

IPI Consultation Committee Meeting February 26, 2020 Minutes

Present: Suzanne, Chair, Kelly, Doug, Karen, Anne

Absent: Carl

Meeting convened at 12:00

1. Minutes from January meeting approved.
2. Suzanne reported follow up on an item from November meeting: The use of the word "psychotherapy" in the promotional material describing the IIPT Seminar on Consultation/Supervision in Psychoanalysis. Suzanne raised this item with Caroline as Director of IPI and a process of discussion followed with the chairs of the IIPT seminar. The result is that the description of the seminar has been changed. The word psychotherapy has been taken out.
3. IPI April weekend: Karen is co-chairing this weekend with Jane Garbose. A request came from the Faculty Development Committee to support a lunch time presentation by Paul Bosco to fulfill a requirement to become faculty. His case presentation needs a discussant and Karen offered the opportunity to the CCC committee faculty as a chance to also talk about the CC program. Suzanne is willing to be the discussant and Doug is willing as long as this presentation does not conflict with the analytic case discussion held during the lunchtime slot. Karen will confirm the scheduling and let Doug know the time.
4. Caroline has requested that Suzanne consider creating a video for social media to be posted online to market the Consultation certificate program. Suzanne agreed to create such a video when the program is revised.
5. Blog: follow up on the request to create a blog for the Consultation committee. Unanimously agreed that we are not able to create a blog for this program at this time.
6. Periodic consultation, a steering committee matter: Caroline recommended that the committee create a list of faculty willing to provide periodic consultation and this list would be posted on the IPI website; students

could approach the supervisor for periodic supervision of a case, not weekly or scheduled regularly.

Would faculty want to offer this model of consultation?

Does the committee want to support and facilitate such a list?

Anne pointed out that on-going supervision is more fulfilling for the supervisor and the supervisee.

What are the consequences of the committee generating such a list? Would be endorsing specific faculty and thus take on an ethical responsibility?

The consultation committee was initially charged with expanding the visibility of consultation within IPI and to facilitate accessibility to supervision/consultation for students.

The IPI Faculty Development committee has not addressed the question of faculty members qualifications to provide supervision or requirements to do so, such as taking the Consultation certificate program.

Doug raised the question of how we support new faculty to become proficient at skills of providing supervision/consultation.

Suzanne pointed out that not all faculty members provide supervision to IPI students or programs.

Is a list necessary? Does the committee want to make this available to students? Karen pointed out the history of the consultation committee mandate and the possibility that a periodic consultation could possibly lead to more engagement in on-going supervision.

We have a list of faculty members willing to provide 25 sessions of supervision at a reduced fee of \$75 per session for those students enrolled in an IPI program. The list has not been updated in some time. All members agreed that this list is useful and necessary for students to find accessible and affordable consultation.

Discussion ensued about ways to fulfill our committee mandate to make supervision/ consultation more accessible.

Outcome:

We agree to canvass faculty and create one list of faculty members available for reduced fee supervision and/or periodic supervision that would be posted on the website.

7. CC certification class progress: Discussed Carl's observation of the group process, and Suzanne's observations of the class at this point. The specific faculty member's approach to the class and the readings makes a big difference in the responsiveness of the group. Doug pointed out the significance of the GAM group that was held recently in promoting the group process and the learning functions of the group. Suzanne made the point that specific faculty member teaching or leading the group makes a difference in the responsiveness of the group. Anne suggested that Suzanne inform faculty of the group's preference for a collaborative approach, and Suzanne responded that she has been discussing suggestions with each faculty teaching. Due time constraints we tabled the discussion of revising or restructuring the program.

Next meeting March 25, 12:00 pm

Meeting adjourned 12:50.

Respectfully submitted by:

Karen Fraley