

CISV International

@cisv-international

Admin x

u Collapse all

CISV International [Admin](#) [8w](#) in Draft Motions 2018 Discussion Forum 1 e @ W x

Draft Motion 1 – 2018 – Accounts and Auditors

Like

thom1309 [7w](#) x

(y)

Like

CISV International [Admin](#) [8w](#) in Draft Motions 2018 Discussion Forum 20 e @ W x

Draft Motion 2 – 2018 – Age Limits

Like

thom1309 [7w](#) x

Makes sense. No more comment than that. Would make things WAY easier ...

Like

edinur [7w](#) [a3](#) x

I think there are two distinct issues here that are worth separating out:

- 1) The month range of the age limits (15 months vs. 12 months)
- 2) When does that range start (Jan vs. another month)

I think it would be helpful to have separate discussions about each of these.

Like

thom1309 [7w](#) x

My2cents: Keep it simple. Start in Jan. Count for the calender year.

Like

jonaspeterson [6w](#) x

@edinur: Why do you think that the month range needs to be separated from the other part? I see it as a whole package, where the thing with the range start is that it should be simple with just one calendar year (which results in a 12 month range).

Like

cisvfrank [6w](#) x

We need to account for different calendars in the motion, as there are still countries in the world that don't use the gregorian calendar – well I know for most of us existing CISV Countries this would be clear, but when new countries might join in the future, we can avoid confusion by just adding the reference to the gregorian calendar once to this motion.

Like

thom1309 [6w](#) x

Agree

Like

katharinakanns 20d x

By switching the age separation for approx. half a year I expect the “children finding” process to be more complicated, as then schoolmates would be “of different age” – now finding one child very often leads to the next one, which most probably will be of the same age in summer, as school classes are separated by the age they have after summer holidays.

By switching the age separation from “during the holidays” to “January” we will have different age settings in different programmes.

Kids born in 2009 will be between 10 1/2 and 11 1/2 in July, so the average of a July Village will be 11. Kids born in 2009 will be between 11 and 11,999999 in December, so kids on a December Village will always be half a year older, with an average age of 11 1/2.

So in my opinion, moving from “programme date range” to “gregorian calendar” will effect our programmes a LOT. And winter programmes will then start to differ from summer programmes.

Like

20d x

Another point to be considered: how should we deal with kids who, if we switch, NEVER will be 11? Any kid born from Sep-Dec 2008 will be 10 in Summer 2019 (NO Village for you, my dear), and will be considered to be 12 in 2010 (NO Village for you, old kid).

(And so on for Step Ups and JCs)

Like

20d x

Hm, fairness. Good point. On the other hand: In our chapter we estimate the chance of being flexible and move the kids a bit around. We are willing to on the one hand fill our spots as good as possible, on the other hand not to disappoint people, and third: especially the children which are the youngest/oldest of the range can often be given more attention, and sent to the programme they fit in better. A very mature 14/15 may be a benefit for a 15 Step Up, a childish 13/14 may be perfect in a 12/13 Interchange, ... Or can be asked to return next year.

The fairness in our case is done by the chapter. We keep track of our members, and we will not send a child to three Step Ups, even if age limits would allow this. And, of course, everybody is aware of the fact, that no kid should ever attend two Villages, isn't it?

Like

jonaspetererson 20d x

@katharinakanns

then schoolmates would be “of different age”

The school year has not been taken into consideration in the motion, as it differs between countries. It's impossible to find a system which suits every country exactly as they would like it and who then gets to decide? In this case, the motion is trying to find a system that is easy to explain, easy to handle and fair to everyone.

@katharinakanns

NEVER will be 11?

Are you referring to the kids that will be “stuck in between” the two systems? We trust the Educational Programmes Committee to find a good way to sort that out to make it fair for everyone.

@katharinakanns

In our chapter we estimate the chance of being flexible and move the kids a bit around.

Do you think that you will lose the flexibility just because you lose 3 months out of 15 (or 3 out of 27)?

The motion doesn't narrow the age span that much, it just removes the possibility for some kids to

apply twice. It also gives the same applicants the chance to apply for all programmes during a year, instead of having to keep track of three different age limits (one for each programme period).

Like

thom1309 20d x

I didn't think about that. What Katharina says above, is pretty accurate. By moving the age boundaries we really may lose kids – it doesn't seem to be supportive for growth (or do I miss anything?)

Like

20d a1 x

@jonaspeterston wouldnt the option to have a not-yet-mature June-kid in a Village delegation next year be an advantage? For the kid? The chapter? For growth of reach?

Like

jonaspeterston 20d x

@thom1309

@jonaspeterston wouldnt the option to have a not-yet-mature June-kid in a Village delegation next year be an advantage?

Yes, it might be an advantage for the kid and the chapter, but at the same time, what gives a kid born in June the right to apply twice and not a not-yet-mature kid born in May or September?

For reach I would say it's a disadvantage, as we are not looking for “new” participants but relying on the kids that applied last year.

Regarding growth: It's up to the chapter to organize other activities for those who are not selected (no matter which reason) and CISV has a lot of other options for them the coming years. Your CISV life doesn't end just because you weren't able to go to a Village.

Like

thom1309 20d x

True. However, other activities require even more volunteers willing to organize and execute those activities. And that is pretty hard for smaller Chapters and NAs. I haven't thought about that impact details, that Katharina lined out above in the first place. Now, thinking about it, it would create quite a burden for us. Obviously, we'd handle it; however, I can well imagine how that new rule supports large NAs and Chapters (easier and more fair application and decision process) and how it could make the lives of smaller NA/Chapters harder.

Like

Bjorn_NAR_Swe 19d x

To reply regarding the flexibility: that's something we have for all programmes except Village, which I imagine is for the reason that “we” wanted a specific age, and/or had enough participants in that age group who applied.

If we as an organisation want to have that flexibility for Village as well, then all children should have it, not just the lucky ones =)

Like

thom1309 19d x

You're right, Björn. And being a bit flexible for those with June-August birthdays is good – – – and at the same time pretty minor. What I didn't realize in the first place was that by this change we could have 10yo together with 12yo in a Village. Imagine the impact to the programme with THAT variety. For this age group, this is really HUGE.

Like

katharinakanns 18d x

Just thinking a bit out-of-the-box: Village is the most challenging topic when we discuss age limits. What about having a lot of Villages for 11-y-olds and at least some for 12-y-olds? Similar to Seminarcamps ... in one way, similar to Step Up the other way. You may attend only once, but there is less a chance that kids “drop out” just because they are “a bit too young”.

Like

18d x

@jonaspetterson: reducing the limit from 15 months to 12 months is a reduction by 20% ... in my opinion that IS much)

Like

Bjorn_NAR_Swe 17d a1 x

Thom – The maximum age difference with the current system is even larger, as you can see in the presentation. We will actually make it slightly smaller =)

Like

17d x

Katharina – With the current system only some people have two chances, so the reduction isn't really 20%. I think it's weird and unfair that different people get different treatments, it doesn't make sense. So sure, one could consider giving everyone two chances, but until further notice we're going to suggest making it just one year. =)

Like

CISV International 8w in Draft Motions 2018 Discussion Forum 8 e @ W x

Draft Motion 3 – 2018 – Junior Branch Purpose and Goals

Like

thom1309 7w a1 x

Am I correct in assuming that “Junior Branch is an integral yet autonomous part of CISV International” is not anymore stated in the future J-01 document? I would consider this an important claim for Junior Branch!

Like

piparaimundo 6w x

Dear Thom, thank you a lot for your comment!

In fact, we believe that Junior Branch is an integral part of CISV and we are looking forward to have integration at all levels. We would like to hear from you, what does ‘autonomous’ mean in CISV? How do you perceive/understand Junior Branch’s autonomy at this moment?

Looking forward hearing back from you!

Flora and Pipa

Like

thom1309 6w x

“Integral” is the more important bit for me, to be honest. I favour a strong committment to Junior Branch. Always.

“Atonomous” in this context describes the fact, that Junior Branch shall act by their own goals, strategy, decisions, priorities, ... Junior Branch's goal to support CISV's overall vision and mission is outlined very candidly; which I think is good. The strategy of how to achieve that support of our overall movement shall be found autonomous. That sentence says exactly that crystal clear.

Like

piparaimundo 6w x

Dear Thom,

This is a very good comment – thank you!

We do agree that Junior Branch is an integral part of CISV. We will definitely take this into account when reflecting on the motion.

In your opinion, do you believe it would make sense to:

- Include it in our goals, for example in Goal 2: Provide youth with the opportunities for self-development and leadership? We will need to reflect on the wording, but something such as: By ensuring that Junior Branch’s strategy remains autonomous while aligned with CISV mission and vision?

Thank you for this enriching discussion, we look forward hearing back from you!

Flora and Pipa

Like

thom1309 5w x

Hi again U2 :))

My humble opinion is, to be honest: Keep the sentence as it is. I think, that it does by no means conflict with anything else in the motion. By making it part of one of the goals, it might appear as if belonging to that goal only. In my opinion it is an important preamble. However, I shall not be the only one having an opinion on this. Hope, others do engage in the conversation here ...

Like

piparaimundo 5w a1 x

Dear Thom, hi again!

Thank you for your message – it is a good point!

And we do hope that people participate in this discussion as well)

We will be having our first task force meeting very soon and we will keep you posted!

Flora and Pipa

Like

18d x

Dear all,

As we have received important feedback and key interrogations from the Regional Meetings, we are looking forward starting the discussion on some relevant points that will help us get a clear sense on what the organisation deems important to have as part of the new J-01. Please join us for this discussion!

This week’s question based on the Regional Meetings’ feedback:

Junior Branch brings together individuals who have common interests, similar concerns and a shared vision for the world we live in. Nevertheless, one of our main strengths relies on the diversity we have as a group, as each individuals brings its own characteristics to the mix.

One suggestion that was made was in regards to Goal 4: "Create a community of Like-Minded individuals" was to add ‘inclusive’ community of like-minded individuals. In your opinion, does Junior Branch foster an inclusive community of like-minded individuals?

Looking forward hearing from you!

Flora and Pipa

less...Like

10d x

Throughout the next 4 weeks we will be sharing with you the meaning for putting forward this motion. With it, we hope to provide more insights on our rationale and what it will mean for CISV if the motion is approved.

Week 1: What does this motion mean for CISV International?

As it is now, Junior Branch's contribution is present in all of CISV areas and levels but our impact is not clearly defined by the organisation. With a more concise and clear purpose and goals, we are aiming at not only measuring this impact but also on how to increase it through our educational initiatives.

With the approval of this motion we will:

- Provide a clear definition on what Junior Branch purpose is and what it strives for.
- Provide a clear framework for local, national, regional and international level.
- Recognize youth's contribution to the organisation in terms of impact and resources.

In fact, we are aiming at clarifying Junior Branch (JB) purpose and goals into a concise document as J-01 was approved at the last Annual International Meeting (AIM) in 2013 and hasn't been updated since.

Since then, CISV has greatly evolved as well as Junior Branch and its contribution to the organisation.

This contribution is even more relevant for CISV's growth which is aligned with our new vision: 'By 2030 we will be well-known for creating educational experiences that reach at least twice as many people as we do today (2015). We will stand together to lead, act and inspire change in our communities to help build a more just and peaceful world.'

Looking forward hearing from you!

Flora and Pipa

less...Like

CISV International [comment](#) 8w in Draft Motions 2018 Discussion Forum 3 e @ W x

Draft Motion 4 – 2018 – Approval R-11 Policy & Procedure

0

For enforcement of rules

Like

thom1309 [7w](#) x

Having heard some dispute about this motion, I'd like to contribute to any discussion to come, that I do feel that this moves a better balanced alternative to the existing R-11. Because:

- (1) easier to grasp, less complicated, straight forward
- (2) supporting the fact that some rule violations happen because of very thorough consideration (such as e.g. not being able to find a 4th kid to a delegation, hence sending a kid, who wants to go, has the personal development fit for the programme but not precisely the right age). Hard sanctions in such cases may lead to severe frustration especially when the option (in the above example) would be to not send the right number of participants (which is equally sanctioned today afai).

Bottom line: I think the new R-11 would allow for a much more balanced sanction execution than previously.

Like

edinur [7w](#) x

Just a clarification, it's not that CISV int'l has no ability to apply sanctions today and that this document gives it additional 'power'. It's more about streamlining the process. If and when CISV int'l decides to start enforcing rules that were not previously enforced, this will be done transparently and gradually. For example, Maggs sent out an email in February with regard to having a national risk manager in place by 2018 and chapter RMs by 2019 and explained the sanctions of non-compliance. This is meant to give NAs and Chapters sufficient time to react to this and ensure they are in compliance. Bottom line: if we decide to introduce new sanctions, this will be clearly communicated (along with the rationale) and in a way that gives our Members a chance to prepare for it.

Like

thom1309 7w x

Makes sense. I do personally like this motion.

Like

CISV International [Home](#) 8w in Draft Motions 2018 Discussion Forum 6 e @ W x

Draft Motion 5 – 2018 – Approval of Board Priorities for Next Strategic Plan

Like

thom1309 7w x

With this one, I feel that priority area (2.) is a useful way of figuring the next steps towards our vision. I would however, not be able to tell if the items suggested in priority area (1.) would work to support priority area (2.) and our overall path towards our vision. In the best case, the items in priority area (1.) MAY POTENTIALLY LEAD to supporting priority area (2.), but who'd be able to grant that. I think that priority area (1.) items need to be more clearly set into perspective to our vision to see whether they really make sense with this next strategic plan.

Like

edinur 7w x

One way we described this during ARC is the following: Obj. 1 is more about **optimizing** our existing programs and structures to be able to support growth. For example, finding ways for NAs to co-host, providing a cash advance to assist in hosting, etc. In that way, obj. 1 will help ensure the short-term growth towards our vision (as the results of the program review will take a few years to implement, regardless). Obj. 2 is more about setting us up for growth in the longer term in ways that perhaps we are not doing today. More of thinking about initiatives that are more 'out-of-the-box', for example, new types of programs, replicating national models, partnering with similar organizations that can help extend our reach, etc.

Like

thom1309 7w a1 x

If that is the purpose of priority area 1, then we need to be more clear in how sample initiatives support this growth: (1) exceeding hosting plans only works when we can attract more volunteers to actually DO it (staff for our programmes especially; already today, it is utterly hard to get the necessary programme staff lined up to actually DO it) – (2) the global marketing plan as such does not add to growth; it may be a good thing, but without details on plans, costs, outcome, effect on chapters it won't help us – (3) the Alumni Association would need to "flood" volunteers into the chapter, who are willing to act as staff, if that should support our growth priority area – (4) eLearning is a great opportunity; and

maybe eLearning might make it easier for people to learn the essentials to be a good staff & leader; but eLearning will not provide these kind of courses this year; so on the short term, this also will not support growth directly.

Get me right, please: None of these things may be bad ideas as such; I just feel that I can make much more from priority area (2) compared to (1). Of course, we want to grow, but there's only one thing, that will help us to do so: Volunteers, that take action. Very concretely. Everything else may be nice, but not supporting the goal.

Like

narsannestepthorsten 7w a1 x

In line with some of the concerns raised by Thom in the discussion above, we are a group of NARs who got together during BEAM to discuss certain concerns about this motion, particularly priority #1.

Our main concern is that a strong focus on growth might compromise the quality of our programs and general work in CISV. As Thom mentioned, many NAs and PAs are struggling to find staffs and leaders, let alone fill a delegation with the right age and gender (see discussions about motion 04 and sanctions). We fear that focusing head-on growth before ensuring a sustainable roadmap for growth might lead to a decreased quality in our programs, when what we are aiming for is in fact the opposite.

Secondly, and importantly, we still do not have the results from the Programme Review. That means that we still don't know if the programs in their current form are what we should focus our growth on for the future. If, let's say, the Review results indicate that a certain program does not contribute to the growth and development of our organization and that is the program we have put a lot of force in to achieve a 10% growth in participation, we're developing a counterproductive way.

Thirdly, we believe there are other forms of growth to be investigated, which might be a better and more sustainable solution for our organization right now. These are exactly what should be investigated in the second priority – creating a roadmap for growth.

We want the broad priorities to ensure a sustainable growth, and we believe that the current format of the motion primarily focuses on quantitative growth, specifically a 10% increase in participation in our international programmes, while not specifically ensuring the quality of the required long-term growth for 2030.

For these reasons, we would suggest the following to improve the motion:

- Remove priority number 1: Grow participation in our international programmes by 10%.
- Change the second priority to be the first priority for the GoBo to continue forming a roadmap to reach our vision for 2030.
- Take the results of our ongoing Programme Review into consideration to adapt the next strategic plan to our needs for sustainable growth.
- Continue work on the foundation (as stated in the SP 2016-2018) until we can take in the results from the Programme Review and internal educational content review to ensure a well-informed and quality-based growth plan.

Finally, we are not aiming at no growth at all, of course not. Our vision as voted on states that we have to double our reach, but we do not believe that growth in necessarily where we should start, when we still have a lot of quality assurance to do before we can ensure a sustainable growth.

less...Like

thom1309 7w x

Good one. Makes perfect sense to me.

Like

cisvfrank 6w a2 x

@edinur: I have the feeling that the sample initiatives are not really aligned with the broad priority. Especially when it comes to #1, I feel these are incremental improvements that need to be done anyway as part of our operations, especially when I look at marketing or e-learning, also working with the newly founded Alumni organization is basically a follow up of the foundation of that organization. And when it comes to exceeding commitments in the GHP, I would be careful for exceeding the plan with offers, a) plan already includes a reasonable increase, b) plan includes an assessment of expected sending as well, something that is nowhere else done. Camps with no participants won't be of help. I even feel that #1 is making already an early decision on the expected outcome of #2, which I find dangerous. Why would we then still need to do #2 is a big chunk is already decided on by #1?

Like