ICTC minutes 10-7-2020

Present: Jim Poulton, Jill Scharff, Nancy Bakalar, Patricia Pallaro, Carla Trusty Smith, Charles Ashbach, Ana Barroso, Suzanne St John, Sheila Hill, , Michelle Kwintner

Absent: Lorrie Peters

We agreed that Nancy would send out the invite to her room for last few months.

Agenda

Minutes of Sept 2

Corrections: Caroline was not present. Jill asked for the minutes to remove the "to Teach" at the end of what she said .

Approved: Suzanne, seconded by Charles. All in favor.

Report on where ICTC is in its progress

Jim presented a report and identified to foci of interest – 1) CORE curricula and 2) Interprogram collaboration to reduce duplication of effort.

1) ICTC has been talking about ambivalence towards CORE as a program that prepares students for the advanced programs. We want to expand the CORE to serve students more adequately. What recommendations would we then make to advanced programs to avoid duplication of their efforts after an expanded CORE is effectively preparing students?
2) We want to increase collaborative teaching as part of the reduplication of effort. A teacher from one advanced program might teach a class for other multiple programs, or multiple program teachers might combine, all to teach a series of focused topics applicable to all programs. Merged classes or co-teaching models could be applied in a topic-centered, single events not in a programmatic way. Michelle asked for specifics: "What would the expansion of CORE look like? Would the advanced programs then require the CORE?"
3)

Report of conversation among Jim, Caroline and Lorrie about CORE

Expansion of CORE would cover basic core concepts (refined by subcommittee Nancy, Michelle, Jim, and Charles) but how and when and by whom they would be taught is not yet designed. There are monthly Zoom meetings already for continuity, but in future they would be more programmatic with attention to scaffolding a progression of object relations concepts. Unfortunately, Lorrie cannot attend the subcommittee but communication is good. ICTC will not make recommendations to the advanced programs as to how to adapt to how the core operates. PPP, Intro to Psychoanalysis and, IIPT have elements of syllabi that duplicate the CORE.

Recommendations to reduce duplication and introduce integration

There could be a category of programs that occur in a sequence of learning with progressive requirements, and a person could stop off at any point in the progression. Other programs would be alternative programs or stand-alone programs. For instance, the didactic track of PPP would be an alternative program, like Master Speakers, or Infant Observation. These would not be in a sequence towards child and adult analytic training.   Some programs are stand-alone money makers like Couple and Family Program. Others could operate like extension courses at a university. Each program that IS in the progression track should set its own admissions prerequisites. IPI has proliferated with popular programs, but now there are many entry points other than CORE, and this is creating duplicated teaching. It raises more money, but maybe it exhausts faculty. Should we suggest there should be only one entry point? Or many? Flexibility builds in duplication but broad diversification of menus appeals to a large group. How do we decide about the trade-offs? How will we represent the views of the faculty and communicate views of the ICTC back to the faculty and determine their support for our recommendations? Maybe we are reducing duplication to save faculty from getting exhausted and IPI can only do so much with so many people. There are costs and benefits to be realized, and priorities decided based on that.

IPI weekends are on the cutting edge, and since moving from traditional Kleinian to intersubjectivity themes, CORE has not been meeting the need for immersion in basic object relations theory. CORE needs a curriculum that prepares people for any IPI experience. Itwas noted that the work of the Program Committee of the CORE and the subcommittee of ICTC is itself a reduplication of effort. Subcommitte members of ICTC pointed out that the CORE Program Committee is not looking long-term or beyond its own curricula whereas the ICTC sub-committee is thinking about what all programs need CORE to teach.

Originally, the ICTC sub-committee formed to build a scaffold of concepts from most basic to most advanced, but it became too unwieldy, and so they zeroed in on recommending expansion of CORE instead, very much regretting that Lorrie was too pressed for time to join them in that.

Some members of ICTC are eager for this committee to develop the second task in its remit: The co-teaching model recommendation and integration of overlapping curricula.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Scharff 10/7/2020