International Association of Facilitators

IAF

STATEMENT OF VALUES AND
CODE OF ETHICS
FOR GROUP FACILITATORS

THE REPORT OF THE
ETHICS AND VALUES THINK TANK
JUNE 2002

International Association of Facilitators

STATEMENT OF VALUES AND
CODE OF ETHICS
FOR GROUP FACILITATORS

Prepared by
Sandor P. Schuman
Center for Policy Research
University at Albany
Albany NY 12222 USA
sschuman@albany.edu
On Behalf of the Ethics and Values Think Tank

The Report of the
Ethics and Values Think Tank
June 2002

Co-Chairs	Dale Hunter, NZ
	Schuman, US
On-line Facilitator, Criteria & Drafts 1 & 2	Anthony (Tony) Nash, CA
Mini Task Force Members, Drafts 1 & 2	Anthony (Tony) Nash, CA
	Grant Feltmate, CA
	Katy Jordan, US
	Gordon Laing, CA
	Deborah Starzynski, CA
Essayists/ Discussion Leaders	Joan Firkins, AU
	Roger Schwarz, US
	John Butcher, CA
	F. Freeman Marvin, US

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The IAF Ethics and Values Think Tank (EVTT) concluded its work in developing a Statement of Values and Ethics for Group Facilitators (the Code) in May 2002. The development of the Code involved a wide diversity of views and integration of different perspectives to achieve a consensus across regional and cultural boundaries.

The work took place over two years (June 2000 – May 2002) and involved an estimated 150 people. An online group of 85 people exchanged more than 900 emails and engaged in thousands of thinking and discussion hours on the EVTT electronic discussion group, http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT. In addition, two sessions involving 40 people were held at IAF Conference 2001 in Minnesota. Workshops and discussions were also held at regional venues: Southern Ontario Facilitators Network, Toronto, Ontario, November 2000; Latin American Facilitators Conference, Cochabamba, Bolivia, November 2000; Arizona Association of Facilitators, March 2001; Australia & New Zealand Facilitators Conference, Brisbane, Australia, October 2001.

The following resolution was adopted by the International Association of Facilitators Association Coordinating Team (its Board of Directors) at its meeting on May 22, 2002.

The following Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics (the Code) was adopted by ACT and will be formally reviewed in two years. During the two years the Ethics and Values Think Tank will solicit feedback from IAF members and other stakeholders, and continue to provide a forum for discussion of pertinent issues and potential revisions. The Code should be made widely available and copies distributed to all IAF members.

Anyone wishing to comment on the Code, or participate in implementation and training activities is welcome to join the Ethics and Values Think Tank http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT or contact the co-chairs, Dale Hunter, zenergy@xtra.co.nz or Sandor Schuman, sschuman@albany.edu.

The International Association of Facilitators
DRAFT STATEMENT OF VALUES AND
CODE OF ETHICS
FOR GROUP FACILITATORS

Preamble

Facilitators are called upon to fill an impartial role in helping groups become more effective. We act as process guides to create a balance between participation and results.

We, the members of the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), believe that our profession gives us a unique opportunity to make a positive contribution to individuals, organizations, and society. Our effectiveness is based on our personal integrity and the trust developed between ourselves and those with whom we work. Therefore, we recognize the importance of defining and making known the values and ethical principles that guide our actions.

This Statement of Values and Code of Ethics recognizes the complexity of our roles, including the full spectrum of personal, professional and cultural diversity in the IAF membership and in the field of facilitation. Members of the International Association of Facilitators are committed to using these values and ethics to guide their professional practice. These principles are expressed in broad statements to guide ethical practice; they provide a framework and are not intended to dictate conduct for particular situations. Questions or advice about the application of these values and ethics may be addressed to the International Association of Facilitators.

Statement of Values

As group facilitators, we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group. We strive to help the group make the best use of the contributions of each of its members. We set aside our personal opinions and support the group's right to make its own choices. We believe that collaborative and cooperative interaction builds consensus and produces meaningful outcomes. We value professional collaboration to improve our profession.

Code of Ethics

1. Client Service

    We are in service to our clients, using our group facilitation competencies to add value to their work .
    Our clients include the groups we facilitate and those who contract with us on their behalf. We work closely with our clients to understand their expectations so that we provide the appropriate service, and that the group produces the desired outcomes. It is our responsibility to ensure that we are competent to handle the intervention.
    If the group decides it needs to go in a direction other than that originally intended by either the group or its representatives, our role is to help the group move forward, reconciling the original intent with the emergent direction.

2. Conflict of Interest

    We openly acknowledge any potential conflict of interest.
    Prior to agreeing to work with our clients, we discuss openly and honestly any possible conflict of interest, personal bias, prior knowledge of the organization or any other matter which may be perceived as preventing us from working effectively with the interests of all group members. We do this so that, together, we may make an informed decision about proceeding and to prevent misunderstanding that could detract from the success or credibility of the clients or ourselves. We refrain from using our position to secure unfair or inappropriate privilege, gain, or benefit.

3. Group Autonomy

    We respect the culture, rights, and autonomy of the group.
    We seek the group's conscious agreement to the process and their commitment to participate. We do not impose anything that risks the welfare and dignity of the participants, the freedom of choice of the group, or the credibility of its work.

4. Processes, Methods, and Tools

    We use processes, methods and tools responsibly.
    In dialogue with the group or its representatives we design processes that will achieve the group's goals, and select and adapt the most appropriate methods and tools. We avoid using processes, methods or tools with which we are insufficiently skilled, or which are poorly matched to the needs of the group.

5. Respect, Safety, Equity, and Trust

We strive to engender an environment of respect and safety where all participants trust that they can speak freely and where individual boundaries are honoured. We use our skills, knowledge, tools, and wisdom to elicit and honour the perspectives of all.

We seek to have all relevant stakeholders represented and involved. We promote equitable relationships among the participants and facilitator and ensure that all participants have an opportunity to examine and share their thoughts and feelings. We use a variety of methods to enable the group to access the natural gifts, talents and life experiences of each member. We work in ways that honour the wholeness and self-expression of others, designing sessions that respect different styles of interaction. We understand that any action we take is an intervention that may affect the process.

6. Stewardship of Process

We practice stewardship of process and impartiality toward content.

While participants bring knowledge and expertise concerning the substance of their situation, we bring knowledge and expertise concerning the group interaction process. We are vigilant to minimize our influence on group outcomes.

When we have content knowledge not otherwise available to the group, and that the group must have to be effective, we offer it after explaining our change in role.

7. Confidentiality

We maintain confidentiality of information.

We observe confidentiality of all client information. Therefore, we do not share information about a client within or outside of the client's organization, nor do we report on group content, or the individual opinions or behaviour of members of the group without consent.

8. Professional Development

We are responsible for continuous improvement of our facilitation skills and knowledge.

We continuously learn and grow. We seek opportunities to improve our knowledge and facilitation skills to better assist groups in their work. We remain current in the field of facilitation through our practical group experiences and ongoing personal development. We offer our skills within a spirit of collaboration to develop our professional work practices.

Notes on Stewardship of Process (Section 6)

The following paragraphs present interesting and informative perspectives. However, they were not included in the Code at this time for the following reasons:
    (1) There may have been less agreement substantively about the issues they present (or perhaps about the precise wording that should be used to present them) and
    (2) There may have been disagreement as to whether it is necessary to include these points -- even if we were to agree on them -- because they make the code longer and perhaps more confusing.

We are impartial with regard to potential outcomes. We do not favor one individual or sub-group over another. However, we are not impartial with respect to process issues; rather we are process leaders and advocates, exercising our process expertise to help groups achieve their purpose.

We recognize that process and content are mutually interdependent and that making a practical distinction between "process" and "content" is difficult. At times, what is a process issue might appear to a group as content related. Indeed, the major issues facing some groups *are* process issues. In all cases, we focus on applying our process expertise to complement the group's focus on the content.

We recognize the enormous power that we may wield. The process choices we make or suggest may affect group outcomes, whether or not these effects are intended, and whether or not we are aware of them. Furthermore, we recognize that our personal biases towards the subjects of discussion may be reflected, however subtly or innocently, in our process decisions. Consequently, we are vigilant to minimize our influence on group outcomes and engage the group to assist us in this regard.

BACKGROUND: WHY AND HOW

By the late 1990s the International Association of Facilitators (IAF) had adopted a set of competencies and a certification program for the same. An important complement to competencies is a coherent set of values and ethical standards that should guide the application of those competencies. The development of a statement of values and code of ethics was proposed at the IAF annual conference in 2000 to further strengthen the credibility of group facilitation as a profession, enhance the professional identity of group facilitators, avoid misconceptions of group facilitation by existing and potential customers, and provide guidance in practical situations.

The formation of Ethics and Values Think Tank (EVTT) was an outgrowth of the IAF 2000 Conference session "Critical incidents: How do

our values and principles guide us?" Formally chartered as a "Think Tank" by the IAF Association Coordinating Team (its Board of Directors), the purpose of EVTT has been to create a "code of ethics," "statement of values" or similar document that could be formally adopted by IAF and its members. Members may then indicate to existing and potential customers that they have agreed to adhere to the code and may provide the customer with a copy of it.

The EVTT was organized as a virtual group using electronic communications technology, specifically email and web-based technologies. In addition to people who expressed interest at the IAF 2000 Conference, the invitation to participate was distributed via the IAF membership list (IAF-L@listserv.albany.edu) and the Electronic Discussion on Group Facilitation (grp-facl@listserv.albany.edu). EVTT membership has varied over its two-year time span, with more than 50 members by the end of its first year, and 85 members by the end of its second year. The group's discussion archives and resource files are available to anyone who subscribes at http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT. The initial plan proposed in 2000 is shown below.

Major Tasks

1. Develop a two-year plan for creating and implementing a code.
2. Gather and examine similar documents from other professional organizations.
3. Develop among Think Tank members a draft document. Consult with professional ethicists and other professional societies as needed.
4. Draft a document for review by the Association Coordinating Team (Board of Directors).
5. Revise and make available a draft to all members.
6. Conduct a Think Tank session at IAF Conference 2001.
7. Revise and recirculate a draft to ACT and make available to all members.
8. Develop training materials.
9. At IAF 2002 present code to ACT (and perhaps to general membership) for formal adoption.
10. Test our training materials at Think Tank session at IAF 2002.
11. Finalize training materials and make available to IAF members.

As indicated in step 2 above, background materials -- mostly in the form of codes of ethics from other professional associations -- were made available on the EVTT web site. These materials include a compilation of the codes of ethics from various professions -- A Professional Ethics Compendium.

In July 2000, Tony Nash proposed a procedure for moving forward and volunteered to act as facilitator. The discussions and idea generation work would be done by all EVTT members via the electronic discussion group. At various stages, the work of integrating and synthesizing the ideas into a coherent presentation would be undertaken by a "mini task force" that would meet face-to-face and then propose its results to the entire group. After some discussion this was agreed. In early September 2000, Tony summarized the first steps as follows:

Timetable

What	Who	by When
1) Brainstorm "must meet "criteria	EVTT Group	September 22
2) Finalize "must meet" criteria and present back to EVTT	Task force	October 16
3) Provide feedback to task force on "must meet" criteria	EVTT Group	October 30
4) Brainstorm Ethics/ Values etc.	EVTT Group	November 10
5) Deliver "First Cut" to EVTT for feedback	Task force	December 18
6) Provide feedback to task force on "First Cut"	EVTT Group	January 15, 2001

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITERIA

In the same email, Tony provided a detailed plan for developing the criteria, as follows.

STEP #1 – CRITERIA SETTING:

The first step in the process is to set some criteria. As a facilitator colleague of mine likes to say "How would I recognize the perfect IAF statement of core values and a code of ethics and values if I were to run into it on the street? What would it look like - what would be its characteristics?"

My experience is that criteria tend to present themselves in one of two forms, i.e.

1) "Screen" or "Must meet" criteria. These usually qualify under three headings – First, they are "MANDATORY". Second, they are "MEASURABLE", and third, they are "REALISTIC". If they don't qualify under all three headings they are probably...

2) "Comparison" or "Nice to have" criteria.

For this exercise I suggest we look only for the "Screen Must Meet" criteria – those criteria that our values ethics statement MUST satisfy. An example I gave in my July 4 e-mail, based on comments that had already been made, was that any set of statements would need to provide for ethnic and or cultural differences – therefore one criterion might be - "Must be able to be applied across all cultures". This is just a suggestion – the group does not have to accept this as one of the criteria.

As you will appreciate, the more "must meet" criteria that we establish the "tighter" the process becomes. I imagine if we end up with 10 or more we'll probably have too many.

YOUR TASK:

Between now and close of business – September 22/00 I would like the group to BRAINSTORM for "must meet" criteria and DISCUSS THESE CRITERIA AS THEY ARE POSTED.

At the time of writing there are 57 members in the EVTT e-group. If we can manage to receive one criterion from at least one-half the group, we will probably have more than we need. My suggestion is that when you post a criterion you preface your submission with "Must…..", followed by a short explanation as to why you feel this is an appropriate "must meet" criterion. In other words, please outline for the group what your thinking was that prompted your choice.

There were no suggestions from the group as to what rules should govern our behaviour - I don't see this as a problem. I encourage you to participate early and often. Thanks for wanting to be involved - let's keep talking!

The Mini-Task Force summarized and organized the criteria that had been suggested and discussed by the group. Tony initiated a poll, using the polling feature available through Yahoogroups and via email. The adopted criteria are presented below.

- *Must be clear, concise and credible - easily understood by facilitators, clients and others - expressed as succinct concepts and supported by additional information that enhances understanding*

- *Must include a preamble which incorporates:*
   a) *a clear definition of what "ethics" means;*
   b) *what the organization aspires to;*
   c) *why a code is essential for the organization; and*
   d) *the voluntary nature of adherence by members.*

- *Must state ethics in a positive manner, i.e. what we "will do" rather than what we "should not" do.*

- *Must provide guidance to facilitators in designing their business practices*

- *Must provide guidance to facilitators as they design process*

- *Must provide guidance in the case of ethical dilemmas*

- Must be applicable across national borders, economic and cultural boundaries

- Must be applicable to facilitators working in the widest possible variety of circumstances and sub-disciplines

DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST DRAFT

Solicitation of specific values and ethics was initiated by Tony in early November via the following email to the group.

I read somewhere that "ethics" are grounded in "values". To appreciate someone's ethics, it's necessary to understand that person's values. Values are the enduring beliefs or ground rules by which a person guides his or her life. In other words our "values" are what we believe that governs our behaviour. If we continue this line of thinking, our "ethics" are how we'd like to be seen acting out those beliefs. For example, as facilitators, we might value "openness", which could be expressed as follows:

We, as members of the IAF, believe in "openness". *Therefore...* "We create meeting environments where all perspectives can be freely expressed", *which, for me, is an "ethic" in this context. Or, another example might be...*

We, as members of the IAF, believe in "clarity of thinking". *Therefore...* "We use process and facilitation techniques to ensure a group is fully able to explore the issue it is addressing".

The group does not have to use these - they are just my random examples - but you get the drift....

We'll need to start by asking ourselves such basic questions as:

1) What do we believe in that guides our behaviour?

2) What do we want to be recognized for in the way we provide our services?

3) What's important to us in the way we...
   - do business?
   - treat our clients?
   - interact with group participants?
   - make a difference?
   - add value?
   - treat each other?
   - support our profession?
   - take responsibility for our own personal development?
   - others...

<u>*YOUR TASK*</u>*:*

Once you've done your "silent" brainstorming to establish your values, I'd like each of you to submit your "top/most critical" facilitator "value", in the format indicated above, i.e. "We, as IAF facilitators, believe in/that..."

followed by the word "therefore"…and a brief description of how you think IAF facilitators act in support of that value, i.e. the "succinct concept". Later we'll develop the additional information to enhance understanding of that concept. If you would like to submit more than one - please feel free.

Please note...much of the data the group will need for this part of the process is included in the output from the Toronto "Critical Incidents" session…a WORD document is attached for your information. I've also attached the Code of Ethics of the American Library Association. I pulled this off the site provided by Rose (e-mail Oct. 28) - http://csep.iit.edu/codes/coe/Writing_A_Code.html - as just one example of what you might want the final format to look like...this site is well worth visiting.

I don't see my role as responding to each submission, so you will need to pick up on, and comment on, each other's submissions. From the resulting dialog the task force will attempt to assemble the data.

Originally we had planned to have the brainstorming complete by November 10. Based on comments that were made early in the process around allowing sufficient time for discussion, together with the fact that I am going to be unavailable for a substantial part of this month, I would like to extend this to December 10, thereby providing a full month for dialog.

Thanks again for your continued participation.

Facilitated by Tony Nash, EVTT members proposed and discussed statements for inclusion in the statement of values and code of ethics. A Mini-Task Force was convened to meet face-to-face in late December and the first draft "Statement of Values and Code of Ethics" was transmitted by Tony to the group via the following email on January 31, 2001. :

Back again....Happy New Year! The mini-task force was joined just after Christmas by EVTT member Deborah Starzynski who made a great contribution to the effort in bringing you the first draft of your "Statement of Values and Code of Ethics" by the end of January, as promised.

You will note the document consists of a preamble, an over-arching Statement of Values, and a Code of Ethics consisting of 10 (ten) succinct statements, followed by additional text to enhance understanding, as required by the 'must meet' criteria.

We claim no pride of authorship. No new data was generated...everything you see has been posted by one person or another since the discourse began. We've been quite blatant in our plagiarism, taking quite freely from your submissions where we felt that someone had "expressed it best".

We tested the "Code" against the 'must meet' criteria. The only omission is the where the preamble is required to include the voluntary nature of adherence by members. We felt that the IAF would probably want to

develop an appropriate policy as part of the roll-out process following dialogue at the conference in this regard.

YOUR TASK:

My request is that we follow this process...

(1) What I like about the Code...
(2) My concerns/what would I change...
(3) My suggested 'specific' wording to address my concern/change in #(2).

Hopefully, by following this process it will discourage members from making broad statements such as "It should have said something about..." By taking a disciplined approach it will be easier to incorporate any suggested changes.

I'm not quite sure of the next steps to position ourselves for the May conference. Perhaps Sandy can provide some input in this regard once we've all had the opportunity to consider the First Draft, which I suggest we do for the entire month of February. Thanks again for your continued participation in this process, and many thanks to members of the task force for their great effort. Keep talking!

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECOND DRAFT

Building on the comments received, the Mini-Task Force met again on March 15, 2001 to develop the second draft. Following is Tony's description of the process used by the Mini-Task Force to create the second draft.

Members of the mini-task force that put together Draft #2 were: Grant Feltmate, Canada; Katy Jordan, US; Gordon Laing, Canada; Deborah Starzynski, Canada; Tony Nash, Canada.

Deborah Starzynski drove 250 miles from Toronto to Ottawa (once again in the snow!) to meet with Gord Laing and Tony Nash. Katy Jordan and Grant Feltmate were invited to provide their input prior to the meeting (which they did), which took place Thursday, March 15. Deb/Gord/Tony met from 9:30 am until 4:30 pm, taking a one-hour lunch break. We were all seeing double by the time the meeting ended. I had a giant headache.

The group followed the same format as they did with Draft #1. That is, prior to the meeting every single response to Draft #1 was printed off, numbered, and assembled in three binders. Gord went through Draft #1 and assigned the corresponding page number reference to either the preamble, statement of values or the ethical statements.

Because of the positive reaction to Dave Wilkinson's suggested changes (Feb 26), we decided to start with that, and included Rose Bednarz's comments (Feb 28) together with Marilyn Stecyk's (Mar 2).

With this as our base we followed Gord's numbering protocol to ensure that everyone's input was considered. Of course, we made some judgement calls and could not use everything.

The day we met was the day that Sandy and other EVTT members worked on wording for a draft statement pertaining to consensus. We liked the statement produced by Sandy with input from Dale, Wayne, Katy and Joan. As Sandy had observed earlier, we felt it was slightly "wordy" so we made some modifications which we felt accommodated all sides of the "consensus" debate, without losing the intent. You'll have to be the judges.

Once we had put together Draft #2 we asked for feedback from both Grant and Katy. They suggested wording changes. We quickly realized amongst ourselves that even we could not agree on all the wording. Some of us felt (as Rose suggested on February 27) that the ethical statements and supporting text could be more direct and less wordy. However, we reached consensus in that we all agreed with Draft #2 as best representing what the majority of the EVTT has been saying for the past few months.

I'd like to thank each and every member of the mini-task force, Grant Feltmate, Katy Jordan, Gordon Laing and Deborah Starzynski, for their time contribution, diligence and effort. Having completed what they volunteered to do, the mini-task force is now disbanded.

Although comments were received on the second draft, changes were postponed until after the EVTT sessions at IAF 2001 Conference.

P L A N   F O R   2 0 0 1   -   2 0 0 2

The following plan was developed by EVTT members present at IAF Conference.

1. Circulate this preliminary list of next steps and the summary of comments to EVTT, Conference Session participants, and ACT for their review and comment. ACT should be fully informed of and endorse the actions, accountabilities and timetable for further work on the Statement of Values and Code of Ethics.

2. Develop the next steps and timetable to result in a proposed statement of values and code of ethics for action by ACT at its May 2002 pre-conference meeting

3. Develop a Study Guide and encourage the self-organization of virtual and face-to-face small group discussions. Provide a summary of the issues of concern with cross references to the specific sections of the draft that contain the language of concern. The facilitator ensures that a summary of the comments is either added to the comments web page <give the url> or emailed to evtt@yahoogroups.com.edu

4. Distribute to all IAF members and to Grp-Facl the following: Draft II, summary of comments made by EVTT and IAF conference session participants, Small Group Study Guide, and description of next steps with timetable.

5. Place Draft II on the web using a commenting technology that will serve to collect all comments and suggestions for change.

6. Convene a series of conversations on controversial topics, with invited speakers with divergent points of view. These may be virtual discussions -- synchronous and asynchronous, open to all -- and/or printed conversations published in the journal. The facilitator ensures that a summary of the comments is either added to the comments web page <give the url> or emailed to evtt@yahoogroups.com

7. Request that the PDTF and accreditation board review the statement and code for consistency with the competencies.

8. Develop a glossary of terms to accompany the "Statement" and "Code."

9. Convene a face-to-face meeting, prior to the IAF Conference in May 2002, to integrate the comments received and develop a proposed Statement of Values and Code of Ethics. Alternatively, the face-to-face meeting could be convened just prior to the conference.

ESSAYS AND FOCUSED ONLINE DISCUSSIONS

Over the course of the next year three topics were addressed in detail via essays and focused online discussion. Joan Firkins (Australia) prepared an essay on "Trust, Safety and Equity" and facilitated an online discussion from mid August through mid September, 2001. Freeman Marvin (United States) and John Butcher (Canada) each prepared an essay to explore issues regarding consensus and then reacted to each other's essays. These essays were scheduled for publication in the Fall 2001 issue of the Group Facilitation Journal. Unfortunately, publication was delayed and these essays were not made available to EVTT until early April 2002. Roger Schwarz (United States) prepared an essay and facilitated an online discussion on "Who is the client" during the month of March 2002. Each of these discussions resulted in revisions to the draft.

As the group anticipated concluding its discussions and preparing a final draft for presentation to ACT at the May 2002 IAF conference, a poll was conducted to determine if there were any reservations about moving forward. Two additional issues piqued further discussion. One pertained to "neutrality/ impartiality/ objectivity;" the other addressed "appropriate methods and needs of the group." These two issues resulted in a spike in the quantity of messages exchanged during the month of April 2002. Where as the average number of messages per month prior to April 2002 was 28, and the high for any single month was

72, the number of messages exchanged in April 2002 was 250. These discussions, too, resulted in changes to the draft.

In the course of the closing months EVTT reviewed Drafts 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. The final version was adopted when 27 EVTT members responded to a poll in early May indicating their support of the following resolution with no one indicating that they had reservations.

The IAF Ethics and Values Think Tank has concluded its work in developing a Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Group Facilitators (the Code). We recommend that it be adopted by ACT as IAF's official policy and that it be formally reviewed in two years. During those two years the Ethics and Values Think Tank will solicit feedback from IAF members and other stakeholders, and continue to provide a forum for discussion of pertinent issues and potential revisions. The Code should be made widely available and copies distributed to all IAF members.

The Code, including the above proposal, was formally transmitted to ACT on May 3, 2002. It was adopted by ACT on May 22, 2002, with the inclusion of the word "draft." The complete version, as adopted by ACT, is included in the section entitled, "The International Association of Facilitators Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Group Facilitators."

MOVING FORWARD: 2002 - 2004

The following actions were proposed at the EVTT Meeting, May 23, 2002, at IAF Conference 2002.

Proposed Next Steps

Date	Task	Volunteers (first person is lead)
June 2002	ACT Resolution: - Post resolution to EVTT as it was actually adopted by ACT	Dale Hunter
June - August 2002	Translation: - Consult with Gil Brenson-Lazan, IAF Vice-Chair International - Have *The Code* translated into Spanish, French, and other languages	Sandy Schuman
June - August 2002	Report: - (see below - notes on report contents) - post to EVTT for comment - obtain comments and lessons learned from EVTT - deliver final report to IAF membership	Sandy Schuman
June 2002 - April 2003	Liaison with Facilitator Certification - *The Code* and competencies should be consistent - Should adherence to *The Code* be a condition of certification?	Tony Nash
June 2002 - April 2003	Liaison with Professional Development Task Force - *The Code* and other PDTF efforts should be consistent - What are IAF's legal liability issues pertaining to *The Code?* - Will adherence to *The Code* be mandatory or voluntary for IAF members?	Dale Hunter
June 2002 - April 2003	Critical Incident Project: - Elicit critical incidents - Elicit responses to critical incidents - Prepare package for IAF Conference 2003	Freeman Marvin, Deb Starzynski, Stephen Thorpe John Butcher

Date	Task	Volunteers (first person is lead)
June 2002 - December 2003	Obtain feedback on *The Code*: - Recruit researcher (e.g., graduate student looking for thesis topic) - Solicit feedback from EVTT, IAF - Survey facilitators and clients - Develop instrument for assessing facilitator behavior with respect to the code	
September 2002 - June 2003	Conference Session: - Organize, propose, market, and host conference session - Based on results of Critical Incident Project - Similar to IAF 2000 Conference session - Recruit authors to serve as respondents/ panelists	Sandy Schuman, Freeman Marvin, Critical Incident Project Team
June- 2002-	Journal Article: - Write and submit an article for publication in the Group Facilitation Journal - Same basic content outline as the report, but more thorough and complete - See below - notes on journal article	Dale Hunter, Stephen Thorpe, Deb Starzynski
July 2003 - July 2004	Publish Critical Incidents - Edit, refine, and supplement critical incidents and responses for publication in Journal or stand-alone training manual or book.	Freeman Marvin, Critical Incident Project Team
November - December 2003	Amendments to *The Code* - Recruit facilitator to elicit amendments	Sandy Schuman
January 2004 - April 2004	Amendments to *The Code* - Solicit and build consensus on amendments, if any	Facilitator to be identified

Date	Task	Volunteers (first person is lead)
May or June 2004	Present *The Code* for adoption at pre-conference ACT meeting	

EVTT 2002 Report

<u>June - Draft the following sections</u>
    Acknowledgments
    History of the project and EVTT
    Results (*The Code*)
    Lessons learned

<u>July - Circulate draft and collect comments from EVTT</u>
    Solicit additional comments and lessons learned

<u>August - Finalize and distribute</u>

Journal article

A more thorough version of the report that is also better grounded in the existing literature and proposes a model for global inclusion and participation.

Delusions of grandeur

All of the critical incidents are integrated to depict a series of vignettes in a single, ongoing group; a coherent story of a group and its facilitator punctuated by critical incidents

Video tape with actors depicting the critical incidents

Interactive learning/ DVD

We get together with closely related professional associations and develop a "meta-code" for impartial, change-oriented professions (e.g., Organization Development Network, International Association for Public Participation, Association for Conflict Resolution, American Society for Training and Development, Association for Quality and Participation)

We spin off a DFTT -- Defining Facilitation Think Tank. Since many people have commented that The Code goes a long way to defining the profession, it would be useful to use The Code, and other materials (such as the competencies) to develop a definition/ explanation of group facilitation.

LESSONS LEARNED

At the EVTT meeting at IAF Conference 2002 the participants brainstormed "lessons learned" regarding the process used by EVTT over the past two years. We were encouraged by Jo Nelson to incorporate such lessons to develop a model for IAF global, inclusive processes. Following is result of that brainstorming session.

- We maximized inclusion for those with online access and provided only a few opportunities for participation by those without online access

- It takes time (duration/ elapsed time)

- It allows time (for people to think about what they want to say)

- Asynchronous, written communication provides a richness not often found in real-time meetings

- Deadlines stimulate participation

- Maximizing inclusion requires continuous integration of new members

- Don't assume that silence means concurrence

- Lack of familiarity with technology produces limits

- Private communication among those in facilitator roles was helpful

- Personal communications helped develop sensitivity

- Email exaggerates implicit messages and misunderstandings

- Differences in use of language (cultural or otherwise) must be taken into account

- Exaggerate transparency, e.g., let everyone in the group know what's going on, such as when you invite new people to join the group

- We should have established ground rules and orientation to technology, and related facilitation skills; need for intervention

- Clarity of membership - who is a member

- Role of moderator vs. facilitator - need clarity as to who is in which role

- Synthesis/ integration/ convergence requires and intensive effort by one or a small number of people to propose a single formulation that can be reviewed and reworked by the group