

# Global ToP Policy Implementation Group

## Draft Terms of Reference

### 1. Background

Following the approval of a new Global ToP Policy by the ICAI<sup>1</sup> General Assembly in July 2015, the working group which had been brought together to develop and build consensus around the global ToP<sup>2</sup> policy, completed its work in June 2016 by developing a set of proposals for the implementation of the policy. These were submitted for consideration (but not a vote) by the ICAI General Assembly.

One of the key recommendations made in the proposal was for the establishment of a co-ordinating body with a mandate from the ICAI General Assembly to guide and support the implementation of the policy. As a first step towards this, the ICAI Board requested that Terms of Reference be drafted for such a body.

### 2. Purpose and Main Tasks

The main purpose of the co-ordinating body is to build worldwide consistency and capacity for ToP trainer training and qualification. In considering how best to do this, members can draw on concrete proposals that have already been suggested as to how this may be achieved:

- Initiative A: *Establish* Internationally Recognized ToP Trainer Competencies and Criteria
- Initiative B: *Build* ToP Trainer Training Capacity
- Initiative C: *Develop* Resource Repositories

It was proposed that the process of doing this should be to develop a realistic action plan backed by the buy-in and support of ToP stakeholders worldwide by conducting a grassroots action planning process to (a) *share* the proposed initiatives and related draft ideas or models; (b) *discuss* and provide feedback; and (c) *identify* implementation steps and roles. The next step would be to *prepare* draft models to consider, refine and mobilize in the regional action planning process.

More broadly, the coordinating body would develop a process for addressing any development issues relating to ToP that emerge. Current examples include:

- ToP collaboration with the International Association of Facilitators (IAF)
- Discussion of local branding issues and initiatives

### 3. Role and Responsibilities

- 3.1 To provide overall management of the implementation of the ToP policy and taking operational responsibility for coordination

---

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Cultural Affairs International

<sup>2</sup> Technology of Participation

- 3.2 To champion, guide, encourage and support implementation by ICAI members and ToP practitioners
- 3.3 To develop and implement an economic support model for the international ToP programme
- 3.4 To report to the ICAI Board on the implementation of the ToP policy, taking the necessary decisions and actions and obtaining approval from the wider Board or the General assembly as appropriate

#### **4. Structure and Membership**

- 4.1 The co-ordinating body will consist of 5-6 people, divided into two categories:
  - a) A core group of three individuals, nominated by Statutory or Associate Members of ICAI. These will be the key decision-makers and will be characterised by<sup>3</sup>
    - i) an intimate knowledge of ToP and ICA history and values
    - ii) having no personal financial interest in the decisions<sup>4</sup>
    - iii) (in the short term) being from ICAs at different stages of their development of ToP systems
  - b) A further group of 2-3 individuals who are recognised for the extent of their competence in ToP training and the development of trainers.
- 4.2 For the core group, they will be elected by the General Assembly for a term of two years, renewable once
- 4.3 For the wider group, the core group will work with ICAI members to identify and appoint appropriate individuals
- 4.4 As far as possible, the whole group should reflect diversity by
  - a) being from different geographical regions
  - b) being in different age ranges
- 4.5 The co-ordinating body will be able to co-opt more people, either on a voluntary or paid basis, to work with them as needed

---

<sup>3</sup> The challenge of identifying individuals who meet all the criteria is recognised. In the process of forming the co-ordinating body, the ICAI Board may need to take a pragmatic approach and make some judgements on the relative weight of the three criteria

<sup>4</sup> Examples of such individuals could be (e.g.) an ICA staff person on salary, whose personal income is NOT tied to their training income; a person who does lots of facilitation, but does not train, for instance, or who no longer trains, or who trains for free, or who gives their training income back the Statutory or Associate Member, or who gives their training income to ICAI or to the “decision-making structure”; a volunteer Board member of an ICA member.