

IPI

ICTC Minutes July 1, 2020

Attendees: Jim Poulton, Chair. Charles Ashbach, Ana Maria Barroso, Sheila Hill, Michele Kwinter, Caroline Sehon, Jill Scharff, Suzanne St. John

Absent: Nancy Bakalar, Lorrie Peters, Carla Trusty-Smith

Agenda:

1. Review Minutes from the last meeting.
2. Update re: invitation to the Overseas Program to name a representative to the ICTC.
3. Continue to develop or list core concepts and ideas.

Review of Minutes:

#4. Discuss inviting a representative from the Overseas Program. The committee agreed that a present ICTC member who is teaching in the Overseas Program could be named as a representative or the Chair of the Overseas Program could also be the representative to the ICTC. This will be changed in the minutes and approved.

Update of invitation to the Overseas Program to name a representative to the ICTC.

The chair of the ICTC invited the chair of the Overseas Program to name a representative of the program to sit on the ICTC.

Discussion: Continue to develop or list of core concepts and ideas:

1. The chair, spoke to moving more quickly by a) reviewing the task of the core concepts and 2) for the ICTC offering a streamlined delivery of the core concepts.
2. Questions among the ICTC committee members included: a) are we looking at all core concepts to all programs or are we looking at the core concepts of the core program which is further developed in the advances programs?
3. Discussion of the fundamental program as being basic “psychoanalytic” concepts. The core program are the fundamentals of the next level of understanding the “Object Relations” concepts.

4. Question: Is our task to compare what core concepts are actually being taught versus those concepts on the existing list of the ICTC.
5. Returning to the concepts of the Everyday program. This course is “too basic” and has more to do with an introduction to a state of mind.
6. It was then stated that the aim of this committee was to reduce duplication and redundancy. Questions asked: Are we going to offer a structure of programs? Areas of redundancy? What are we trying to achieve? Can two programs use one teacher to teach (the example of the concept of attachment was used) one core concept? There is so much overlap between the IIPT and PPP programs, why is this not taught together? For the first two years, can the IIPT and PPP programs be taught together and then branched out? A brief discussion included the different levels of student commitment within programs. A comment was made of the importance of flexibility which gave rise to the idea of “shared seminars” for all programs. However, another committee member saw this as a scheduling nightmare.
7. The discussion returned to the curriculum of the Core Program. The Steering Committee of the Core Program has been working to bridge the weekend conferences with the concepts being taught in the Overseas Program to those being taught for the Core.
8. There are aspects of some programs that do not require the core program or the equivalency of the core program. Another committee member stated that Bion was not taught in the Core Program. Furthermore, that dreams are not taught in a comprehensive manner within the cluster of core concepts. Should the work of dreams and symbolic function be included in the core program? Since the Chair is on the newly formed Steering Committee of the Core it was explained that the structure of the Core was presently being discussed and not content at the last meeting.
9. Further questions: What is our vision of the core concepts? Are the core concepts less important than the delivery of curriculum in terms of form and content? In terms of movement of core concepts, should these concepts be taught in the core? Should a minimal requirement of training in Child, Couple and Family be met in every program? With these questions, we came back to the question of our goal.
10. Restated Goals of this Committee: a) committee needs to be time limited.

b) Can one person give instruction of variations of a concept in more than one program? c) Should the institute include exposure to Child, Couple and Family Object Relations among all programs? d) Did this group become involved with the concepts being taught in the core due to the crisis of that program? We returned to the goals of this committee. What length of time should we give the committee to complete the mission and goals? Is the goal "shared" teaching?

Respectfully submitted by Suzanne St. John