This was an informal, virtual meeting, as the minutes reflect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 15 May 2016 @ 5pm UK time</th>
<th>Chair: Luis</th>
<th>Minutes: Chuck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of next meeting: 19 June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access link: [https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/207266357](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/207266357)
To call in, using your telephone:
Dial +44 (0) 330 221 0098
Access Code: 207-266-357
Audio PIN: Shown after joining the meeting
Meeting ID: 207-266-357

**Agenda**

1. **Welcome** (Luis, 5 minutes)
   a. Update from the Governing Board
   b. Focus area: Strategic question regarding training across CISV

2. **Current status of the review of R-07** (Steve, 5 minutes)
   a. Feedback we have received
   b. Plans moving forward

3. **Responding to the questions regarding Programme Training Curricula** (Sarah or Jennifer?, 10 minutes)
   The TQA Committee has been asked by the Walrus team (see Bebbe’s email, 10 May 2016) to comment on the current version of the seven Programme Training Curricula.
   a. Clarification regarding the input requested.
   b. Who will read and comment on the set of training curricula?
   c. Who can be the point person to collect the Committee’s input and enter it into the **OneNote** by 31 May?

4. **Decision to be made about training goals, indicators and elements in training materials across CISV** (Rupert, 50 minutes)
   The TQA Committee is requested to make a decision which will guide work across all of CISV International trainings in relation to training development, specifically training curricula and training materials packages.
   a. **Recommendation by senior managers**: Clarification of the need for the decision to be taken and the nature of the recommendation
   Please read the recommendation before the meeting and share any questions or comments.
   b. Discussion of advantages and disadvantages of scenarios a) and b)
   c. Decision

**MINUTES**

1. **Welcome** (Luis)
April Governing Board meeting held April 2 2016. Discussion revolved around updates for the strategic plan and educational committees which we will be discussing during this meeting.

2. **R-07** (Steve) Everyone should have had access to the letter of concern that has come from EMEA. The discussion related to the idea that the concerns are not with changing R-07 but with 1. responding to concerns,
2. clarifying the rule and its’ implementation and 3. communicating the "why" of the issues relating to the intent of the rule.

3. Walrus (Sarah) - an extensive amount of time and energy has come to a point of this request for review. The Walrus team is asking for members of the TQA to review and provide feedback to the current recommendations. Tim, Chuck and Rupert will review and submit feedback individually on the form provided by Bebbe.

4. Goals, Indicators, Elements discussion. (Rupert) - Senior managers had a lengthy discussion regarding the issues and pros/cons for the questions relating to goals/indicators/elements.
Two perspectives.
A. all have the same goals/indicators/elements.
B. one set for educational training one set for organizational training.

Chuck and Jennifer gave an historical perspective from the origins at the 2010 writeshop. representatives from each educational program and all organizational aspects of CISV were represented. While the group process took a great deal of time, a common plan was accomplished with input and confirmation from all present that common goals/indicators/elements were an important foundation from which to build. then topics and content are individualized and differentiated based upon need.

Questions reflected concern regarding a standardization and limiting programs from providing training that is unique to program needs. The focus of plan A is to provide consistency across all CISV training while also allowing for flexibility in topics, content, and procedures.
Tim and Steve brought up concerns that RM has invested energy and time in getting to this point in their reorganization that they would like to get feedback from the RM group before proceeding with a vote. Rupert asked if we could agree on principle and then meet again if the RM concerns warranted further discussion. All agreed to accept the senior managers recommendations in principle with a possible meeting in two weeks.

Meeting adjourned.
Decision to be made about training goals, indicators and curriculum elements across CISV

This is a recommendation to the Training & Quality Assurance Committee by Bebe, Nadia, Steve, and Rupert. It is based on extensive discussions and the knowledge we have of the work done so far on the different training curricula by the Chapter Development, Educational Programmes, and Training & Quality Assurance Committees.

What is being asked of the Training & Quality Assurance Committee and why now?

As part of the 2016 - 2018 Strategic Plan (Objective 9, outcomes 1 and 2), the three committees are now at different stages of reviewing their training curricula and training materials packages. The seven Programme training curricula are currently under review; Chapter Development and Risk Management training are in the final drafting stages; TTT, and possibly Essentials of Peace Education, training curricula are up for review in 2017. Work to produce training materials packages is scheduled for 2016 (Educational Programmes) and 2017 (Organizational Trainings).

Quite recently, it was brought to light within the senior management team that the three committees have interpreted the function and significance of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum in differing ways.

The CISV Basic Training Curriculum clearly states that “all training in CISV has an agreed upon curriculum, which is based on CISV’s common elements of training”. Comparing the elements across all trainings, it becomes clear that “based on” has been interpreted differently by different working groups and Committees. The situation now is that between the three committees, two committees have adopted a looser interpretation of the number of elements and the formulation of some training goals and indicators, while one committee has adhered strictly to the elements and the Common training goals and indicators, as stated in CISV Basic Training Curriculum.

The senior management team has engaged in several lengthy discussions on the matter and we now see very clearly the consequences that these different interpretations will have. Firstly, the shape of CISV’s suite of training curricula (7 Educational Programmes, 4 organizational trainings, plus any new trainings that may be developed in the future) will be influenced by it. Secondly, the role and significance of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum depends on it. In short, the alternatives are: To follow a strict interpretation which will lead to one coherent suite of 11 training curricula, the common basis of which is defined in the CISV Basic Training Curriculum. To follow a loose interpretation will lead to at least two suites of training curricula (Educational Programmes and organizational trainings) and the basis defining how the organizational trainings cohere is yet to be defined.

We appreciate that this situation has not come about by design, but feel that the role of and significance of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum needs to be clarified before further review to the training curricula is made, and before work can proceed on the training materials packages. Either way, the decision will impact the work to be done, and also some of the work that has already been done.

The senior management team has not found this discussion very easy, as each of us has been part of some of the work to date on the different training curricula. But we think that clarity is urgently needed and we have a recommendation for the Training & Quality Assurance Committee to consider. We will also outline and assess what we see as a possible alternative (scenario b) to give the Committee the best information to inform this decision.
In clarifying the current role and future significance of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum, we see two possible scenarios:

a) The role of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum is to provide a common, prescriptive and foundational structure across all CISV trainings. All CISV trainings have four identical general goals. The specific competencies to be learned by trainees through attending a specific training are accounted for by 16 indicators which are specific to each training. The purpose of each training will thereby be defined in a way that combines commonality (four common training goals) with specificity (four specific indicators for each of the four goals; each indicator is clearly derived from the equivalent common training indicator). The names of the 7 elements are identical across all trainings. Review of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum should take into account the lessons learnt from all training curricula to ensure it remains a relevant basis for all of CISV’s training curricula.

b) The CISV Basic Training Curriculum is re-defined as a looser basis (or reference) for training curricula. Individual committees are free to adapt the names and number of elements; the number of training goals and indicators remains fixed at 4 goals and 4 indicators per goal, but the content of goals and indicators varies.

We recommend the Training and Quality Assurance Committee mandates scenario a) for all Committees during its meeting on 15 May 2016.

Context and significance of the decision

The terminology we apply and its underlying logic is:

Training goals and indicators spell out the Why or purpose of a given training. Each of the four common training goals defines, in general terms, an area of learning which is necessary for each CISVer in a position of responsibility to develop. Taken together, the four goals ensure that – irrespective of the specific role that a CISVer who receives training holds – all CISV trainees will develop their understanding of CISV as a whole; and the skills and attitudes they require based on the needs of CISV as a whole. Training indicators describe specific competencies (attitudes, skills and knowledge) required of an individual to perform their specific role in CISV well.

Experiential learning describes CISV’s general approach to How training sessions are delivered; we use the Training Session Template as a standardized format for documenting and sharing how a CISV International training session is run. Training materials packages are detailed instructions for trainers regarding how they should prepare for, run, and follow up on all full training.

The elements of a training curriculum define the What or subject content of a given training.

The logical distinction between Why, How and What is helpful in this discussion because it establishes a hierarchy: Why is the defining first question to ask and answer; How and What follow. Furthermore, Why/How/What is well established in CISV and it helps to clearly separate conceptually three basic dimensions.

Table 1 compares the two scenarios in detail.
Table 1: Scenarios a) Strict and b) Loose interpretation compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training goals</th>
<th>Scenario a) Strict interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
<th>Scenario b) Loose interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 sets of 4 identical goals.</td>
<td>7 sets of 4 similar goals for Educational Programmes trainings. Separately, 4 sets of 4 similar goals for Organizational trainings. Commonality between the goals of Educational Programmes and Organizational trainings is to be defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training indicators</th>
<th>Scenario a) Strict interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
<th>Scenario b) Loose interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 sets of 16 indicators: Each set of 16 indicators spells out the unique and specific purpose of each training. Taken together, one set of indicators describes the specific set of competencies required to fulfill the roles of the training's target audiences.</td>
<td>7 sets of 16 similar Educational Programmes indicators. Separately, 4 sets of 16 organizational training indicators. Commonality between Educational Programmes and organizational training indicators to be defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training sessions (applying experiential learning)</th>
<th>Scenario a) Strict interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
<th>Scenario b) Loose interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The training session template defines how we document and share training units or sessions on a given topic (element) to achieve a given goal (defined more specifically in the indicator(s) covered). The How to train and the How to document and share training sessions is not affected by the choice between scenario a) and b). As a matter of urgency, we should review the logical structure (items in) the template (e.g. add items such as “time management” and “small/big group of trainees” to increase the flexibility of one session. At a later stage, we will improve the design of the presentation of sessions and their publication online enabling trainers to compile training materials packages in a modular way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Scenario a) Strict interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
<th>Scenario b) Loose interpretation of CISV Basic training Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 sets of 7 elements: Each set describes the content of the training under the defined 7 elements in the CISV Basics Training Curriculum. Specification takes the form of sub-headings and narrative text for each element which covers general aspects first and specifics second.</td>
<td>7 sets of 7 elements for Educational Programmes trainings. Separately, 4 sets of organizational training elements. Number of elements per curriculum and commonality across trainings to be defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our assessment of scenarios a) and b) is presented in table 2.

Table 2: Advantages and disadvantages of scenarios A) and B)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a)       | Short term: Simplicity of concept.  
Long term:  
- Common structure enables quality management across all trainings  
- Builds pressure and need to review Basic Training Curriculum **together**  
  - involving TQA, Educational Programmes, and Chapter Development Committee | Short term:  
- Requires revising goals and indicators of organizational trainings  
- In cases where existing elements don’t match the 7 elements from CISV Basic Training Curriculum, content needs to be made to fit  
Long term: n.a. |
| b)       | Short term: Less friction and frustration among those who have put considerable amounts of work into training curricula and materials over last years.  
Long term: Organizational trainings are by and for specialists. | Short term: Additional work required to define commonalities among organizational trainings, which is not foreseen in the Strategic Plan and will likely mean not achieving outcomes 9.1 and 9.2 as planned.  
Long term: We establish a new separation between Educational Programmes and Organizational trainings which makes coordinating the two more difficult. |

Our recommendation is based on the assessment that from a long term strategic perspective which considers CISV as a whole, the advantages of scenario a) outweigh those of scenario b). We are aware that scenario a) is likely to generate some frustration, which is at least partly justified because the clarification comes at a point when a lot of work has already been done. However, we anticipate that the work required to bring any training curricula (back) structurally in line with the CISV Basic Training Curriculum would entail few substantive changes at the level of training goals and indicators. The content of existing curricula will remain the same. There may, however, be a considerable amount of moving around to be done so that existing content can be fit under one of the seven basic elements where it fits best – e.g. in the form of subheadings.

**Significance of the decision:**

The decision

- Will shape the process leading to outcomes 9.1 (training curricula) and 9.2 (training materials packages) of the [Strategic Plan](#)  
- Will shape the suite of materials for the 11 trainings CISV International has for the foreseeable future  
- Has to be integrated into strategic thinking beyond the current strategic plan; i.e. it should be kept in mind that in any case there should be a review of the CISV Basic Training Curriculum itself during the next Strategic Plan, and that the integration of online learning into CISV International training will proceed  
- Is necessary at this juncture because the Educational Programmes and organizational training curricula at this point show considerable variation between themselves; see an overview of current goals, indicators and elements of the organizational trainings [here](#)  
- Will affect the production of training materials packages – they will form a set which is clearly traceable to one common foundation (scenario a) or not (scenario b)
• Will define the common structure that will form the basis for CISV International to maintain overview, to update, and to manage quality across all trainings
• Will affect CISV’s ability to review any common structure for trainings in the future
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Develop a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Risk Management in planning and implementing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Be able to define the four areas of risk management (diversity, conflict, resolution, and local community) and their significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Know where and how to find information about potential risks, adhering to confidentiality and appropriate standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Understand how ASK (Assess, Set, Know, and Do) can contribute to effective risk management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Be able to respond in a prepared manner to incidents, adhering to procedures for using resources and maintaining a professional attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Be proactive and strategic in risk management, applying lessons learned to improve the quality of educational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Know the CISV statement of purpose for risk management, which promotes CISV’s principles, diversity, and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Actively uphold and support CISV’s Risk Management framework, adhering to the principles and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Be able to evaluate and contribute to the improvement of CISV’s risk management, working collaboratively to ensure continuous development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Understand where your role in risk management fits within the broader perspective of CISV’s activities and how it impacts the organization’s growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk Management Framework:**
- **Assess:** Recognize and identify potential risks and prepare for their impact.
- **Set:** Develop strategies and plans to manage identified risks.
- **Know:** Understand the risks and the actions taken.
- **Do:** Implement plans and monitor the outcomes.