EuroTAB annual report 2022

Dear colleagues,

In 2022 we found, more than ever, that the EuroTAB mission is not only to support and promote quality & continuing education but also to improve transparency and communication inside the community. Unfortunately, a veteran member left this year (Raz Ori, Trainer), but we have been able to find a new Trainer member quite quickly. Our newcomer is Martin Mossiman (Switzerland). So we remain seven members.

The main tasks of last year continued to be in our attention and were all addressed in our live meeting in Jerusalem.

Webpage

We have been able to go one step further. We found two providers (Spain, and Israel) and must now choose between them. We have discussed the new general plan and architecture, with its hierarchy. It will be divided into two levels, one for the general public and one for members of our educational community (training organizers, trainers, assistant trainers, etc). The difficult points include the protection of personal data (GDPR) and the templates for compliance forms (which also include personal data). We wish the new webpage to be a lever to change communication, to enable a shift of paradigm.

ATM-only project

One of the most important issues facing our community is the idea of ATMOP. We work hand in hand with the ETC and the other TABs on this issue.
First, it is important to state that it is not our role to recommend in favor or against this development but to help clarify all possible aspects of such programs in order for any discussion to be well-informed. And in case a decision to go forward is made, it would be our role to ensure the quality of such a program.
Second, in one of the recent InterTAB meetings (composed of the chair of each of the four TABs), it was made clear that both guilds already proceeding with ATMOP (NATAB and DTAB) are really aware that this new format is a trial-and-error process, whether it is defined as a pilot or not. We strongly reiterated the need for a flow of information and hopefully would have some reports soon from NATAB and DTAB.
Third, the current work process is not a question of all or none, totally shattering the international guidelines, but a search for more freedom within these guidelines recognizing that in different countries there are different needs, constraints, and changes that need to be faced if we want the method to flourish. ATMOP, in the eyes of NATAB and DTAB, is not a whim but a solution to what they perceive as a real threat to the existence of the Feldenkrais method in their territory.
A more detailed report about the ATMOP would be sent to you shortly. Any wish for more information could be addressed also to the local guilds.

Assessment tool (AT)

We have gone through a process of exploring the Assessment tool (AT). Two very experienced members of the group that developed the tool, Anat Aviv Yeffet and Eitan Sarig, guided us through three workshops, two online and one at our live meeting in Jerusalem. We found these very informative, giving us the opportunity to follow the path of its creation and history.

The main goal of this process was to understand the logic behind the AT and find ways to utilize it. We tried to go beyond the level of mere acquaintance with the current state of the tool and to look into its possible future development and usefulness. As a result of this process, we have formulated a series of recommendations that were shared with the BoD of ETC. We attach the full report as an appendix to this report. In summary, we would like to share our belief that pedagogical shared work outside of the Training Programs is indeed a very important issue to address. We think that the AT has the potential to do part of the work, but needs a lot of investment in order to become a means of continuous learning and improvement. The only way to do that is to hire a project manager that would be responsible for the continuing development and application of such a tool.

TAG review group

The final draft of the review of the TAGs is now ready for the next step, namely comments by the TABs. The next phase would be to collect the feedback and comments from the TABs and integrate them into the proposal, and then to proceed to the governing bodies/ community for approval. There are two main subjects that remain to be addressed: online teaching and the proposal that, while trainings should still entail 800 hours of contact time, this might be fulfilled in two years.

Applications (personal and training applications)

In terms of applications for Assistant Trainer, Trainer Candidate, and Trainer, the two years, 2021 and 2022, have been prolific. Maybe because of lockdown, or due to the maturity of personal processes, we have received and assessed not less than 15 personal applications in 2021 and 14 more in 2022. Not all applications were immediately approved; some were deemed in need of further development before being accepted. We want to remind you that the reason for that might be either that the application itself lacks information or that the applicant needs more experience and maturity. Every applicant can apply again.

Assistant Trainers 2022
Gabriela Icardi (Italy)
David Danon (France)
Marta Melucci (Italy)
Claudio Gevi (Italy)
Yuriko Kugo (France)
Nadav Chen (Israel)

Trainer Candidates 2022
Lorna Tardin (Israel)
Heike Schmidt (Germany)
Kajetan Schamesberger (Austria)
Monika Praxmarer (Germany)
Donna Wood (USA)

Trainers 2022
Francesco Ambrosio (Italy)
Matthias Riessland (Germany)

New FPTPs 2022
Sussex 12 (UK)
Moscow 2 (Russia)
Cantal 4 (France)
Graz 4 (Austria)
Ljubljana (Slovenia)
Wien 2023 (Austria)
Wingate 15 (Israel)
Brussels 3 (Belgium)
IFELD 8 (France)
New Barcelona Training (Spain)
Bar 8 (Israel)
Jerusalem 9 (Israel)

Appendix

Discussion

The main theme that arose in the discussion of the workshop was our impression, both as individuals and as a group, that the lively learning experience of the workshop was very distinct and even distant from the feeling that emanates from the tool itself. Comparing our direct experience with the written tool, we found the latter to be rather dry and schematic, and although it might include all the necessary elements for a cognitive process, it is by no means inviting and engaging. It might be the structure of the protocol that is too formal, but we found it difficult to imagine a learning process behind it. This is not a trivial matter, since beyond any assessment or evaluation of the current level or state the practitioners find themselves, a future possibility to improve should be explicit.
For us, the most enriching part of the workshop was the generation of questions by pointing out not only what we could see, but all that was surprising and playful. The specific pedagogical strategies of the presenters were a major ingredient in this.

Some conclusions and recommendations for further work with the AT:
1.   The name of the tool should be changed since the element of assessment is not its essential goal, but rather one of creating learning opportunities.
2.   A platform for promoting learning and discussion as a shared activity is certainly a need, and the tool has the potential to fulfil this role. But we believe that in order to do so it should be developed and presented in terms of continued professional development.
3.   However, it is very clear that the AT as it stands is only a skeleton that needs a lot of work still. We believe that it could thrive only in the existence of certain conditions.
4.   The protocol is written in a dry manner that does not inspire the participation of the target public. In order for it to be less technical and more inviting much more information should be added, such as a more welcoming introduction and more possibilities.

5.   This information should include many more examples and illustrations that would clarify it and make it more accessible.

6.   In order to reduce the element of assessment and promote learning in a group, attention should be given to the settings of the process. An explanation of the kind of learning involved, the relationship between the participants and possible outcomes might incline the tool towards this.

7.   Although it was originally aimed at experienced practitioners of at least five years of experience, we feel this gap should be bridged so this tool could be employed much earlier. If it is perceived not as an assessment tool but rather as a way to support practitioners and promote learning, why not integrate it already in training programs?

8.   It seems essential that whoever promotes the assessment tool would collaborate with those who are developing the competency profile. While at the beginning of the development of the Assessment Tool, the two groups might have been more or less at the same point, the competency profile adherents have been working incessantly in order to implement the tool in different environments and create a learning community around it.

9.   Beyond the value of the AT as a structured tool it certainly needs a support community that would make it grow. A platform that makes it available, together with practitioners who are willing to play with it and are willing to share their experience, could create an open-code model that would promote it much more than the current model.

10. If we want the Tool to develop, thought should be given to its implementation model. Making it available to practitioners is not a question only of translation, but of a whole process of creating interest, identifying the target public, creating skills, etc.

11. The only possible way to do this seriously is to invest in someone who does the work in a structured and remunerated manner.