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**Evaluation of the AGV 2020**

**Positive assessments**

+ At the beginning of the process, the movements had concerns about a virtual organisation of the GA but it was a technical and organisational success.

+ Excellent preparatory work due to a close collaboration between Gabi and Mariel before each meeting and welcome correction of their minutes.

+ Willingness of the commission to work on the points that were indispensable for the continuity of the legitimacy of the FIMEM.

+ High availability of the organisers (commission and Board of Directors) throughout the GA.

+ Actual availability and accessibility of documentation on the site

+ Well-informed movements with plenty of time to study the files; their involvement in the whole process was important

+ A lot of work in the three language groups to master the files. They had rich exchanges between participants.

+ Important cooperation between the Board of Directors and the AGV commission.

+ The commission accompanied the movements in their need for information.

+ Free and democratic choice of coordinators within the language groups

+ The coordinators of the language groups have done a great deal of work to ensure productive meetings; they have played their role as an interface between the Board, the Commission, the language groups and the movements.

+ Great freedom of decision for movements within language groups. High quality of listening within these groups.

+ Very clear operating rules available to the participants and the moderator.

+ Use of the Chat to communicate our points of view.

**Relative appreciation**

- The commission was quickly reduced to few effective and involved members, which created a significant overload of work for them.

- Difficulties for the movements to understand that this different AGV could not handle all the dossiers they presented and difficulty in cataloguing the importance of these dossiers.

- Failure to take into account the ICEM's proposal to create a PRE-AGV in order to facilitate the technical and organisational management of the AGV. This would have saved time for the dossiers that are important to the movements.

- Roles of the moderator and the presidency not clear enough.

- Motions had to be grouped BEFORE the AGV by the language groups.

- Regrets that motions were not presented and worked on over time between the Ridef so that the reflection could be fully completed and a vote had to be taken without prior discussion.

- Reading of the rules and operating codes differed greatly between language groups. Very high tolerance on the part of the moderator for non-compliance with these rules.

- AGV ending unfinished ... something that unfortunately often happens also in presence .

- Difficulty in listening of the movements concerning the priority points of a GA. Significant frustration for movements that feel they are not being listened to.

- Translations and PV approximate

- AGV not finished since we did not have time to talk about the moral report and orientations.

- Technical difficulties that disturbed the presence of some movements

- Too much discussion time on clear files available that would have allowed an immediate vote.

- Imbalance between the time allocated to the dossiers.

- Lack of a summary on each point dealt with in order to know what is retained.

- Non-compliance with the operating rules: too long speeches; repetition of arguments already presented; unauthorised speeches, invasion of some at the expense of the serenity of the process; lies that cannot be rectified due to lack of time.

- Presentation of candidates more or less taking into account their commitment to comply with the FIMEM guidelines

- Lack of justification of work within the Board of Directors for the request to extend Antoinette's mandate, but also lack of a written message explaining her personal and specific motivations for requesting the extension.

- No explanation of the points to be reported at the end of the General Assembly.

**Questions and proposals for improvements for the Ridef Commission and the new Board of Directors**

o Make Commission 1 immediately operational for all exchanges concerning the continuation of our work within FIMEM.

o To propose as a priority the evaluation of the moral report and the orientations to the movements and language groups and to allow them to take a position to facilitate the work of the new Board.

o Work with the movements on what the rules of operation mean for them:

 What are they for? Who applies them? What are the sanctions for non-compliance?

o Define the meaning of the three fundamental imperatives of our FIMEM :

DEMOCRACY - COOPERATION - FREINET PEDAGOGY

And agree on a common sense for all of us. The current variations of these interpretations too often vary according to the particular interests of the movements.

The language groups have prepared many motions. They must now be sorted according to their urgency and relevance, and put them in order of priority in discussion in the movements to be able to move forward without waiting for decisions that would only be taken in 2022... to the detriment of the new issues that will arrive between now and then.

How to deal with this problem and give the movements the space to take a position and then to vote on these motions if necessary.

o Language groups do not currently have a statutory definition. They have always functioned to facilitate exchange and reflection throughout the Ridef.

 Should they be given the role of statutory coordinators? And which one?

The two current BD will propose a timetable for finalising this document and continuing the discussion.

NB :

Ask Gabi to help us with his technical and relational skills to work with in the future