

Report of the IUPsyS Capacity Building Workshop on Bereavement: Advanced In-field Training and Curriculum Development

Tbilisi, Georgia

October 2 – 8, 2011

Following the 2008 Russian–Georgian armed conflict and the request from the Georgian Psychological Society for psychologists world-wide to provide support for Georgian psychologists' work with internally displaced persons, the President of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen (University of Jena) submitted a proposal to the German Exchange Service (DAAD) for funding to hold a series of three capacity-building workshops as part of its "Conflict Prevention in the South Caucasus Region". The workshop series was to focus on "Bereavement, Research and Practice" and to include psychologists from Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. This report covers the third workshop in this series, which was held in Tbilisi, Georgia, in October 2011 and focused on "Advanced In-field Training and Curriculum Development".

Background

The first workshop, "Bereavement Research and Practice" was held in Jena, Germany in 2009 and focused on the topic of bereavement from a theoretical perspective (including models and theories on bereavement after normal lifespan-related loss of family and friends, after loss due to accidents and natural catastrophes, and after loss caused by armed conflicts). The workshop was evaluated by the participants and faculty as very successful. The second workshop, which was also held in Jena, Germany in 2010, was entitled "Intervention following Bereavement: Application & Training." This workshop focused on practical issues and their application in dealing with bereavement and trauma following disasters. Full reports on both workshops can be found at www.iupsys.net/index.php/capacity-building/other-activities

Over the three workshops in the series, the rationale for our workshops in the Caucasus region has not changed – the idea has been to pursue capacity building for individual scientists of the younger generation, but with an eye to strengthening the organizational structures of psychology in the region. The corner stone of our planning was the belief that psychology in emerging national states and societies should represent first class science, while at the same time recognizing that national needs require psychological knowledge and means of intervention. Certainly there are many unique needs in countries of the Caucasus region, often related to the fragile political and economic background of nation building, including ethnic strife, but there are also commonalities with large segments of the globe; that is the high likelihood of disasters of various kinds, including warfare, natural catastrophes, technological failure, and pandemics. Natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods and storms affect large segments of entire populations, destroying infrastructure, causing human loss, and displacing people. The resulting deterioration of social capital and mental health requires responses, and psychology has a role to play in this. Given the rapid increase in the incidence of disasters - doubling over the last decade with more than 2 billion people affected - we at IUPsyS can attest to a dramatic mismatch between the need for expertise on psychological consequences of disasters and the representation of relevant

scientific knowledge and modes of intervention at the mass population and individual level. All over the world, as our research has shown, curricula for psychology education and training in ordinary university programs are rare, and paradoxically this is particularly true for the countries and societies most affected by disasters.

Across the three workshops, topics and structure were chosen so that the young scientists from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia could learn in a step-like fashion: first gaining knowledge about theories related to the psychological consequences of disasters; then learning about and experiencing types of interventions that can help people cope with consequences of disasters, such as grief, complicated bereavement, and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD); and finally, investigating academic program content and syllabi dealing with these issues, and debating and planning how such programs can be introduced.

Workshop Goals and Expected Outcomes

The third workshop was designed to build on and extend the training of ways to treat bereavement (theoretical orientation and hands-on practical training) started in Workshop 2. In addition, there was to be a special focus on curriculum development in the Caucasus region related to the causes and consequences of bereavement, including course implementation and evaluation. The terms of reference for the third workshop in the Caucasus series are given in the introduction and background sections of this report. With regard to specific goals for this workshop, these were:

1. To continue and extend the in-field training started in Workshop 2.
2. To address the issue of curriculum development with institutions of further education in the south Caucasus region.
3. To involve scientists from the Caucasus region in the planning and delivery of the workshop.

Expected outcomes centred mainly on developing the skills and awareness of psychologists from the three Caucasus countries involved (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan) concerning dealing with trauma in individuals following disasters, whether natural or the result of human action, such as war; on invoking curriculum change to increase future capacity in the region; and on establishing Georgia as the hub for future capacity-building - vis à vis the training of psychologists in handling trauma following disasters - within the Caucasus and Central Asia regions.

Implementation

Planning Group: As for the 2009 and 2010 workshops, the organising team for the 2011 Workshop was led by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen (as President of IUPsyS and Head of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Director of the Center for Applied Developmental Science, University of Jena, Germany) and Professor Wolfgang Miltner (Head of the Department of Clinical and Biological Psychology, University of Jena, Germany). Dr. Martin Obschonka (University of Jena, Germany) and Dr Verona Christmas-Best (University of Jena, Germany) made up the rest of the organising team in Germany. As this workshop was scheduled to be held in the Caucasus region (in Tbilisi, Georgia), we also had a local organizer, Professor Tea Gogotishvili from Tbilisi State University, Head, Psychological Counselling and Training Centre at the Patriarchate of Georgia, and Director of the D. Uznadze Georgian Psychological Society (www.geopsys.ge).

Recruitment of participants: As for the previous workshop, in order to identify participants for the new workshop we first informed former participants by sending them a letter of invitation giving an overview of the workshop and details of the target audience. In general, the workshop was seen as being of interest to doctoral students, post-docs, and more senior

scientists involved in any academic psychology program, especially if it covered the topic of treatment of bereavement from a broad interventionist perspective, but of particular importance to those involved in clinical psychology and related fields, such as developmental and social psychology. Participants were expected to be normally resident in Georgia, Armenia or Azerbaijan, to be willing to attend and participate in the whole workshop, and to present a poster on their current research and empirical work to their fellow participants and faculty. They were also asked to forward the workshop information to other psychologists in their country working in the field of clinical psychology and related fields.

As this workshop also had the focus of curriculum development, the local organizer was asked to approach senior faculty and administrators of higher education institutions in the region with regard to participating in a 'Round Table' that would discuss the issue of curriculum change.

The applications received resulted in a database of well over 50 possible candidates from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia working and/or studying in the field. Applications were only considered once a CV and abstract of their work had been received. It should be noted here that the deadline for receipt of applications had to be extended for one week, and reminders had to be sent concerning the deadline due to an initial slow response; most applications were received in the week following the first official deadline.

Selection was based on goodness of fit between an applicant's area of research interest and the aims of the workshop, as well as the quality and suitability of the abstract and CV. In total, the organizers invited 31 applicants to take part in the workshop. Selection also aimed at ensuring a balance across the three countries within the workshop with regard to number of participants from each country, to gender, and to academic status. Of the successful applicants, just over 42% (14) had not participated in either the first or second workshop.

Recruitment of faculty: As for previous workshops, faculty members were chosen for their international renown, this time as experts in the field of psychotherapy, clinical psychology, developmental psychology, public health, and curriculum development, including course evaluation. As always, not everyone invited initially was able to participate. At the end of the invitation process, the following agreed to participate as faculty:

Andreas Beelman, University of Jena, Germany
Presenter and trainer on: *Evaluating psychosocial and clinical interventions: Basic concepts and research problems*

Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota, USA
Presenter and trainer on: *Moving research into practice for families affected by traumatic events: testing and implementing parenting interventions to promote children's resilience*

Elana Newman, University of Tulsa, USA
Presenter and trainer on: *Curriculum content, development and delivery regarding bereavement and trauma following disasters and other traumatic events*

Susanne Schaal, University of Konstanz, Germany
Presenter and trainer on: *Diagnosing and treating PTSD: Narrative Exposure Therapy*

Michael Stevens, Illinois State University, USA
Presenter and trainer on: *Bereavement and Trauma: Curriculum Basics, Resources, and Networking*

Hansjörg Znoj, University of Bern, Switzerland:
Presenter and trainer on: *Developing courses in relation to Psychotherapeutic methods in the case of complicated grief*

Professors Rainer K. Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany, Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany, and Tea Gogotishvili, Tbilisi State University and the Patriarchate of Georgia, were also faculty members.

Financial resources: As for the two preceding workshops and as noted in the introduction, funding for this workshop was largely met by the German Exchange Service (DAAD) following a formal grant proposal submitted by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen in November, 2010 – directly following the second workshop. As the DAAD funds could only be used to support participants and faculty from the Caucasus region and from Germany, additional funding was again (as for previous workshops) requested from and granted by IUPsyS as part of its capacity-building program. The University of Jena also supported the organisation of the workshop by providing staff and office facilities in Jena, and the University of Tbilisi and the Patriarchate of Georgia provided local support through the services of Professor Tea Gogotishvili. The Georgian Psychological Society also aided the functioning of the workshop by setting up accounts and handling local expenditure.

Plans for evaluating activities: An evaluation procedure was built into the workshop. Upon acceptance of their application, participants were sent a specially designed pre-workshop evaluation questionnaire that endeavoured to capture individual expectations concerning workshop proceedings, content, delivery, and outcomes. This was returned to the Jena office, or handed in at the workshop location prior to the commencement of the workshop. Immediately following the end of the workshop, a post-workshop evaluation questionnaire, which included all items from the pre-workshop questionnaire, plus additional questions regarding participants' satisfaction in different domains and whether their goals and expectations had been fulfilled, was given to all participants. A summary of the evaluation findings is given towards the end of this report; a full evaluation report can be found in Appendix 1.

Difficulties encountered during planning: As this was the third workshop in the series, few difficulties were encountered concerning contacting potential participants and faculty. The location of the workshop in the region, and unfamiliarity with workshop requirements on the part of the conference centre where the workshop was to be held, did cause the Jena and local organisers some problems initially, such as organising contracts with the hotel, arranging local transport etc., and did require a great deal more time and effort than was anticipated. However, the willingness and friendliness of all involved in Georgia meant that problems were overcome relatively easily and without any real difficulty.

Procedure

The workshop proper started on October 3, 2011 (arrival for participants was October 2; for organizers, October 1) and lasted until October 7 (departure October 8). Faculty members arrived and departed at various stages of the workshop, but the majority were in attendance from Day 1 through Day 3. It was for this reason that the poster presentations were all held either on Day 1 or Day 2 so that participants would have the benefit of feedback on their work from as many experts as possible (see workshop program attached). In all there were 30 participants from the Caucasus region, which was a substantial increase on the 24 of 2010; we had invited and expected 31, but one participant from Azerbaijan declined for family reasons shortly before the workshop took place.

Training Days: Each training day started with an introduction to the day's program and (when appropriate) a review of the previous day's proceedings. The days varied slightly depending

on which faculty were present. As mentioned earlier, Days 1 and 2 were highly concentrated, each starting with a 45 minute presentation, followed by small group work on tasks set by the presenter/trainer, and concluding with poster presentations. For full details of each day's schedule, see the workshop program attached (Appendix 2).



Presentation by Abigail Gewirtz, USA: Discussant, Rainer K. Silbereisen, Germany

For the small group training sessions, participants were placed into 5 groups of 6 members based on a variety of grouping exercise to ensure random membership. In these smaller working groups, participants were asked to work on tasks, such as to evaluate a particular program or to practice specific therapeutic methods, set by the faculty member who had acted as presenter. The working groups were joined by faculty members, although overall supervision was by the presenter/trainer. Group work was followed by a plenary session for groups to report back, present their experiences, and ask questions.

With regard to the poster presentations: overall there were four poster panels, organised as much as possible by area of research or work focus. Each participant presented their work and received feedback from the faculty member leading that session. Questions and comments were then invited from other faculty members and from other participants. The presentation of the participants' posters and the in-depth discussion their work was very well received by all involved, and the participants particularly seemed to value the advisory support that these sessions offered – so much so that all sessions overran.

On training Day 3 there were two presentations and two sessions of group work. This required an early start and resulted in a later than planned finish. However, Day 4 finished mid-afternoon to allow time for recovery and the chance to see something of the wonderful countryside and historic monuments of Georgia. Although the excursion was optional, all but



Lilit Sargsyan, Armenia, presents her poster
(Faculty members, Wolfgang Miltner, Germany, and Michael Stevens, USA, standing)



Participants, Organizers and Faculty, Tbilisi

a few participants from Georgia attended. The morning of training Day 5 followed the usual schedule of presentation and group work. In the afternoon of Day 5, however, there was a complete change to normal procedure. The room layout was change from school-style to theatre-style layout in preparation for a Round Table event with invited speakers from local universities and NGOs.

Round Table

The aim here was for faculty and invited guests, who were in higher administrative positions in Georgian Universities and leading positions of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerned with the support of people following disasters, to present their ideas and comment on current psychology curricula needs in relation to the focus of the workshop. In particular, we wanted to hear from University administrators about the current situation in their organizations with regard to curricula provision, and about their perceived need and willingness for change in this regard. In light of this aim, the following guests were invited to join faculty in making a short formal presentation on the theme of the Round Table, which was "The Adjustment of Psychology Curricula to Recognise National Needs: The Case of Capacity Building for Disasters and Bereavement:"

Alexandre Kvitashvili, Rector, Tbilisi State University,
Sergo Vardosanidze, Rector, St. Andrew Georgian University, at the
Patriarchate of Georgia,
Manana Gabashvili, Director, NRC (Norwegian Refugee Council; an
intergovernmental organisation that has played a significant role in working
with displaced persons in Georgia)
Tea Kacharava, Program Coordinator. Charity Humanitarian Center
"Abkhazeti" (NGO)

The following guests were invited to comment on the presentations from the perspective of their own roles and experiences:

Darejan Dzotsenidze, Director, IOCC (International Orthodox Christian
Charities; provided assistance to those displaced by the 2008 conflict in
South Ossetia),
Irma Khachidze, Senior Researcher, Life Science Research Centre,
Dimitri Nadirashvili, Dean, St. Andrew Georgian University, at the
Patriarchate of Georgia, Head of Masters program, Tbilisi State University,
Ketevan Makashvili, Head of Masters program, Ilia State University,
Rusudan Pkhakadze, Director, NGO (Family Violence Victims)
Representative of the Network to Combat Violence,
Nodar Sarjveladze, Director, NGO for Psychotrauma Rehabilitation.

Faculty members participating in the Round Table were:

Dr Susanne Schall, University of Konstanz, Germany
Professor Andreas Beelmann, University of Jena, Germany
Professor Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena
Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen, University of Jena
Professor Hansjoerg Znoj, University of Bern, Switzerland

The names of guests given above, whether as presenters or invited audience, are those who had been invited and agreed to participate. However, unbeknown to the organisers of the workshop, or indeed to the hotel's conference organising team, plans were afoot for President Sarkozy of France to visit Georgia and to make a speech in Freedom Square, directly in front of the conference venue and at precisely the time of the Round Table. Security for the visit meant that the area for some considerable distance around the hotel was cordoned off so that our invited guests had great problems to access the meeting. The overall result was a delay in the start of the Round Table of almost one hour, and that two guests were unable to attend: Sergo Vardosanidze, Rector of St. Andrew Georgian University at the Patriarchate of Georgia, and Tea Kacharava, Program Coordinator at the Charity Humanitarian Center "Abkhazeti." Luckily, the Vice Rector of St. Andrew Georgian University, George Andriadze, was able to stand in for Rector Vardosanidze.



Round Table event showing invited presenters and faculty

Following opening remarks by Rainer Silbereisen, the Rector of Tbilisi State University and the Vice Rector of St Andrew University expressed their thanks for the opportunity to participate in the Round Table discussion and highlighted their readiness to cooperate in fulfilling the aims for the workshop by reviewing and discussing the psychology curricula of their respective organisations, and by their willingness to support and be involved in post-workshop projects. They also emphasized that Georgia had made big strides over the past years and felt that it was now better able to respond positively to suggestions for change. The importance of developing psychology was recognised.

Tea Gogotishvili, the local workshop organizer, thanked the audience, the invited guests and the workshop participants, as well as IUPsyS and the DAAD for making the workshop and Round Table meeting possible. She emphasized the importance of the workshop in

particular, and of capacity-building activities in general, for countries like Georgia, and stressed the extreme importance of the workshops for so many people in the Caucasus region. Particular reference was made to the opportunity the workshops had provided for meeting and working with international experts in the field, and for the feedback the participants had received regarding their own work and how to move forward. With regard to curriculum development, she felt that the workshops had provided access to examples of good practice and had raised awareness of international standards.

Other points raised by invited guests and faculty members echoed many of those already made, especially concerning the importance of meeting other scientists and being able to talk about broadening programs related to psychosocial support for those damaged by disasters. The provision of help and support for refugees and displaced persons, including psychosocial rehabilitation, was seen as a basic right. The meeting was reminded of the importance of psychology and its potential for dealing with great problems; and of the need for strong education, which requires strong research basics that can lead to comparability and value among other scientific disciplines. Finally, there was a plea for the resources embodied in the incredibly motivated and interested young generation to be fully utilized and not neglected. The enthusiasm and engagement of the workshop participants was noted and commended by all faculty members.

In summing up before opening the discussion to the floor, Rainer Silbereisen noted that the meeting had wholeheartedly recognized the need for more qualified people with an academic background in psychological research. Turning to the young participants, he urged them to seize the rare opportunity to speak directly to the Rectors on the podium, not just for themselves but on behalf of all students. This was followed by an immediate response from the floor and an exchange with the Rector of Tbilisi State University, which led to a discussion about increasing chances for exchange visits for students in MA studies involving Georgian and Armenian participants; about the involvement of psychologists from all over the world that helped Armenian psychologists after the 1988 earthquake and the desire for such quality cooperation to be reestablished in the region; and, with regard to Georgia, for the University hierarchies to raise ease of access to international research (here the absence of access to international databases, such as PsychLit and ERIC, was noted). One participant from Azerbaijan made a request for trained professionals to be sent from Tbilisi to Baku. This led to the suggestion that a summer school be organized by some of the Georgian participants, which would be a wonderful learning opportunity for them, and serve the needs of others, such as the Azerbaijan participants who had raised the issue. This idea was strongly endorsed by the Rector of TSU, who promised support if they followed up the idea with a firm proposal. Following this discussion and other comments from the audience, an interesting idea was proposed by a representative of Javakhsivili University: would the faculty participants of the round Table agree to provide online lectures for the internet education of the university? The general agreement was that this and other similar ideas for further contact and cooperation should be followed up after the workshop.

The Round Table meeting was closed following a summary by the workshop organizers, Rainer Silbereisen and Wolfgang Miltner. Here the need for in-depth preparation by participants before research cooperation and study exchanges can take place, and for participants to have a similar background of knowledge and skills, was emphasized. But opportunities need to be created to enable young scientists in countries such as Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan to broaden their experiences and to prepare and train them for the growing challenges of psychology. Finally, it was noted that the task of any university is not to create small islands of additional education, but to develop general education to its broadest horizon, including ensuring that what it offers is methodologically up-to-date.

Evaluation

Before and after the workshop, a specially designed evaluation questionnaire that examined various aspects of the workshop experience was given to the participants. The response rate was very high: Before the workshop all participants (N = 30) filled out the questionnaire, after the workshop 96.7% of the participants (N = 29) completed the questionnaire.

Looking at the results of post-workshop evaluations (see Appendix 1, Table 1) we can conclude that, as was the case in the two former workshops of this series, the third workshop was very well received. All pre/post items were answered well above their respective scale mean. This applies especially to items referring to the quality of the presentations and presenters (e.g., "Instructors included recent developments in this field") and to a stimulating and supportive atmosphere (e.g., "Instructors encouraged question & discussion"). Regarding the additional items that were only included in the post-workshop evaluation, the high level of satisfaction with the workshop is again obvious. For example, participants were very satisfied with the supervised group activities, and also rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop as very high (M = 4.76). The excellent evaluation of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfilment of own expectations (M = 4.48).

From the open-ended items in the post-conference evaluation, it is evident that the practical training in small groups and the poster presentation sessions were deemed to be particular highlights of this year's workshop.

Publicity and Dissemination of Information concerning the Workshop

The proceedings of the workshop have been well documented and publicized quite widely. First, the DAAD interviewed Rainer K. Silbereisen about the workshop series in general and about the third workshop in particular. A transcript of this interview was published in the new DAAD brochure (in German) on its Conflict Prevention Program (more information on the DAAD, its mission and its work can be found at: www.daad.de/portrait/wer-wir-sind/kurzportrait/08940.en.html) and an English translation of the article can be found on the IUPsyS website by going to www.iupsys.net/images/announcements/1101-daad-rks-interview.pdf. During the Round Table, both Georgian TV and newspapers were present, and the German Embassy in Tbilisi requested a short report for its 06/2011 Newsletter; a short report has also appeared in the Newsletter 04/2011 of the Jena Graduate School "Human Behaviour in Social and Economic Change" (GSBC). An interview between Rainer K. Silbereisen and the Press Office of the University of Jena concerning the IUPsyS capacity building workshops and the Caucasus region was also held in November and will be published early in the New Year.

Plans for Follow-up

A fourth workshop is planned. This aims to disseminate insights from the three capacity building workshops, 2009 – 2011, to countries in Central Asia that were not involved so far. Building on expertise gained, and supported by the long-term partnership (since 1966) of Tbilisi State University with the University of Jena, as well as by its membership of IUPsyS, the aim is for Georgia to act as regional hub for this and other subsequent capacity building activities in the region. A proposal for the workshop has been submitted to the DAAD. If funding is granted, it is anticipated that the workshop will take place in Tbilisi, Georgia in October 2012. Attempts to make contact in the region are already underway.

+++++



Small group work with presenter/trainer Elana Newman, USA

Appendix 1

Workshop Evaluation

Before and after the workshop, a specially designed evaluation questionnaire that examined evaluation of various aspects of the workshop experience was given to the participants. The response rate was very high: Before the workshop all participants ($N = 30$) filled out the questionnaire, after the workshop 96.7% of the participants ($N = 29$) completed the questionnaire.

The pre-workshop questionnaire comprised 20 items to be answered on a 5-point Likert scale (1 “Strongly disagree” to 5 “Strongly agree”). Topics of the questionnaire were expectations regarding the workshop objectives, the instructors and their presentations. Furthermore, the questionnaire included two open-ended questions regarding the expectation and the topics the participants like to see covered in the workshop. All items from the pre-workshop questionnaire were used in the post-workshop questionnaire in addition to additional questions regarding the satisfaction in different domains and whether one’s goals and expectancies were fulfilled. In total, the post-workshop questionnaire comprised 33 items. Note that we used a slightly different wording with regard to the pre- and post-workshop questionnaires. Whereas the pre-workshop items dealt with the expectation and wishes of the participants (e.g., “Instructors should use a variety of teaching techniques”), the post-workshop items dealt with the actual fulfillment of their wishes (e.g., “Instructors have used a variety of teaching techniques”). Please refer to Table 1 for an overview about the items used in the evaluation.

Judging by the mean levels of the pre-conference items, the greatest expectations of the participants referred to opportunities for intensive learning at a high level (e.g., “Instructors should create an atmosphere that actively encourages thinking and learning; Instructors should include recent developments in this field.”). Taken together, all items were answered well above their scale mean and ranged between $M = 3.97$ and $M = 4.73$ indicating no great variation in the high expectations concerning specific workshop details. Furthermore, there was no substantive variation in the answers to the open-ended question concerning the topics they would like to be covered in the workshop. Almost all participants specified content-related topics on a very general level (such as “Familiarization with the theoretical and practical aspects of treatment of bereavement”). Many participants expressed the wish to get in touch with international experts in the field and to receive valuable feedback and tips on own research endeavours.

Looking at the results of post-workshop evaluations, we can conclude that, as was the case in the two former workshops of this series, the current workshop was again very well received. As can be seen in Table 1, all pre/post items were again answered well above their respective scale mean. This applies especially to items referring to the high quality of the presentations and presenters (e.g., “Instructors included recent developments in this field”) and to a stimulating and supportive atmosphere (e.g., “Instructors encouraged question & discussion”). Regarding the additional items that were only included in the post-workshop evaluation, the high level of satisfaction of the workshop is again obvious. For example, participants were very satisfied with the supervised group activities, and also rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop as very high ($M = 4.76$). Finally, the good evaluation of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfilment of own expectations ($M = 4.48$), which, as noted above, were very high before the workshop.

Looking at the open-ended items in the post-conference evaluation, both the practical training in the small groups and the poster presentation sessions were frequently named as highlights of this year’s workshop. Furthermore, we were interested in how to improve future workshops: Some participants would have liked more time to go deeper into the training

sessions and to have had more practical and case-oriented sessions. Others suggested having specific lectures and sessions on improving scientific and academic skills, such as statistical and methodological seminars or sessions of how to write empirical articles. We have to see how to incorporate these suggestions into the planning of our next workshop. It is clear however, that the next workshop will focus largely on the development of curricular elements and, as such, the development of academic and methodological skills surely will play an important role.

To conclude, the evaluation of the third workshop indicates that the workshop was, in the eyes of the participants, highly successful and effective in meeting high expectations. These evaluation results thereby confirm the positive impressions of the organizing team and the faculty members.

Table 1: Overview about evaluation items (Means and Standard Deviations)

		<i>M (SD)</i> Pre (Expectations)	<i>M (SD)</i> Post (Evaluations)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Lectures, discussion and activities were relevant to workshop objectives	4.38 (.86)	4.55 (.57)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject matter	4.41 (.73)	4.76 (.51)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors included recent developments in this field	4.55 (.57)	4.90 (.31)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors provided useful factual knowledge and demonstrate content competence	4.45 (.74)	4.72 (.45)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors related course material to practical situations	4.55 (.78)	4.38 (.73)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors discussed topic in sufficient depths	4.18 (.90)	4.14 (.79)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors demonstrated the significance of workshop topics	3.97 (.78)	4.55 (.74)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Workshop encouraged understanding of concepts and principles	4.28 (.59)	4.48 (.74)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors clarified the relationships among various topics covered in the workshop	3.97 (.82)	4.38 (.49)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors distinguished between major & minor topics	4.14 (.97)	4.34 (.48)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors related the subject matter to actual situations	4.10 (.77)	4.54 (.58)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors presented examples to clarify abstract concepts	4.44 (.63)	4.38 (.68)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors integrated lectures, break-out groups and other assignments	4.21 (.82)	4.55 (.57)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors used a variety of teaching techniques	4.34 (.77)	3.97 (.87)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors maintained an atmosphere which actively encouraged thinking and learning	4.73 (.53)	4.55 (.78)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors selected relevant examples	4.38 (.56)	4.59 (.63)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors communicated his/her subject matter well	4.46 (.58)	4.62 (.62)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors encouraged question & discussion	4.45 (.57)	4.86 (.35)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors encouraged differing points of view	4.55 (.63)	4.66 (.55)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors helped clarify difficult material	4.34 (.67)	4.62 (.56)

Continuation *Table 1*

[Post] Overall satisfaction 1 st supervised group work	/	4.74 (.59)
[Post] Overall satisfaction 2 nd supervised group work	/	4.63 (.69)
[Post] Overall satisfaction 3 rd supervised group work	/	4.63 (.56)
[Post] Overall satisfaction 4 th supervised group work	/	4.67 (.55)
[Post] Overall satisfaction 5 th supervised group work	/	4.63 (.56)
[Post] Overall satisfaction 6 th supervised group work	/	4.41 (.93)
[Post] Overall satisfaction with the workshop	/	4.76 (.51)
[Post] The workshop met my expectation	/	4.48 (.69)
[Post] I learned things I did not expect to learn	/	4.14 (1.04)
[Post] I learned a lot from other participants	/	3.90 (.90)
[Post] Everyone had a chance to participate	/	4.69 (.60)
[Post] I will be able to apply what I learned	/	4.45 (.63)
[Post] My personal goals of attending the workshop have been fulfilled	/	4.36 (.73)

[†]different wording for pre-workshop items.

Note:

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation;

Answering scales: Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, No opinion = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5;

Appendix 2

Workshop program

IUPsyS Capacity Building Workshop on Bereavement: Advanced In-Field Training and Curriculum Development

October 2 - 8, 2011

Tbilisi, Georgia

October 2: Arrival

October 3: Training day 1

Faculty present: RKS, WM, TG, MS, SS, AG, EN (see end of program for details)

09:00 – 09:15 Opening & welcome address: Review of past two workshops and current aims

Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany

Professor Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany

Professor Tea Gogotishvili, Patriarchate of Georgia University, Tbilisi

09:15 – 10:00 Presentation: Assistant Professor Susanne Schaal, University of Konstanz,
Germany

Diagnosing and treating PTSD: Narrative Exposure Therapy

10:00 – 10:30 Question and answer session

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 13:00 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter
(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

13:00 - 14:30 Lunch (and poster set up Group A)

14:30 – 15:30 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

15:30 – 16:30 Poster presentations: Group A (with all faculty and participants)

16:30 – 17:00 Coffee Break and poster set up Group B

17:00 – 18:00 Poster presentations: Group B (with all faculty and participants)

19:30 – 21:00 Dinner (location to be determined)

October 4: Training day 2

Faculty present: RKS, WM, TG, MS, SS, AG, EN

09:00 – 09:15 Review of day 1 and introduction to Day 2

Professor Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany

09:15 – 10:00 Presentation: Associate Professor Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota,
USA

Moving research into practice for families affected by traumatic events: testing and implementing parenting interventions to promote children's resilience

10:00 – 10:30 Question and answer session

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 13:00 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter
(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

13:00 - 14:30 Lunch (and poster set up Group C)

14:30 – 15:30 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

15:30 – 16:30 Poster presentations: Group C (with all faculty and participants)

16:30 – 17:00 Coffee Break and poster set up Group D

17:00 – 18:00 Poster presentations: Group D (with all faculty and participants)

19:30 – 21:00 Dinner in hotel – informal follow-up discussions between faculty and participants

October 5: Training day 3

Faculty present: RKS, WM, TG, MS, SS, AG, EN

08:45 – 09:00 Review of Day 2 and introduction to Day 3

Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany

09:00 – 09:45 Presentation: Professor Michael Stevens, Illinois State University, USA

Bereavement and Trauma: Curriculum Basics, Resources, and Networking

09:45 – 10:15 Question and answer session

10:15 – 10:30 Coffee Break

10:30 – 12:00 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter
(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

12:00 – 13:00 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

13:00 – 14:15 Lunch

14:15 – 15:00 Presentation: Professor Elana Newman, University of Tulsa ,USA

Curriculum content, development and delivery regarding bereavement and trauma following disasters and other traumatic events

15:00 – 15:30 Question and answer session

15:30 – 17:00 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter
(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

16:00 – 16:15 Coffee break (as required during small group task)

17:00 – 18:00 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

19:30 – 21:00 Dinner (location to be determined)

(Faculty: MS, EN, and AG leave tomorrow)

October 6: Training day 4

Faculty present: RKS, WM, TG, SS, AB

09:00 – 09:15 Review of Day 3 and introduction to Day 4

Professor Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany

09:15 – 10:00 Presentation: Professor Andreas Beelmann, University of Jena, Germany

Evaluating psychosocial and clinical interventions: Basic concepts and research problems

10:00 – 10:30 Question and answer session

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 13:00 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter

(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

13:00 - 14:30 Lunch

14:30 – 15:30 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee Break

16:00 – 21:00 Group activity/excursion and dinner – details to be announced

October 7: Training day 5

Faculty present: RKS, WM, TG, SS, AB, HZ

08:45 – 09:00 Review of Day 4 and introduction to Day 5

Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany

09:00 – 09:45 Presentation: Professor Hansjörg Znoj, University of Bern, Switzerland

Developing courses in relation to Psychotherapeutic methods in the case of complicated grief

09:45 – 10:15 Question and answer session

10:15 – 12:15 Supervised small group work related to presentation - task(s) set by presenter

(5 groups: 4 x 7 participants, 1 x 6 participants)

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee Break – to be taken during group task session

12:15 – 13:00 Reporting back to plenary of group task(s) – discussion

13:00 – 14:15 Lunch

14:15 - 14:30 Summary of workshop and introduction to the round table discussion

Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany

Professor Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany

Professor Tea Gogotishvili, Patriarchate of Georgia University, Tbilisi

14:30 – 16:00 Round Table Discussion:

*The Adjustment of Psychology Curricula to Recognise National Needs: The Case of
Capacity Building for Disasters and Bereavement*

Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen

Professor Wolfgang Miltner

Professor Tea Gogotishvili

Workshop Faculty

Invited Speakers

16:00 – 16:30 Coffee Break

16:30 – 17:30 Discussion and Conclusions

Where do we go from here? Goal setting and future activities.

17:30 – 18:00 Evaluation by participants

18:00 End of Workshop sessions

19:30 Final dinner – location to be announced

October 8: Departure

Faculty Codes

RKS = Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen

WM = Professor Wolfgang Miltner

TG = Professor Tea Gogotaschvili

MS = Professor Michael Stevens

SS = Assistant Professor Susanne Schaal

AG = Associate Professor Abigail Gewirtz

EN = Professor Elana Newman

AB = Professor Andreas Beelman

HZ = Professor Hansjörg Znoj

IUPsyS Capacity Building
Workshop on Bereavement

**“Advanced In-field
Training and
Curriculum
Development”**

October 2-8, 2011
Tbilisi, Georgia

Contact

Organizational Team

Verona Christmas-Best +49 (0) 160 8436392
Martin Obschonka +49 (0) 170 8107527
Stefanie Gläser +49 (0) 3641 945201
(Secretary Department of Developmental Psychology, Jena)
Katrin Müller +49 (0) 3641 945204
(Secretary Department of Developmental Psychology, Jena)

Hotel / Workshop Location

Courtyard Marriott Hotel Tbilisi,
4 Freedom Square, Tbilisi, Georgia +995 32 277 92 00

DAAD Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst
German Academic Exchange Service

Friedrich Schiller University of Jena



Title and back pages of Workshop Program handout