

**International Psychotherapy Institute
International Institute for Psychoanalytic Training
Steering Committee Minutes**

September 15, 2021

Present: Sue Cebulko, Collen Sandor (Co-Chairs); Nancy Bakalar, Peter Gross (candidate rep); Michelle Kwintner, Karen Mohatt, Matt Rosa, Lea Setton;

Minutes for the July 21st meeting were reviewed and minor changes were made to the FDC report. Nancy moved and Karen seconded approval of the minutes which were then unanimously approved. Nancy will make the changes and send to Sue.

Agenda Items:

Admissions Committee and Admissions: As of the last meeting, Janine Wanlass resigned as Chair of the Admissions Committee because the SC meeting conflicted with her other teaching commitments. IIPT is looking for a new chair. Sue asked the committee to think about who might be a candidate for this position. Lea suggested Monica.

The SC spoke about the challenges of recruiting a new class because of the uncertainty as to what the structure will be (in person, online or a hybrid) due to restrictions because of the covid pandemic. A discussion ensued as to how decisions are made re when training will be in person vs online; could IIPT make that decision of this program only? A general discussion ensued as to how important training decisions are made in general. A committee member shared with the group an email from Kelly Novick of APsaA who is interested in hearing from institutes about how major training decisions are made in institutes. (There is a movement within APsaA to move towards more democratic input and decision making in training programs although APsaA is not able to enforce such policy changes.) (See attachment to minutes.) The committee further discussed the importance of clear communications and more transparency as to how and by whom decisions are made even though faculty opinion or input is sought. This was deemed essential since otherwise lack of transparency in these issues can lead to confusion, a sense of chaos, lack of a feeling of agency by invested faculty which can then contribute to low morale.

Teaching Analyst and Mentoring:

The committee discussed generally if there is a problem with members who have an appointment of Teaching Analyst who don't teach. It was clarified that those few Teaching Analysts who don't teach or don't teach often contribute significantly in other arenas. For example, one chairs and basically is the sole teacher for Infant Observation and chairs the CPC as well. Another is on the CPC, teaches occasionally in IO and recently did the lion's share of the work for the Mark Solm's weekend conference. There was general agreement that a teaching faculty need not actually teach in IIPT if she contributes significantly to IPI and IIPT by teaching in other IPI programs, chairing committees, serving on committees or serves in other important ways. Nancy asked Sue and Colleen to apprise her as FDC chair if they feel someone who holds an appointment as an IIPT teaching faculty and is not sufficiently contributing to the IIPT mission. The FDC can learn more about such a situation and make recommendations.

Sue raised the question as to whether a teaching analyst could serve as the discussant for a weekend case conference or can that role need to be filled by a supervising/consultant analyst. The consensus of the committee was that the role could be filled by a senior teaching analyst.

Discussion of third supervisors for candidates:

Sue asked for discussion and clarification as to who the candidates can ask to be their third supervisor, this in response to some email exchanges between Karen as chair of CPC and Nancy as chair of FDC. Nancy provided the history: at the beginning of the IIPT program, adjunct supervisors were needed because there were only five supervising faculty, some serving as candidates' analysts. Over succeeding classes, candidates were allowed and sometimes even encouraged to seek an outside supervisor because such a supervisor's work was of particular interest to the candidate or the candidate had a case that a particular outside analyst's expertise might be useful. Then later, when there were more IIPT analysts, candidates were encouraged to seek a third supervisor from among the IIPT supervisors. So now, there is some confusion. Karen as chair of CPC would like clarification that can be passed on the current candidates.

The committee discussed this and was of the opinion that it wants the candidates to have free choice in this matter. Nancy made a motion, Karen seconded and the committee unanimously voted that candidates may enlist an adjunct as a third supervisor or may choose to work with an IIPT supervisor.

Update on Meeting with Candidates:

Colleen and Sue recently met with the candidates to see how they were doing. The opinion was that they are doing fine. The candidate rep confirmed this, especially now that the issue of tuition (what was the issue) has been resolved. The only other issue is that the candidates expressed a wish to have the fall schedule and handouts earlier.

Committee Reports:

FDC: Nancy reported that Bonnie Buchele declined the invitation to become adjunct faculty because of her time commitment as an APsaA officer. The updated Adjunct list has been circulated to all the IIPT faculty. Nancy met with teaching applicants Matt, Andi and Karen S to review their Survey Monkey results following their first observed teaching experiences. All did fine.

Curriculum Committee: Michelle reported that the committee finished and sent out the fall schedule and readings. Most of the seminar objectives have been sent out; a few are pending. The committee is beginning work on the spring curriculum. Noted was that the committee is small and the few members on that committee do a lot of work.

Candidate Rep Report: See above.

Consulting/Supervising Analysts Committee: Lea missed that meeting and Sue reported. The CAs/SAs discussed who would serve as discussant for the October and November weekend case conferences. David volunteer for on. Teaching analysts are not currently endorsed (per the Handbook) fulfill this function. See above where the committee voted that this role could be filled by a senior teaching analyst. The CAs also discussed the general agreement that CAs would not be assigned to teach on the first Tuesday of the academic year so that they would be able to attend the CA meetings, but that exceptions can be made as needed when agreed to by the CA who would miss the CA meeting.

CPC: Karen said that candidates are asking for contact info for the adjuncts. Nancy recommended that if they are interested in working with a specific adjunct, that Karen or Nancy would provide an email address or phone number if the candidate could not locate it on the web. Karen also asked if Vaughns is an adjunct. Nancy clarified that he is not; that his name was withdrawn from nomination in an SA meeting because of his many other obligations and commitments. However, if a candidate were particularly interested in being supervised by him, an exception might be able to be made after discussion in the CA committee as was done for another advanced candidate.

The next SC meeting will be October 20, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,
Nancy Bakalar

Attachment: Copy of APsaA memo from Kerry Novick

Dear Colleagues,

As the membership and the Board consider the IRRRC's proposed Revisions to APsaA's Educational Standards, there is one element that I particularly want to draw to your attention. This is one of my favored provisions and I want briefly to explain why, and how I hope that we could take this idea further:

APsaA promotes democratic governance of its Approved Institutes and recommends that major decisions about psychoanalytic education by Approved Institutes be decided by the majority of the institute's faculty or of its analyst members.

APsaA, as a Regional Association of the IPA, already follows the lead of the IPA in making democratic governance of our component Societies a part of continuing and new association with APsaA. Except for a cumbersome and unlikely existing process of excommunicating offending Societies for whatever reason, APsaA has no immediate enforcement mechanism for this provision, but relies on reminders and moral leadership to continue to influence Societies whose governance may be lagging behind on the democracy front.

It would be informative to all to hear on this list from members of different Societies about their governance structures and the reality and/or perception of democratic functioning in local groups. That is information that can and should be transparent to all, especially since many Societies are also non-profit organizations, usually recommended to make their bylaws public.

At this point, however, with Institutes/Training Centers having no structural relationship to APsaA beyond being "approved" for the purpose of automatically admitting their graduates to membership in both APsaA and the IPA, APsaA has no clout to enforce democratization in its connected institutes. It seems that quite a few have changed in recent years to having Education Committees elected, Boards independent of Education or Training committees, good turnover of members in positions of power and influence, and inclusion of candidates, etc. On the other hand, many have not done so and remain governed in the old way of all-powerful TAs who control every function.

Here too it would be good to hear from members posting to this list what it's like at your training place – how is it actually governed and what does it feel like? I look forward to an outpouring of relevant and useful information and I think I will be disappointed if we don't get that. Would that mean that there is reluctance/shame/pressure to keep the realities hidden? Or what?

Once we know what is actually happening, we can consider what we want. For me, I would want all Societies and Institutes to be governed democratically, and my understanding of what that means is that everyone who is part of the group can vote on matters that affect them and can vote to elect people to mind the store from day to day, and bring important decisions back to all. That means members, faculty, AND candidates.

What do you think?

Your Board needs to hear from you, as we will consider and possibly vote on the new Proposed Standards on September 26! Please let us know what direction will inspire you –

Best wishes,
Kerry Novick