

Clinical Consultant Committee meeting

November 22, 2017

Present: Charles Ashbach, Suzanne St John, Karen Fraley, Carl Bagnini, Doug Dennett

Absent: Joseph Weber

Agenda:

Discuss progress of the Clinical Consultants in Psychotherapy program.

Change in frame for presenting vignettes: has this been adequately discussed?

Consider ways to help participants get a supervisee: is there any way IPI can help with this?

New chair- Karen will step down and a new chair is needed.

Minutes from October- approved.

New committee chair- Karen will step down as committee chair at the end of December 2017. A new chair is needed.

Karen will ask Janine how long the term of committee chair runs, and the optimum rotation time for this role.

Role of this committee- do we need a steering committee for the clinical consultants program in addition to the IPI consultation committee? Or does this IPI consultation committee take charge of the program and become a program committee? If so, would this mean we need a Steering committee representative for the Clinical Consultants program, and another representative for the IPI Consultation Committee?

Discussion:

Charles- is another committee for the program redundant?

Doug- do we "morph" into a program committee now that the supervision program is launched?

Carl- how do we distinguish the functions of this committee?

Karen will bring this question to the IPI Steering committee, and request clarification about this committee's function.

Clinical Consultants in Psychotherapy program:

Discussed participant presentations of supervision vignettes, and the problem for students who do not have a supervisee, or students who do not have permission from their supervisor to bring a vignette from their supervision to the group for discussion.

A student brought brief details of her case and some dialogue from a session, and the group thought about how they would respond as supervisors. Each participant spoke as a supervisor, as did the presenter. This discussion went well.

Doug suggested another possible model for the discussion of consultation vignettes:

A therapist anonymously gives case history and narrative to a group and the group discusses it from a supervisory perspective. The students use the case to activate the internal supervisor. The presenter does not discuss the case, only the group discusses it. Someone else in the program could offer the case vignette anonymously.

Carl- what is the content? Is the focus on the patient or the therapist? Take the identity of the therapist out. What is in the therapist's mind in making this comment? But the therapist is not there. It hones the supervisory skill of thinking about what is in the therapist's mind.

Charles mentioned a particular student's situation which she described as a collapse of the consultation space. She has not requested a consultation as far as we know. Should we inquire? We do not require her to do this. State free consultation at the next meeting- 1x a year for anyone in an IPI course.

Another participant raised questions about the change in the guidelines for presenting the vignettes. Have we addressed his questions? Did he feel that his presentation failed to address the kinds of vignettes we wanted? He did not bring an individual supervision vignette. He presented a group supervision vignette about working with a group of CBT therapists in a psychodynamic model.

Charles will reply to the email from this participant and blind copy Karen and Suzanne.

Low fee supervision- can we offer a lower fee supervision, provided by a program participant, to students or therapists looking for a time limited supervision?

Karen will take this to the steering committee.

CE evaluations- get forms from Anna and send to Suzanne to have a look at them.