

**INSTITUTE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN POTENTIAL**

GUIDELINES FOR IDHP COURSES

GUIDELINES FOR IDHP COURSES

(Revised March 1994)

CONTENTS

	Page No
General Principles and Ethics	1
Organisation and Objectives	3
Methodology	4
Content	7
Time Structure	8
Facilitators	8
Appeals and Crisis	10
Finance	11
Applications and Selection Procedures for Course Facilitators	12
Selection Procedure for Short Courses	18

INSTITUTE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN POTENTIAL

GUIDELINES FOR IDHP COURSES

General Principles and Ethics

1. IDHP courses are intended to develop as peer learning communities within the continuing evolving tradition of the Institute. This tradition values and seeks to work creatively with:
 - * autonomy, co-operation and power, so that authority and knowledge are used openly and authentically, and all involved are empowered by the learning enterprise
 - * transcendence, as we believe that individuals, course communities and the whole Institute can always be open to that creative chaos which moves us beyond current structures and processes to new levels of realisation.

Thus each IDHP course is intended to develop as a peer learning community with a hierarchy which strives to be authentic and enlightened; these relationships are expressed in clear contracts between the course members and its primary facilitators (Course contract), and between the Committee and the primary facilitators and thus through them to the course members (Facilitators contract).

2. The IDHP deals with all issues of practice through processes of self and peer review and assessment. This applies to ethical questions as well as all other issues of practice.
3. Ethical issues should be addressed when courses are proposed and validated, in Course Reports, in supervision, in any emergency situation (facilitators are expected to review the ethics of their practice as appropriate at those times) and as an ongoing live and relevant debate to current practice.

The following list of issues identifies the kinds of ethical issues which are important to address:

- a) Facilitators clarify to themselves, to their co-facilitator, to course participants and to supervisor, their own stance on:
 - * their negotiable and non-negotiable boundaries in working as a facilitator of an IDHP course
 - * their secrecy/privacy issues
 - * their relationship with each other and with group members

- b) Consider the possibility that the group process on ethical issues could be a mirror of their own unconscious process.
 - c) Disclose the nature of the relationship between facilitators, past and present, when they first present themselves to run a course and at the selection.
 - d) Disclose with co-facilitator and supervisor the nature of relationships with individual course members, before the course and/or any changes which begin to develop during the course. Including addressing the issues of sexuality in terms of potential relationships with group members.
 - e) Explore in an ongoing way ethical facilitator choice issues with supervisor and group.
4. The IDHP is committed to fostering and maintaining awareness of issues relating to racism, sexism, class and stereotyping.
 5. Course participants are selected on the basis of ability, appropriateness, fitness and readiness for this type of work and are not selected on the basis of gender, race or sexual orientation. The IDHP expects course facilitators to address and maintain an awareness of equal opportunities practice and is committed to creatively struggle with all this involves.
 6. The IDHP Committee draws up broad guidelines about Diploma Course Objectives, Ethics, Methodology, Content, Assessment, Time Structure, Staffing, Appeals and Crises, Finance etc. These guidelines are in principle open to continuous revision. All course organisers are invited to contribute to this revision.
 7. Course facilitators may not have special relationships with course participants e.g. client-therapist, sexual, financial, working or family relationship.
 8. Course facilitators may not run more than two consecutive courses.

Organisation and Objectives

The IDHP is a non hierarchical, sponsoring organisation.

It consists of current, past and future course facilitators who operate as a non-hierarchical committee.

The Committee's task in relation to courses is to monitor the quality of course facilitation and assessment and accreditation processes to ensure that IDHP guidelines are exemplified, that the IDHP ideology is honoured, and to provide supervision, support and advice to each course.

The IDHP does not finance, administer, organise nor design specific courses, this is the responsibility of course facilitators whether they are operating as part of an organisation or as individuals.

The Committee's intention is that each institution or centre sponsoring a Diploma Course should feel free to design a version of the course which has its own special emphasis or flavour. The

guidelines are sufficiently flexible to allow for this. However an essential component of all IDHP courses is that they will:

- * include self and peer assessment and accreditation
- * follow the general principles and ethics as outlined in this document.
- * meet criteria of methodology which keep them within the spirit of the IDHP.

Our intention is that the 2 year diploma course will provide a basic grounding in the experiential, practical, and theoretical aspects of humanistic psychology. This means personal development, facilitation, inter-active skills building understanding and expression of relevant theory, and the application of this in some form of social change.

Currently the IDHP also sponsors shorter courses in personal and group development and aspects of facilitator training, both one to group and one to one. These courses need to meet criteria which keep them within the spirit of the IDHP.

The IDHP will consider one year courses which may be at pre- or post diploma level as long as these courses adhere to IDHP guidelines and principles and the course embodies the spirit of the IDHP.

Methodology -

The following refers primarily to the 2 year Diploma Courses for which it is non-negotiable. For shorter courses we recommend that the following is used as a guide.

The working methods give the courses their distinctive structure and provide a framework in which different levels of learning can take place.

Courses should be committed to the following:

1. A Learning Community

Each course is intended to develop towards a peer learning community, which aims to balance hierarchy and authority (where facilitators take a strong lead) with co-operative and self directed ways of working. How this learning community develops will depend on the nature of the group, the specific course and the style of the facilitator(s). It is common for the primary facilitators to initially have a high profile with participants taking increasing responsibility for decision making, content, method, group and individual process and facilitation.

2. Course Contract

Each Diploma course is run on a contract basis. This states the structure, the non-negotiable guidelines and the ethical boundaries, within which the course proceeds and self-direction and peer decision-making take place: overall learning objectives, basic course methodology, required content, role of facilitators, student responsibilities etc. The contract should also contain information about the relationship of the course to the Institute. Course facilitators need to inform participants of the supervisors and describe their role and availability to the course participants. Each person joining the course must make a commitment to the contract.

3. **Experiential Learning**

This means autonomous and cooperative discovery through structured and unstructured and interactive experience, in which emphasis is placed on participants innate ability to learn from their own and others thoughts, feelings, bodies, perceptions, intuitions and interactions. Time is set aside for reflecting on the process and drawing out meaning and significance.

4. **Working with the Process of the Group**

Which could include; developing the life of the group through working with individual and group needs as they arise, here-and-now encounter, and working with group dynamics and defense processes.

5. **Theoretical Study**

Which could include; the use of theory, discussion seminars, reading, book reviews, and the presentation of prepared papers by course members, to give participants a comprehensive grasp of a broad range of theoretical issues.

6. **Skills Training and Practice**

Which could include; using roleplay, coaching, pair-work, co-consultative triads, observation and analysis, video, fieldwork arranged by course members, peer supervision and feedback. Participants will take turns in facilitating and/or co-facilitating the group.

7. **Project Work**

An appropriate amount of course work, which maybe specified in advance or negotiated with participants. As a rough guideline, one piece of work each term is recommended. This may include writing expressive prose, poetry, theoretical discussion and self reflection; an appropriate balance between these four should be sought. Each course is also committed to encouraging non-linguistic expression through painting, sculpture, music, dance, video etc. The project work and its mode of presentation should challenge and extend each participants expressive abilities.

Some form of application work or social change project which we recommend is started in the first year and is further developed in the second year. The purpose is to take the learning from the course into action in a wider arena. This might involve work within the family, with local or community organisations, at work, or in new organisations or networks; or the course as a whole might engage on a joint project. The project might be relatively micro or macro in scope; concerned with changing consciousness and/or changing political structures. Whatever the nature of the project, course members are expected to discuss and explore their application work verbally or in writing with their peers.

8. Assessment and Accreditation

The self and peer assessment and accreditation process is a particular strength of IDHP courses.

- I The diploma is awarded on the basis of assessments made during and at the end of the course: minimally at the end of each year. The assessment method is self-, peer-, and facilitator-assessment, the last two being used to refine and develop the first. The committee can provide practical guidance on self and peer assessment procedure.
- II The Institute's Diploma carries the signature of the candidate, a course representative (i.e. a representative of the candidate's peers on the course), the course facilitator(s), and a representative of the IDHP committee (i.e. course supervisor). The Diploma is only recognised as being valid by the Institute if it carries all these four signatures.
- III The assessment and accreditation process should normally include three written statements: an Assessment of Development; an Accreditation; and the Diploma itself.

The Diploma is a formal document which confirms the satisfactory completion of the Diploma course. It attests to the accuracy of the accompanying statements, and thus confirms that the candidate has an acceptable degree of self understanding. The Diploma does not in itself indicate that the candidate has developed any particular skills or is competent in any particular aspect of facilitation. The Diploma is important in its symbolic sense in representing formally that it is awarded through self and peer-assessment, rather than by an outside authority.

The Assessment of Development is a statement of personal and professional learning through the two years. It is intended to show that the candidate knows themselves well and deeply, appreciates their particular strengths and aptitudes, and knows well the creative and distorting patterns of their living. This assessment should normally cover experiential, theoretical and practical learning in the three fundamental areas of the course - personal development, facilitator competence, and social change.

The Accreditation is a statement by the candidate of the specific areas in which they are deemed to be competent, along with any caveats (such as particular forms of supervision) which may be appropriate.

All these statements should be produced collaboratively, being drafted in the first instance by the candidate, and refined and developed in discussion and negotiation with peers and facilitators until an acceptable degree of agreement is reached. In principle the statements could be produced by the beginning of the final term of the course, so that they may be reviewed and revised by the candidates and peers during that final term.

- IV At the end of the second year primary facilitators must engage in their own self and peer assessment.

9. Participants and course facilitators together evaluate and monitor the course as it unfolds to ensure that it is meeting their needs and interests, in fulfilling the course contract, and is of an appropriate standard of excellence.

10. Primary facilitators are encouraged to honour their own special interests in the course design.

Content

The professional development offered on IDHP courses is thoroughly grounded in and draws from the personal and interpersonal development which forms a major part of the course.

The following content guidelines relate specifically to the IDHP 2 year diploma courses. The programme will be chosen from the following strands, which will run concurrently with varying emphasis on each at different stages of the course. It is an essential part of the learning that these strands are integrated as part of a holistic process.

A proportion of the course will be run by outside facilitators. This has traditionally been in the order of 6-9 weekends per year.

Personal Growth

Peer-counselling, Regression, Gestalt, Psychodrama, Psychosynthesis and Transpersonal approaches, Imaginal psychology, Bodywork, Creative expression and movement, Sexuality, Dreamwork, Learning styles, Theoretical overview of personal development. Previous participants have found it helpful to arrange support structure or engage in therapy outside the course.

Interpersonal and Group Development

Group Dynamics, Transactional Analysis, Assertiveness training, Encounter, Ceremony and ritual, Process consultation, Primal dynamics, Transference and counter-transference, Team building, Conflict resolution, Negotiating and influencing skills, Decision making and Problem solving.

Social Applications

Managing change, Change agent skills, Organisational development, Team building, Confronting skills, Decision development, Power and empowerment, Analysis of political thought and social experiment, Co-operation and self-help, Networking, Equal opportunities, Social change theories.

Facilitator Training

Facilitator Training incorporates the previous 3 strands and more specifically could include the following: Models of Facilitator Styles, both one to group and one to one, Facilitator presence, Support and Supervision, Stress management, Professionalism, Ethics, Workshop design and curriculum studies, Psychology and Philosophy of adult learning, History and relevance of traditional psychotherapies, Theories of group dynamics.

Time Structure

Courses are part-time and last for 2 years.

The IDHP is open to any time structure proposals as long as they fall within a minimum of 48 days per year and a maximum of 58 days per year.

Each year must include at least 1 residential (minimum of 3 days).

Facilitators

1. Facilitators must have some experience of working together as joint facilitators or be willing to obtain this experience prior to the start of the Diploma course.
2. The Facilitators contract is established as part of the Selection Procedure. It may include specific or general recommendations and/or caveats.
3. Because of the demands of the course, the Committee believes it preferable for each course to have two primary facilitators, but other arrangements may be acceptable.
4. The Committee is concerned that facilitation on the course is creatively balanced with regard to gender. This is usually accomplished by having a female and male co-primary facilitators.
5. The weekend workshops will be run by visiting facilitators who represent excellence in their modality. The primary facilitators are responsible for choosing and inviting visiting facilitators in the first year. This is the responsibility of the group in the second year. The primary facilitators must attend at least one of these workshops each year.
6. The participants themselves are resources for facilitation, especially but not exclusively in the second year.
7. The IDHP Committee evolves on a peer basis. Therefore each new Course Organiser will engage in a thoroughgoing self- and peer- assessment procedure to assure themselves, the Committee and any other relevant peers that they are competent. Details of selection procedure on page 12.
8. Each course has a supervisor chosen from within the IDHP Committee. The supervisor role includes the following specific responsibilities.
 - a) To make a supervision contract with the primary facilitators. This would include the number of sessions, three per year is an absolute minimum.

Additional IDHP supervision might be initiated by the facilitators, the supervisor or the Committee either at the Selection Procedure as a specific requirement or as appropriate throughout the course. Supervision is intended to give support, advice, challenge and to raise issues with the Facilitators as appropriate. The style of such supervision is expected to evolve through negotiation between the supervisor and

facilitators. Supervisors should be paid out of course funds and each course will negotiate these fees. Course facilitators and supervisors carry joint responsibility for ensuring adequate supervision under these guidelines, although the primary facilitators carry responsibility for initiating meetings and raising issues.

- b) The supervisor is invited to facilitate a weekend each year and both primary facilitators are strongly encouraged to be there. We strongly recommend that the first visit be in the first term of the first year. This is to enable course participants to establish a relationship with the supervisor and the IDHP Committee; and to enable the supervisor to monitor the course progress.
- c) It is the responsibility of the primary facilitators to inform the supervisor of the self and peer assessment and accreditation procedures to enable the supervisor to support and challenge the process.
- d) To sign the Diploma on behalf of the IDHP Committee. This is a symbolic act to link the individual course and the IDHP Committee.
- e) Course organisers are encouraged to read "Guidelines for Supervisors?"

9. Contract between Courses and Committee.

- a) Representative course participants may attend any committee meeting.

A maximum of 2 representatives is allowed. They are invited to participate in any discussion, however they cannot vote.

- b) Course reports will be sent in the first instance to the course supervisor. The course supervisor will then distribute this report and the supervisors report to the Committee.
- c) Content of Course reports.

The aim of these reports is to communicate to the supervisor and the Committee. They may address the following questions e.g.

- * What is the balance between personal and theoretical development and facilitation training.
- * is there enough space for personal work.
- * what is the group dynamic at the moment.
- * What would you particularly want to share with the Committee.

- d) Each course is required to submit one course report per term.

10. The course facilitators have the responsibility with the help of their supervisor to explain the nature and the history of the IDHP to their course participants.

Appeals and Crises

1. By their nature, IDHP courses are complex processes in which all sorts of conflicts and differences arise and need to be worked through. Any issue which arises on a course should first be exhaustively addressed within the course community. If it cannot be resolved internally, the course supervisor may be invited to facilitate or suggest a resolution. If the course community plus the supervisor are unable to resolve the issue, it may be taken to the IDHP committee at a regular or special meeting, where a mediator may be appointed. The role of this person is to explore the issue with all concerned and to attempt to mediate a situation.
2. Thus the first definition of a crisis within a course is procedural: a crisis has occurred when any one of the levels of conflict resolution has failed. The mediator or the Committee may refer the issue back to the course.
3. A second definition of crisis is by content. At present, the Committee regards a crisis to have occurred if the Facilitators say they cannot manage an issue; if large numbers of course participants leave; if the contract is not being fulfilled significantly; if a course wishes to dismiss a facilitator or a facilitator wishes to resign.
4. While the appeal procedure is primarily for issues which arise within the course which need to be referred to supervisor or Committee for assistance, the Committee or the course supervisor may also raise issues about a particular course.
5. The supervisor is empowered to visit the course to gather information about crises if she/he feels this is appropriate.

Finance

Committee members are usually willing to share their experience and budgets etc. regarding finance with new Course Organisers.

Refer to core group members for details of current course, visiting facilitators and registration fees.

1. Fees for course participants are fixed at the discretion of the sponsoring institution. They may vary from place to place depending on the degree of institutional subsidy. We would not expect to see a gross disparity in fees at different places.
2. All course fees are paid to and banked by the local organisation/individual putting on the course. The IDHP receives no fees other than the registration fee for each participant. Where annual income is over the VAT limit, the local organisation/individual is entirely responsible. The IDHP is in no way responsible for the financial administration of courses.
3. Fees for visiting facilitators are expected to be roughly comparable on all courses.

4. There is a registration fee payable by each participant at the beginning of each year of a course. This is payable to the IDHP within the first term of each year. This registration fee is for Committee expenses and for the course Diploma expenses.
5. The IDHP is a non-profit making concern. Any central funds it accrues are entirely deployed for expenses. Payment for course facilitation and supervision comes directly from individual course funds. Committee members attending IDHP weekends will receive a ú5 premium bond.

Applications and Selection Procedure for Course Facilitators

Applicants need to leave 12-18 months at the very least from time of contacting the IDHP to the start of the course.

Step 1

Contact the facilitator of the nearest course or a member of the Committee directly and request an Information Pack (including the next Committee meeting dates).

Step 2

Attend a Committee meeting to informally present your proposal and to meet the Committee. If the course is within an institutional setting give details of the Department within which the course is to be held; attitudes of key staff in that Department to the course; any academic or other constraints that the institution may seek to impose that could inhibit the sort of methodology (especially course design, evaluation and assessment procedures) and content outlined above.

Step 3

Directly ask a Committee member to support you or alternatively ask the Committee to nominate someone. This person is called The Supporter and will support your application including your initial formal request to the Committee at a subsequent meeting.

Arrange a meeting with the Supporter and present your C.V.'s with full details of your facilitation experience, any theoretical work which you have done, personal development, suitable references, and the (proposed) working relationship with your co-facilitator. You need to know at this stage where the course will be based.

Step 4

Applicants and supporter meet to consolidate, exchange information, look at possible areas of difficulties and ensure that the proposal meets the IDHP guidelines.

Step 5

At the next meeting, a formal request to the Committee by the Applicants and their Supporter is made. If this is accepted the Committee will appoint a Rattle and Shaker. IMPORTANT: The Rattle and Shaker must be present at the selection procedure. This person will lovingly pick holes in your course contract and self and peer assessment, to highlight and iron out weak spots before the actual selection procedure and generally will represent the Committee's interests and check that the guidelines are adhered to. The next step is to request a time for the selection procedure at a forthcoming Committee meeting.

Step 6

Actual preparation of a detailed course contract which should include an ethical statement and an outline course budget (examples of previous contracts available on request) and in-depth self and joint assessments. In addition provide evidence/references and include CV's. It is the responsibility of the applicants to provide evidence to support their self assessment. Ensuring the availability of satisfactory evidence is the joint responsibility of the applicants and the Committee members involved in the early stages. It might include:

- * subjective evidence
- * committee members evidence
- * consultation with supervisors or trainers
- * consultation with participants on the applicants previous or current courses/workshops
- * consultation with colleagues
- * other sources

At this stage you need to pay attention to where the course will be held, to costing and financing as well as administration of the course.

Step 7

Get feedback on Step 6 from the Supporter and adjust accordingly.

Arrange a meeting with Rattle and Shaker.

Step 8

Forward all relevant information, to the Rattle and Shaker before the meeting, with enough time to enable the Rattle and Shaker to prepare the meeting.

Committee members are encouraged to contact the Rattle and Shaker before the actual Rattle and Shake meeting to share questions, concerns, information and absolutely any doubts or knowledge in confidence which need to be incorporated in the Rattle and Shake process.

The Supporter and the Rattle and Shaker will inform the Committee and the Applicants if at any time they cannot endorse the proposal, or if they feel that the Applicants are not likely to be prepared by the proposed date.

Any possible travel expenses incurred by the Supporter and the Rattle and Shaker are paid for by the Applicants.

Step 9

Rattle and Shake meeting. (The Rattle and Shaker will write a report as a result of the process so far, which will be sent to all Committee members in advance of selection procedure). Sometimes a second meeting may be necessary.

Step 10

Course organisers are encouraged to reflect on, take account of and/or incorporate the suggestions and feedback of the Rattle and Shaker in their final proposal and Self and Joint assessments.

Step 11

Circulate the final proposal (including course contract, self and joint assessments and evidence) to all Committee members, at least 2 weeks before the selection meeting to give the Committee members enough time to read and prepare comments before coming to the selection procedure.

It is very important that the supporter comes to the Selection Meeting. If this is not possible, a written report is required.

For the selection meeting to go ahead the Rattle and Shaker must be present.

If for some unforeseen reason this is not possible it is at the discretion of the Rattle and Shaker in consultation with the Committee to decide to go ahead with the selection or to delay. An extraordinary meeting may be called if the time delay is too great.

Step 12 Selection Meeting

The final stage of the selection procedure should take 2 - 2½ hours maximum. (Which means that no more than 2 proposals can be assessed in one day).

The manager of the selection procedure will normally be the chair person of the meeting. However she/he may delegate this to another Core Group member.

Part A (Up to 30 minutes)

Initially time is given (maximum 10 minutes each) to the Supporter to make a statement with regard to the Applicants and/or the proposed course, then to the Rattle and Shaker in addition to her/his written report and finally the Applicants are given the opportunity to make an opening statement (i.e. about their intent, how they are feeling etc).

Part B (Up to 30 minutes with the possibility of a 15 minute extension)

Clarifying confronting questions (prepared by committee members) based on the submitted contract, self and joint assessments and evidence.

Fish bowl format

There will be an inner group consisting of the applicants, 1-2 committee members plus one empty chair. When any other committee member wishes to contribute, they move in and someone else moves out of the inner circle.

The purpose of this method is to reduce the candidates experience of being interrogated from all sides by relative strangers.

Part C (Up to 30 minutes)

Feedback to applicants (partially prepared before meeting).

Positive and negative feedback will be balanced in terms of time and received in silence by applicants except where clarification is necessary.

Feedback can include:

- * appreciation and constructive criticism
- * devil's advocacy, to amplify doubt
- * recommendations for improvement/development

Part D (Up to 30 minutes)

Conferring time

Up to 30 minutes are usually necessary, however in exceptional circumstances the Committee will negotiate an extension of this time with the applicants.

This time is used for the Committee members to:

- * share views on the application
- * identify concerns
- * prepare committee feedback to the applicants
- * prepare any non-negotiable caveats or alterations to the application
- * make decisions regarding the application

and for the applicants to:

- * review their self assessments, contract and application in the light of the feedback received.

Decision options for the Committee

- 1 reject the application outright
- 2 ask for further information
- 3 reject and encourage return when certain criteria have been met
- 4 defer the decision/course to a later date
- 5 accept with caveats, whether non-negotiable or negotiable
- 6 accept as presented.

Decision making is by simple majority and significant minority concerns can be built in as non-negotiable caveats. Lesser concerns can be in the form of recommended but not binding caveats. A two-thirds majority is required for final acceptance of the contract and facilitators.

Part E - 10 minutes

Sharing results of conferring time

The Applicants confirm or otherwise their desire to proceed with the application and share any alterations to their self assessment and/or the contract they wish to make.

The Committee share the results of their deliberations.

The final decision is minuted and new members are welcomed onto the committee, if appropriate.

Part F - 10 minutes

Debriefing and review of the procedure

Candidates have the opportunity to share their experience of the process. The committee may wish to suggest future changes in the procedure in the light of practical experience.

Part G

Find out who is available for supervision after the selection procedure. When you have decided and negotiated with the supervisor, inform the Committee.

Revised March 1994

FOOTNOTE:

Since we think it is silly to reinvent the wheel, we propose that all suggestions to change and amendments to the Guidelines are given to a core group member in writing. (Pat, until March 1995).

Selection Procedure for Short Courses

This proposal was adopted by the Committee at the meeting of the 20th of May 1994.

Procedure For Existing Committee Members

Decide which of the following Options is the appropriate Starting Point.

Option 1

1. Proposers circulate Course Proposal in advance of Committee Meeting.
2. At meeting - Open discussion:
3. Proposers make brief statement about the proposed course (5 mins)
4. Clarifying questions and discussion from the whole committee (who are not strangers, hence no need for the fishbowl) (up to 25 mins)
5. Conferring time (with proposers present but silent) (up to 20 mins)
6. Decision - options as in current Guidelines together with

7. A further option to proceed to Option 2 (or 3) below (up to 10 mins).
8. Total time at meeting - 1 hour.

Option 2

1. Committee appoints Rattle and Shaker/Support person.
2. Course Proposal re-worked in the light of Rattle and Shake.
3. Proposers re-submit Proposal to Committee.
4. Rattle and Shaker s report.
5. Open discussion as above (up to 1 hour)
6. Decision - options as above, but to include possibility of proceeding to Option 3 below.

Option 3

This option is essentially the same as the current 2-year Diploma procedure.

1. Rework proposal in the light of decision and recommendations from Option 2.
2. Submit proposal to Rattle and Shaker.
3. Rattle and Shaker's report to Committee (brief if already done in Option 2, as at present if Option 2 has been skipped.)
4. Re-submit proposal to Committee
5. Fishbowl as in current Guidelines, etc
6. Final Decision

With the three Options outlined above, the Committee has the possibility of:

1. Accepting a course if it seems in order to do so, or
2. Moving the procedure to a next level if more preparation seems necessary.
3. Option 3 is essentially identical to the current procedure.

The committee always has the discretion of moving directly to this option (3.). This may be useful for courses which are a radical, unusual, or novel, or in some other way difficult .

The above procedure eases the process of adopting courses proposed by existing committee members, but also allows for moving to a more in-depth enquiry into courses which the Committee feels require it. The underlying assumption is that existing committee members should not need to undergo selection as facilitators if they have already recently done so. The inquiry is into the course.

The procedure could be tied to the frequency with which existing committee members have already undergone accreditation:

Starting point:

1. Option 1 - for proposers who have already been accredited twice or more.

2. Option 2 - for proposers who have already been accredited once
3. Option 3 - for proposers who are not on the committee.

FOOTNOTE:

Since we think it is silly to reinvent the wheel, we propose that all suggestions to change and amendments to the Guidelines are given to a core group member in writing. (Pat, until March 1995).