

## April 2021 Town Hall Breakout Summary

### **General impressions of the process outlined included the following comments from trainers:**

The process as outlined makes a lot of sense, including the incorporation of the theory of learning/teaching. The process makes sense, though it's clear the timeline, expectations are in the early stages of development.

This has been done before with Motivational Interviewing. Agree with process. General agreement that this is too much for someone who is not an existing trainer.

Mostly positive from all. Appreciative of efforts to connect the trainers. Good but vague. This is great and very happy to see EMDRIA moving in this direction.

It was noted that the paradigm shift with trainees is hard. This shift for trainers also. Also took some offense about "our trainers" as a phrase. EMDRIA accredits but doesn't employ people.

All want trainers to be vetted but some concerns about business model to get all the trainers not vetted into the model. The desire to vet trainers existed on EMDRIA's board in 2000.

EMDRIA reviewed and approved my curriculum 11-12 years ago and I haven't heard from them since. Therefore, I do not believe they can effectively complete the review process as outlined.

Really likes that we are using Gagne and feels it is a fair model and parallels the AIP mode.

Concerns were voiced about the individual trainer approval and process for that, how that would work, given that they are teaching curriculum that are specific to certain trainers.

I've come to every town hall meeting and shared a lot of questions, ideas and concerns and it falls on deaf ears as the reports generated from the meetings aren't reflective of what's been said. Several others agreed with this statement.

The group had similar reactions to having to do a self-study- Lot's of work and time for very little gain. Especially for those who have been vetted for 15-25 years, volunteers and people who only do a training once a year. One team said their manual, liability and malpractice is under their LLC corporation so they are protected. If we now go to individual vetting the manual and liability moves to them as individuals (no longer a corporate umbrella for liability). They are very worried about this. Some from HAP and other training facilities, where they have vetted trainers, are concerned that if these trainers get individually vetted by EMDRIA under permission to use that facilities manual- what would stop that trainer from taking the manual and going rogue? How do we protect against that? Some said they gave a good rubric in place for vetting trainers and aren't interested in changing it.

### **Should initial approval based on written self-study be one year?**

This is jarring to the trainer's systems even though it has been rolled out over time and creates distrust. Too short – too long (6 months as provisional) - no clarity around this.

Lots of worries about the specifics of the self-study. They want a clear guide to expectations of the needed material. Concerns were expressed about how evaluations light up polyvagal systems and

seemed to apply it to vetting trainers as well. Some fears of deadlines that come and trainers are left behind due to “failing” the vetting process. Suggested provisional period of remediation, to enhance the learning of trainers.

EMDRIA needs to clarify this is only relevant to *currently approved* trainers pursuing *Virtual* Trainer approval. Takeaway is we need more detailed clarification on this.

What if someone submits their application on Day 364? Can they still deliver training while their application is under EMDRIA review?

Initial approval should be three years. Others ok with one year. Some concerns about the time frame based on frequency of teaching trainings in English.

EMDRIA should allow people to start out as virtual trainers first if need be.

Several trainers state the two approvals (virtual vs. in person) should be kept separate because there are differences between the two and what constitutes a good trainer in the settings.

One group thought a traditional timeframe of 1 year then 5 years then 10 years made sense. Concerns about people who volunteer for HAP and only do 1-2 trainings a year- are we really going to put them through a self-study and all that?

### **What concerns/challenges do you see with the process outlined?**

This is a lot to ask in a very challenging time – will be time consuming – tight timelines – request to extend deadlines. Overwhelm is an issue. Thinking about it, it was easier for me to write my manual than to write the self-study you’re describing (and my first degree was in secondary education) and I have a full time (30 hr/week) in addition to my trainings.

Some questions about the path for live reviewers – but most said bring it on.

I’ve served on university faculty, in general have concerns with effectiveness of virtual delivery of BT. Interested in outcomes research.

How do we separate out content/curriculum in the evaluation of a (virtual) trainer?

EMDRIA should consider options for how to assess trainers who teach in other languages.

Concerns about how to incorporate differences in trainers and trainings.

I don’t want EMDRIA to over-rely on ways to assess trainees without standardized tests.

I like that there are opportunities for self-reflection and mindfulness in the self-assessment requirement.

I know it is time consuming for trainers to reflect and be mindful of their process, but think it is really good.

I appreciate the collaboration and structure with flexibility, and really love the opportunity to expand resources.

Concerns about more nitty gritty stuff like trainers having a hundred participants- quality and quantity of attending to participants is low. Need to set limits for this even when trainers have other trainers to meet current ratio. We need to really find ways to make sure trainers are following Francine's book and teaching things like using the DES. Some are wondering how EMDRIA will reinforce that or check on things like this?

### **What opportunities do you see that are presented in this process?**

There is an opportunity for quality control and to ensure that learners are being taught what is in the submitted/approved manual – cited some of the issues around this. Standardizing the training & improvement in quality.

Opportunities for Trainer collaboration – wants to collaborate internationally. I experience that same open dynamism within ISSTD, as we are throughout the world. It's more an 'open system' of sharing. Several requests for platform for open, welcoming, collaborative, synergistic, supportive, safe venue for trainer's meetings. Request to change the trainer culture from competitive to collaborative.

Trainer Day at Conference – trainings for upskilling – Virtual collaborative opportunities for sharing, problem-solving, brain-storming with other trainers. Bringing in under the tent. Proprietary material has been an issue as they are franchisees, has been competitive.

Address use of EMDR following the training (dropout rate) – note who is mandated to take training vs self-motivated as part of research/survey/study. All – opportunity to find out where the weak spots are in the training so that they can address them and have more trainees utilize EMDR to create more healing.

I wasn't trained in education in college. I'm a little nervous, but am interested in having feedback from experts on how I can improve.

I'd like to see workshops in pedagogy and effective teaching virtually offered at EMDRIA Conferences in the future.

Concerned about organizations pumping out hundreds of trainers without much vetting or without EMDRIAs knowledge. The ideas of everyone being vetted by EMDRIA might help with that. The group is glad that EMDRIA is putting these topics on the table for discussion but worried they won't listen.

### **Are there other considerations that should be part of trainer evaluation?**

A Trainer in training platform is needed.

How will practicum facilitators be evaluated? If practicum is seen as essential in the teaching, do those facilitators need to be vetted?

The rubrics for teachers change regularly and ideas about best teaching also. How well will this hold up and when will it change?

The vetting process should have trainers blind to the reviewers.

Who will be doing the live observation? [outside professionals] What do they know about EMDR?

There can be a discrepancy between an approved curriculum and the actual content delivered (or not delivered) in a training. An outside observer may confirm 9 Gagne events, but how do we assure the accuracy of the correct content is being delivered to trainees?

It would be nice if there were a way to assess trainer empathy and ability to relate to others. The need for good people skills. An ability to approach people with dignity at the training.

There should be a way to evaluate the way trainers respond to questions.

There should be a 3 hour re-boot/refresher training for trainers with an evaluator present. EMDRIA should host it. This way there would be standardization in the screening.

Some trainers use a fidelity rating scale with participants. We need something similar for trainers to make sure they are following Francine's model. How will EMDRIA pay for or get people who have time for reviewing everyone's applications, self-study packets and video's. Wondering if EMDRIA has consulted with an attorney around their own liability since EMDRIA will be the Vetter for everyone? There was talk about people leaving EMDRIA because the requirements are getting too difficult.