

IPI Steering Committee Minutes
January 8, 2020

Present: Caroline Sehon, Charles Ashbach, Suzanne St. John, Anna Innes, Jane Garbose, Carla Trusty-Smith, Michael Kaufman, Sue Cebulko, Ana Maria Barroso, Jim Poulton, Michele Reed

Absent: Karen Sharer-Mohatt, Patrizia Pallaro, Lorrie Peters

1. Minutes: Michele

2. December minutes were accepted.

3. Executive Administrator's Report:

- ACPE: Anna, Caroline, Colleen and Sue have been doing a lot work on the accreditation self-study application due this Friday

- Enrollment: For the spring, PPP's "Generating Psychic Structures" has 30 enrolled, in addition to the 2 certificate students. Couple's Video Conference has about the same size as last semester. Masters Series has over 60 signed up for all nine presentations, and there are single registrations also coming in. The IIPT Supervision Seminar has 6 people. (Enrollment for the Core is later in the year—present total number is 10 students.)

- Summer Institute Dates: No confirmation yet from the hotel. Caroline asked that reps for Core, PPP, and Child write to the students to let them know that we are working hard to clarify the dates but the negotiating person at the hotel has been away. Expecting to know in the next week.

4. Director's Report:

- APA: Caroline and Anna worked on the APA's requests for more information. In the future we will have to meet more requirements, such as more learning objectives. Caroline will send the past objectives given for 3 programs, along with her revisions for these, per APA's requirement of 2-3 objectives for every 1.5 hours. This will also apply to the local IPI programs.

- Faculty Applications: Caroline wrote a letter to the two applicants who were denied a faculty appointment, and heard back from one, who asked to discuss the decision with the FDC advisor. There has been no word from the other applicant. Caroline's letter sent is available for anyone on the SC to read.

- International Courses: This discussion, which was a continuation from the last 2 SC meetings, included the following:

There was a view that these programs are not just IPI programs—

ie., one of the China programs is collecting fees. The programs are seen by some as drawing away from IPI in terms of: 1.) IPI requiring the faculty's time, which could have been directed to other IPI tasks and 2.) These programs have not gone through the normal representation process, such as the SC, and other meetings, where IPI faculty

could have been part of the initial discussions related to them. One person suggested there is competition between these programs and the existing IPI programs, as was evidenced by two people having accepted an invitation to work in an international program, resulting in them not participating in other programs, as they would have normally done.

In response to confusion about the programs, Caroline explained that there are two China programs, one of which, like the Russia program, is not an internal IPI program. The other China international program, the Adult Psychotherapy Course, is “internal” to IPI, but is co-managed by the Chinese company and IPI. In the “external” programs the funds don’t go to IPI (this includes the China Couple and Family Program and the Russia’s Couple and Family Program). IPI’s Child Program is sponsoring a “Sampler” in China, aimed at future program recruitment. Some of the funds from the internal, international China program go to IPI, and some go to the Chinese entity. A Core Program graduate, Jane, is the owner of the Chinese company.

Reiterating concern, another person wondered what existing programs suffer, such as the Core, if the faculty are spread too thin. One person expressed her view that video seminars which are being offered in so many programs is a problem. Someone challenged why the present focus is on the faculty being spread thin, when it’s been an on-going issue. Anna Innes informed us that enrolment in the Core has vacillated regularly and recruitment is mainly from Salt Lake City and Panama or other students. Caroline discouraged the idea that a temporal relationship between the Core and the China Program in the last 9 months meant they are causally related. Although we are invested in the Core program, there are many feeder programs that do not originate in the Core.

Someone stated he declined the invitation to supervise in the adult China course because he is concerned that by David and Jill extending their work, using our resources, they have influenced IPI’s original goal of bringing the sophistication and sensitivity of our work to this country. A member voiced his attachment to the GAM, and his concern that this is not always part of the larger programs.

The question posed by one member, “Why the China program has developed in the way it has, if it’s part of IPI?” was discussed. Labelling it as a “stealth” program, he requested that it be brought out of the shadows. Another person observed that the growth of IPI has resulted in less connection— relating within IPI feels more transactional, rather than interpersonal. Later that person clarified that his word stealth did not mean that he thought it was intentional, but he feels China programs should be represented on the SC.

Caroline spoke to the importance for transparency and that these programs will be discussed at the SC, and in the community, as a whole. She said there will need to be

representation of the new international programs at the SC. Caroline invited room in the discussion for people who have been involved in the China program to speak to the positive aspects of their experiences.

A member spoke to the rewarding aspect for those teaching in the international programs, but added his view of them being used in the international programs' stealth initiative.

In response, Caroline said that the idea of internal and external international initiatives were raised by David at several faculty meetings, and at the annual retreat last year, but it may be that many people were absent from those meetings or did not register the potential scope of these initiatives. The China internal program was first conceived in March 2019, and then moved quickly, and the SC wasn't focused on it, which Caroline feels contributed to the potential distortion of seeing it as stealthy. The issue had been discussed at the retreat, not hidden. Rich Zeitner and Caroline co-appointed David as Chair of the New International Programs, but Caroline and Rich sign contracts. She said there were no efforts to conceal— it was a natural growth phenomenon, in which IPI was going through massive change at the same time as many leadership changes were occurring, including David and Janine stepping down from their respective roles. She recommended that David attend a SC meeting as a first step so that the SC can also dialogue directly with David about these matters. Sue suggested Caroline invite Pat to the SC, since she is chair of the China adult Program. Caroline said that we could certainly invite Pat to the SC, as we might also want to invite Jill, in her role as Chair of the developing China child Program. Caroline said that as the new international center also includes developments outside of China, such as possibly in Russia, Greece other countries in the future, she recommended that David come to the SC at this time so we can address the new international initiatives, as a whole, that go beyond China.

One person added that although we have all heard many times about the faculty is stretched, the subject continues to not be addressed.

Sue commented that she has found it very rewarding to be involved in the adult China program.

Caroline took a vote of who would be willing to meet before our scheduled time, and the vote was split. She will decide.