Summary of the Recovery Dharma Survey - July 17, 2019

On July 17, 2019, the third of three emails was distributed to the Refuge Recovery mailing list, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement signed on July 6, 2019 by Refuge Recovery, Noah Levine, and Rebel Saints Meditation Society. The first two emails were used to announce the Settlement Agreement and describe the new recovery program, Recovery Dharma. The third was a survey of the community regarding the direction of Recovery Dharma specific to Board of Director elections and governance. 731 community members responded, and since the consent of respondents to publish their comments was not solicited, this document is an effort to summarize them.

Which of the following activities do you want the national organization of Recovery Dharma and Board of Directors to support?

Q1 Which of the following activities do you want the national organization of Recovery Dharma and Board of Directors to support? (Select all that apply):

Maintain listings of recovery meetings and communities. 96.31% - 704
Provide resources to help people start new meetings, and build communities. 90.97% - 665
Coordinate in-person regional and national meetings and conferences. 71.27% - 521
Provide support for online communities, websites, and other means of communication and collaboration. 81.67% - 597
Develop learning materials, lectures, teachings, books, and make them available to the community. 87.00% - 636
Connect local facilitators and officers of local meetings with mentorship and training opportunities to help them grow and develop skills to support their communities. 70.45% - 515
Support the community in developing a network-of-meetings in their correlative region. 72.91% - 533
None of the above 0.27% - 2

SUMMARY: Survey respondents stressed the importance of Recovery Dharma Global as being a communications hub where members and sanghas can share information and experiences, in the spirit of peer-to-peer support. Several respondents noted that this is an ambitious agenda and a lot to ask of a band of volunteers; they noted that there is much existing literature and other resources, and that RD Global not direct all of its energy to developing new materials. Respondents stressed
the value of honoring a locally-driven community, with RD Global providing support but not leading what is at its core a grassroots model.

Recovery Dharma is committed to a democratically elected board of directors. Which model of elections would you favor?

Q2 Recovery Dharma is committed to a democratically elected board of directors. Which model of elections would you favor? (Select all that you favor)

Nominations should be open to any member of the community. 57.18% - 418
Nominations should be limited to one per registered meeting. 30.51% - 223
Nominations should be limited to one per geographic region. 19.84% - 145
None of these options. 4.10% - 30
The community would be assigned by transition team to geographic regions, each of which would elect one board member based on one vote per registered meeting. 0.27% - 2
Role of transition team, comprised of five members of the first board for one year, to allow for both democratic elections of the rest for two-year terms, building in both experience and staggered terms. 0.41% - 3
None of the above. 0.00% - 0

SUMMARY: Survey respondents indicated an interest in having applicants for Board positions meet certain qualifications, including length of recovery time and organizational experience. There were many supporters of diversity in geographic representation, race, gender identification, age, and sexual orientation. Many respondents want to ensure that no one region of the global community dominates the Board. Respondents favored an orderly nomination process, with suggestions ranging from each local meeting having a vote to a regional nominations and voting process. Some respondents indicated that they would like information about the candidates before voting.

I'd like to see the mission statement include the following:
Q3 I’d like to see the mission statement include the following (select all options you favor):

- There will be no Recovery Dharma-sanctioned teachers because we adopt the philosophy that we are our own guides on the path of recovery. 52.80% - 386
- We will adhere to a democratic process for governance. 68.54% - 501
- It is our intention to commit to following the 5 precepts, the eightfold path and 4 noble truths as part of our program and practice. 83.45% - 610
- Meditation practice as a key resource and tool on the path of recovery. 84.13% - 615
- The Board of Directors will continually seek input from the community as part of the development process of the organization. 74.83% - 547
- We are committed to developing inclusivity and safety in our community, through dedicated committees, events, and other means. 73.60% - 538
- None of the above. 0.68% - 5

SUMMARY: Many respondents urged a simple, inclusive mission statement and cautioned against having a mission statement that appears to be in reaction to the events surrounding the closure of Refuge Recovery and subsequent formation of Recovery Dharma and Refuge Recovery World Services. Some respondents noted the difference between a mission statement and a statement of vision/values/policy; these respondents suggested a simple, straightforward mission statement that emphasizes a Buddhist-based approach that is welcoming to all. One respondent stated that a “mission statement should focus on what we’re doing more than how we’re doing it.” A few respondents commented on the value of leaving “outside issues” separate from Recovery Dharma, as is done in 12 Step programs. A number of respondents pointed out that there is a difference between the organization authorizing teachers and individuals or local sanghas attending talks and retreats.

How should board members be elected?
Anybody who wants to vote would cast one vote. The ten candidates receiving the most votes will form the new board. 17.47% - 127
People who have registered themselves as members of Recovery Dharma would cast one vote. The ten candidates receiving the most votes will form the new board. 53.37% - 388
Each registered meeting would be given one vote. The ten candidates receiving the most votes will form the new board. 21.60% - 157
None of these options. 7.57% - 55

SUMMARY: Respondents had a variety of opinions on how best to elect board members but generally agreed that skill and commitment are valued qualities for potential board members. Respondents mentioned concerns about the potential to manipulate the voting process and recommended a regional voting approach as a way to minimize that risk. A couple of respondents had specific structural suggestions. One person recommended “designating the majority of seats for democratic nomination/election by participants (or regions or whatever) and allowing those Directors to nominate/elect additional Directors as needed to create diversity of thought and skill (as long as board-appointed Directors remain in the minority number of seats... or something...)” Another specific suggestion was “All candidates who met basic requirements (say, membership in Recovery Dharma, in this case) would be on the ballot and would have the opportunity to present themselves or be described for the qualities they have that would suit the job. All voters would be encouraged to vote YES on any candidate who would be acceptable, and NO on any candidate considered unacceptable. A non-vote on any candidate would imply the voter simply did not have enough information to have an opinion. Some would only vote YES on all they knew they liked, or only NO on any they felt not suitable; some would vote on only one or two candidates...This kind of voting gives a much more accurate assessment of how widely certain candidates were liked or disliked, and thereby able or not able to unite voters after the election.”

What should be the term of each board member?
Board members should be elected for a fixed term, with all seats open in every election. 11.28% - 82
Terms should be staggered to allow a mix of new members and experienced members. 88.72% - 645

SUMMARY: There was general agreement by respondents that staggered terms would be beneficial, in order to maintain an orderly transfer of knowledge between experienced board members and new ones. Term length varied from six months to two years, with by far the majority of respondents recommending a two year term, with potential for re-appointment to a second two year term. Respondents stressed the importance of term limits, with two terms being the maximum service opportunity. Some respondents recommended that at least some former Refuge Recovery Board members (note: three former Refuge Recovery Board members now serve on the Recovery Dharma Board) be asked to continue with their service to the RD Board, for purposes of continuity.