectives and strategies for AI actions and develop specific actions. The IS implements the decisions and plans of the ICM and IEC.

Motion for the Previous Question: Colloquially referred to as "moving to call the question" or "calling the question." This is a motion for a vote on the last question under consideration (i.e. deciding whether or not it is time to end debate and to vote on an amendment or a resolution). This is not the actual vote on an amendment or resolution. This motion is not debatable.

Point of Information: A question asked by someone on the floor to the chair, or through the chair to the relevant person, for relevant information to the question under discussion.

Point of Order: A statement, usually made by someone on the floor, to remind the body of a rule or procedure. Chair is called upon to make a ruling on this point and to enforce the rules of procedure.

Resolution: A formal motion put to the floor in order to be voted upon. A resolution may propose a change in policy, method or organization, directed either at Amnesty International or AIUSA.

Resolutions Plenary: See Voting Plenary.

Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised: Rules of parliamentary procedure used in the AIUSA Membership Resolutions Process, unless superseded by Standing Rules or the Bylaws.

Section: A recognized Amnesty International structure of a particular country, state or territory generally having three or more active groups who participate to some degree in coordinated human rights work.

Late Resolutions and Non-Binding Resolutions: A resolution not properly submitted by established resolutions submission deadlines/guidelines and brought to a regional conference or the AGM either during a Working Party or at the Voting Plenary session.

A Late Resolution which passes a Voting Plenary at a regional conference will proceed to the AGM with the same status as all properly submitted resolutions.

A Non-Binding resolution brought directly to the AGM and passed at the Voting Plenary session is forwarded to the Board. Such a resolution is advisory only, and is **not binding** on the Board.

Late and Non-Binding resolutions are subject to a ruling as to whether or not they are in order and can be presented at the conference. A late resolution would be considered in order if it was intended to address an issue emerging after the resolution submission deadline, which cannot wait until the next resolutions cycle. Please see the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process for more details about the criteria for Late Resolutions.

For more information, please see the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolution Process.

Standing Rules of the AGM: A set of regulations guiding the process of decision-making at the

AGM, which must adopt these rules at the opening plenary of the AGM in order for them to come into effect. A copy is attached as an appendix to this packet.

Standing Rules of the MRP (Membership Resolutions Process): A set of regulations guiding the process of decision-making within the Membership Resolutions Process of AIUSA. A copy of these rules is attached as an appendix to this packet.

Statute: The document outlining the goals, methods and structures of Amnesty International. It can only be amended by a two-thirds vote of the ICM.

Voting Member: An individual member of AIUSA (one who has paid dues or filed a valid dues waiver to the organization within the past calendar year), or an authorized delegate member of a local or student group who has filed a Group Voting Authorization Form. Voting members will be required to establish their voting eligibility, and will be given a special voting card to use at both working parties and the voting plenary session.

Voting Plenary: A meeting of all those attending a regional conference or AGM which reviews the recommendations of working parties (see below), considers further debate and votes to either defeat resolutions or pass them on to the Board of Directors.

Working Party: A body that debates resolutions, records its debate and actions taken and prepares a report for the Voting Plenary. A working party can either defeat a resolution or pass it for consideration at the voting plenary session. Because they are more intimate, working parties are traditionally the place for more in depth discussions of, and proposal of amendments to, particular policy issues and resolutions.

Acronym Guide

AC – Area Coordinator	and the implementations of ICM decisions.
ACSC –Area Coordinator Steering Committee	IS – International Secretariat.
AMD – Activism and Membership Development. AIUSA Staff Department.	ISP – Integrated Strategic Plan
AGM – Annual General Meeting	LAN – Legal Action Network
AGMPC – Annual General Meeting Planning/Program Committee.	LC – Legislative Coordinator.
AI – Amnesty International	MAAC – Multi-Cultural Assessment and Advisory Committee
AIUSA – Amnesty International USA. The USA Section of Amnesty International.	MARC – Mid-Atlantic Regional Conference
CAN – Corporate Action Network	MARO – Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.
CAP – Country Action Program	MCOD – Multi-Cultural Organizational Development Plan
Co-group – Country Coordination Group	MRP – Membership Resolutions Process
GAN – Government Action Network.	MSP – Military, Security, and Police Transfers.
GIG – Global Impact Goals	MSPWG – Military, Security and Police Transfers Working Group
HPN – Health Professionals Network	MWRC – Mid-West Regional Conference
HRE – Human Rights Education.	MWRO – Mid-West Regional Office.
HREN – Human Rights Educators Network	NC – Nominating Committee. Also known as the NomCom
ICM – International Council Meeting.	NERC – Northeast Regional Conference
IEC – International Executive Committee. The board elected by delegates at the ICM to supervise the IS	NERO – Northeast Regional Office.

NRC – National Resolutions Committee. Also known as the **ResCom**.

NSYP – National Student and Youth Program

NTP – National Training Program

NWFA – National Week of Faith in Action

NWSA – National Week of Student Action

NYAC – National Youth Advisory Committee

OUTfront – AIUSA program to advocate for the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender persons.

POC – Prisoner of Conscience

PADP – Program to Abolish the Death Penalty

RAN – Regional Action Network

RC – Regional Conference

RO – Regional Office

RPG – Regional Planning Group

SAC – Student Area Coordinator

SDPAC – State Death Penalty Abolition Coordinator

SFC – Special Focus Case

SIF – Special Initiatives Fund

SRC – Southern Regional Conference

SRO – Southern Regional Office

UA – Urgent Action

UAN – Urgent Action Network

VP – Voting Plenary session. Part of the Membership Resolutions Process.

WARN – Worldwide Accelerated Response Network

WOOC – Work On Own Country rule

WP – Working Party. A part of the Membership Resolutions Process.

WRC – Western Regional Conference

WRO – Western Regional Office.

STANDING RULES FOR THE AIUSA MEMBERSHIP RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

(adopted March 25, 2007)

1. Controlling Principles
 - A. It is the duty of all those individuals and bodies elected, appointed, established or recognized by these Standing Rules to make the procedures, processes and structure of AIUSA Resolutions Process as accessible, readily understood and friendly as possible.
 - B. The Standing Rules of the Resolutions Process of Amnesty International of the USA, Inc. (“AIUSA”) must be in accord with the Certificate of Incorporation and the bylaws of AIUSA (“Bylaws”).
2. National Resolutions Committee (“NRC”)
 - A. The AIUSA Board of Directors (“the Board”), at its summer meeting, shall appoint a National Resolutions Committee (“NRC”) to oversee and manage the Resolutions Process for the coming year:
 - 1) Establish reasonable rules for the resolutions process, to be set forth annually in the Resolutions Guidelines and Submission Form and conveyed to the membership at least 90 days prior to the September 1st resolutions submission deadline (September 15th for students);
 - 2) Assist and prepare the sponsors of all properly submitted Resolutions;
 - 3) Prepare the Resolutions Packets; reword and combine resolutions, provided that the intent of the original resolutions is not altered and the approval of the sponsors is secured for Resolutions at Regional Conferences;
 - 4) Provide the text of properly submitted and Binding Resolutions to members through print and online communications mechanisms, and provide online discussion of resolutions for members;
 - 5) Communicate with regional and AGM staff to coordinate process logistics; to this end, regional representatives shall serve on any regional conference planning committees and/or groups, and the Chair of the NRC on the AGM planning committee;
 - 6) Ensure the bylaws, standing rules, a summary of Robert’s Rules of parliamentary procedures are available to all members, and all properly submitted or Binding Resolutions are provided to all members at conferences;
 - 7) Promote participation in and understanding of the Resolutions Process; provide overview of the resolutions process at the Opening Plenary of each Regional Conference and AGM;
 - 8) Appoint, train and oversee the officers of the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary;
 - 9) Assign Resolutions to the appropriate Working Parties;
 - 10) Assist the Working Party officers in preparing reports to the Voting Plenary, and ensure that copies of all resolutions passed by the Working Parties are available at the Voting Plenary; and
 - 11) Forward to the general secretary of the Board all resolutions passed by the Regional Conferences and AGM, and reports of deliberations. AGM reports should include status of each resolution, whether binding or non-binding; and if non-binding, whether passed by a Working Party and the Resolutions Plenary, or presented solely to the Resolutions Plenary.
 - B. All resolutions passed in the Regional Conference Resolutions Plenary will be forwarded to the NRC, which shall prepare said resolutions for presentation at the following AGM, unless they are purely regional in their scope.
3. Resolutions
 - A. Any registered AIUSA member (individual member or member group) in good standing may sponsor a resolution, except that only individual members may sponsor resolutions to amend the Bylaws. Member groups sponsoring resolutions must designate on the Submission Form their authorized voting member or another individual member of AIUSA to serve as presenter at the Regional Conference.
 - B. Regional Resolutions.
 - 1) There are two (2) categories of resolutions at the Regional Conference: “properly-submitted” resolutions (“Resolutions”) meeting all submission requirements set forth herein and in the Resolution Guidelines and Submission Form and submitted by the September 1st deadline (September 15th for members of student groups), and “late” resolutions not properly submitted (meeting all requirements) by the established submission deadlines
 - a) Only properly-submitted Resolutions will have background prepared by the NRC, be placed in the Resolutions Packet for the Regional Conferences to which they are submitted, and be assigned to

Working Parties by the NRC.

- b) Late resolutions may be presented at the Regional Conference, subject to a determination by the NRC Regional Representative that the resolution is in order:
 - i. the sponsor/presenter is eligible to vote at the conference;
 - ii. the resolution does not propose an amendment to the Bylaws or these Standing Rules;
 - iii. the resolution is submitted to the NRC Regional Representative on paper and electronically, and the sponsor bears responsibility for providing copies of the resolution text for Working Party participants; and
 - iv. the resolution in question or other resolutions substantially like it have not already been assigned or defeated elsewhere at the same conference.
 - c) Late resolutions are intended to address urgent issues that arise after the submissions deadline.
- 2) Resolutions may be submitted to multiple regions.
- 3) All resolutions (whenever submitted) passed by the Resolutions Plenary of any Regional Conference shall be forwarded to the AGM, unless they are purely regional in scope.

C. AGM Resolutions

- 1) There are two categories of resolutions at the AGM: “Binding Resolutions” which are passed by and forwarded from one or more Regional Conference; and “Non-Binding Resolutions” which have not been passed by a Regional Conference.
 - a) Binding Resolutions will be assigned to Working Parties by the NRC prior to the AGM. If passed by the AGM, the resulting decisions shall be binding upon the board, unless overturned by a two-thirds vote of the Board, as provided in the Bylaws.
 - b) Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented by anyone eligible to vote at the AGM. If passed at the AGM, implementation of the resulting decisions will be at the discretion of the Board.
 - c) Non-Binding Resolutions will be assigned by the NRC to Working Parties upon determination by the NRC that they are in order:
 - i. the sponsor meets the requirements for Late Resolutions at Regional Conferences (above);
 - ii. the resolution or one substantively like it was not defeated at a Regional Conference in the same resolutions cycle;
 - iii. the resolution is timely: addresses a human rights issue arising after the Regional Conferences, or AI policy or procedure issues on which volunteer input is necessary and appropriate, arising from the floor of the current conference;
 - iv. the resolution is urgent: addresses an issue that cannot wait until the next resolutions cycle.
- D. Late or Non-Binding Resolutions determined to be in order by the NRC may be presented at the Regional Conferences or AGM at three points:
- 1) If submitted in writing to the Working Party assigned by the NRC prior to the adoption of the agenda, such resolutions can be presented as amendments and added to the Working Party agenda by majority vote of the Working Party.
 - 2) Late and Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented to any Working Party assigned by the NRC for consideration after the Working Party has taken action on all the resolutions on its agenda, and taken up by majority vote of the Working Party.
 - 3) Late and Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented at the Resolutions Plenary after action has been taken on all the resolutions passed by the Working Parties, and may be taken up for consideration by majority vote of the Resolutions Plenary.
- E. After action has been taken on all the resolutions passed by the Working Parties, resolutions which fail in a Working Party may be taken up for consideration by 2/3 majority vote of the resolutions plenary.

4. Voting

- A. Members are entitled to vote under the Bylaws of AIUSA. Eligible voting members include dues paying members, individuals who have submitted a valid “dues waiver” and those holding valid Group Voting Authorization Forms (one designated voter per member group), in accordance with such criteria and time constraints as the Board shall reasonably establish.
- B. In accordance with the Bylaws, only individual members may vote on Bylaws Amendments.
- C. Voting in Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary sessions at all conferences shall be taken by a show of voting cards clearly labeled “Member” or “Group”. However, only under extraordinary circumstances or to accommodate physical impairment, the chair or chairs may direct a vote to be taken by other means.

INTERNAL DOCUMENT—FOR AIUSA MEMBERS ONLY

5. Quorum
 - A. In accordance with the Bylaws of AIUSA, a quorum of individuals holding at least one valid voting card (40 at Regional Conferences; 100 at the AGM) must be present in order for business to be conducted at any Resolutions Plenary.
 - B. It is the duty of the Chair to establish that a quorum is present before opening the Resolutions Plenary.
 - C. If a quorum is not present, the Resolutions Plenary may be delayed until a quorum is obtained, or the Resolutions Plenary may be adjourned.
 - D. If a Resolutions Plenary is adjourned without a quorum having been attained, no official business is conducted there (except a motion to adjourn or such other motions allowed under Robert's Rules of Order); no resolutions are forwarded from such Regional Conference to the AGM, or from such an AGM to the Board. Business transacted prior to establishing the absence of a quorum shall be valid.
 - E. Sponsors of resolutions not considered in a Regional Resolutions Plenary because of lack of quorum may attempt to have their resolutions considered as Late Resolutions at other regional conferences or as Non-Binding Resolutions at the next AGM.
6. Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary Sessions
 - A. Staff shall provide ample accommodation for Working Parties (which shall be held the day before the Resolutions Plenary) and for the Resolutions Plenary at each conference.
 - B. Except as otherwise provided, Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern.
 - C. Members shall be free to choose which Working Parties or Resolutions Plenary they will attend.
 - D. While the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary are not closed meetings, only eligible voters may propose amendments or propose/second motions.
 - E. Members not in attendance at a given Working Party or Resolutions Plenary may participate in the discussion by:
 - 1) Submitting copies of a position paper to be circulated in the Working Party or Resolutions Plenary by another voting member in good standing;
 - 2) Providing a statement no more than 300 words in length to be read aloud during the discussion by a voting member in good standing.
 - F. The NRC, in advance of each Regional Conferences and AGM, and in consultation with regional volunteer leaders and staff, shall appoint:
 - 1) A Parliamentarian who shall be provided with copies of the AI Statutes, the Bylaws and Standing Rules of AIUSA, and Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised;
 - 2) The Chairs, Rapporteurs, and Runners of such Working Parties as are necessary, and of the Resolutions Plenary; and
 - 3) Tellers and such assistants as are necessary to secure rapid and accurate counts of votes in the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary; Runners and Chairs may serve as Tellers.
 - G. The voting members present in each Working Party or Resolutions Plenary shall approve the officers appointed to them or elect other officers, which election shall be the first order of business.
 - H. The Working Party shall approve or alter the order of the agenda established for the Working Party, which action shall immediately follow the election of officers. The Working Party may not remove from the agenda properly submitted or Binding Resolutions assigned to it by the Resolutions Committee, but may add Late or Non-Binding Resolutions submitted for their consideration.
 - I. The Resolutions Plenary shall approve or alter the order of the agenda established for the Resolutions Plenary, which action shall immediately follow the election of officers. The Resolutions Plenary may not remove from the agenda resolutions forwarded to it from the Working Parties or add new Late or Non-Binding Resolutions until after all other business has been conducted.
7. Board of Directors
 - A. All AGM decisions (resolutions passed by the AGM Resolutions Plenary) will be forwarded to the Board and placed on its agenda.
 - B. Binding decisions will be implemented in full and in a timely fashion, unless overridden or amended by two-thirds vote of the Board within one year of passage, as provided by the bylaws; AGM decisions not overturned or amended by the Board within one year of passage may only be overturned/amended through the Resolutions Process as provided by the By-laws.
 - C. Non-binding decisions will be advisory, and implemented at the Board's discretion.
 - D. The general secretary of the Board or his or her designated representative(s) will:

INTERNAL DOCUMENT—FOR AIUSA MEMBERS ONLY

- 1) Prepare a summary, updated as necessary, and include it in membership publications and communications, outlining the board's disposition of all AGM decisions including Board amendments and the reasons for them, as well as the Board's progress on implementation; and
 - 2) Serve as the officer to whom members may write for a more extensive written report of the Board's action on any given decision, which designation shall be included in the summary distributed to the membership.
- E. By each AGM, the Board shall report to the membership on the implementation of the previous year's decisions, and the Board shall report to the membership at the AGM.
8. Amendments to these Standing Rules
- A. Amendments to these Standing Rules may be submitted by any AIUSA member in good standing, in accordance with the rules for submission of resolutions established herein.
 - B. Amendments to these Standing Rules may not be submitted as Late or Non-Binding Resolutions.

Let's Plenary!

Your guide to the Working Party and Voting Plenary.

Chair or Co-chairs will preside over the meeting.
Rapporteurs will take notes and display the resolutions.
Runners will count votes.

Resolution to be discussed is displayed on a projection screen, read, and introduced.

Are there any questions on the resolution?
If so, questions will be answered.

Are there any amendments?

If you think the resolution should be changed, you can propose an amendment. Please write the amendment on a piece of paper first, before presenting it.

YES!

NO!

The Resolution will be displayed and reread with the Amendment included.

Questions on the Amendment will be taken and answered.

Debate on the Amendment: People will speak for or against the Amendment. Speak if you have something to say, but try not to repeat another speaker's statement.

Can we stop talking and vote? There are two ways to end debate:

1. If debate has slowed or if time is running short, the Chair may ask the body to move to a vote on the amendment.
2. A member may **move the previous question** (call for the question), ending debate and bringing the body to a vote on the amendment. If the motion for the previous question passes, the next step is to vote on the amendment. If it fails, the body moves back to debate.

Vote on the Amendment: Votes will be counted by a show of cards. Your vote can be in favor, in opposition, or you can abstain from voting. Leave your card up until all votes are counted. The Chair will announce the results.

If the Amendment passes, it becomes a part of the Resolution. If it fails, the resolution is unchanged.

Are There Any Other Amendments?

YES!

NO!

Debate on the Resolution: People will speak for or against the resolution. Speak if you have something to say, but try not to repeat another speaker's statement.

Can we stop talking and vote? There are two ways to end debate:

1. If debate has slowed or if time is running short, the Chair may ask the body to move to a vote on the resolution.
2. A member may **move the previous question** (call for the question), ending debate and bringing the body to a vote on the resolution. If the motion for the previous question passes, the next step is to vote on the resolution. If it fails, the body moves back to debate.

Vote on the Resolution: Votes will be counted by a show of cards. Your vote can be in favor, in opposition, or you can abstain from voting. Leave your card up until all votes are counted. The Chair will announce the results.

If there are no more resolutions, the Chair will call the session to a close.

If there is another Resolution, go back to the beginning.