CA Pilot Project Committee – Peer Review process

**Peer Review Panels**

Panelists will be chosen at random (by the committee) taking into account panelist scheduling availability. Panelists are expected to recuse themselves if they have a clinical or other clear conflict with the applicant. Applicants will be informed in advance of the panelists and can request that a panelist be removed due to a clinical or other clear conflict. Panelists will receive applications in advance so that they have an overview of the applicant’s background, but the Pilot Project Committee will have already screened the application to ensure criteria are met. Panel meetings with the applicant will be 90 minutes in length. Following the meeting, the panelists will confer. Panels will occur at mutually acceptable times and will take place on Zoom unless the applicant requests otherwise.

**Peer Review Criteria**

Applicants will have the choice to discuss of one of the following for their peer review.

1. An analysis of their own, which they have independently conducted, or
2. Material from an analysis which the committee provides at the time of the peer review session, or
3. Material from their work as a consultant on psychodynamic therapy or analysis, including they conceptualize the case and their interactions with their consultee.

For options one or three, applicants will prepare and submit in advance a brief written orientation (maximum 3 pages) to the material they will be presenting. For option two, applicants will prepare and submit in advance a brief written description (maximum 3 pages) about their experience as a consultant and/or how their experience using consultants informs the way they approach their work as a consultant.

During the peer review process, the following criteria should be used by the panel. These categories show *possible* areas of clinical capacity. We acknowledge that not every assessment will capture all these areas and that other examples of clinical capacity will likely arise during peer review discussions.

* Empathy
* Understanding of analytic frame
* Capacity to form working alliance
* Ability to hear and work clinically with dimensions of the unconscious
* Understanding of transference and ways of working with transference clinically
* Understanding of countertransference, containment of countertransference, and ways of working with countertransference clinically
* Understanding of defense and ways of working with defense clinically
* Understanding and ability to work with issues of identity and sociocultural context as they arise clinically.
* Capacity to assist consultees with deepening analytic understanding. Able to adjust consultation strategies to meet consultees’ needs.
* Understanding of analytic ethics and of the importance of the analyst’s ethical behavior

**Panel Meeting Instructions**

* Panelists will be provided with a notetaking sheet with the peer review criteria in order to facilitate consistency. Panelists are encouraged to individually reflect on the criteria before beginning the group discussion.
* If all panelists are in favor of approving the applicant after the first meeting there is no need for the second meeting.
* The panel has the option of scheduling a second meeting with the applicant in order to reach a decision. If a second meeting is scheduled, the panel is encouraged to let the applicant know what they would like to focus on in that second meeting.
* The goal is consensus but if 3 of the 4 panelists agree to approve or turn down the applicant, that is acceptable. The panel has the option of scheduling a second meeting with the applicant in order to reach a decision. If a second meeting is scheduled, the panel is encouraged to let the applicant know what they would like to focus on in that second meeting.
* If after the first meeting, a panel anticipates being divided with 2 in favor of approval and 2 opposed, the panel should request a 5th panelist to be present for the second peer review session. This person will be chosen at random by the committee from both the TA and non-TA faculty panelists.
* Each peer review panel will fill out a brief form together which lists the applicant’s name, panel members, the number of meetings, the type of material discussed (an analysis conducted by the applicant; material from an analysis provided by the committee; or material from applicant's work as a consultant), as well as the reason(s) for the panel's decision if an applicant is not approved. The Ad Hoc Committee will keep this information confidential, but will include a composite of the outcome of all peer review panels in their report to the faculty at the end of two years. Each panel should also designate someone to provide feedback to the applicant, and should collaborate in deciding what the designated person should communicate to the applicant about strengths, and (if not approved) areas the applicant is invited to work on before reapplying.
* Panel proceedings and materials should be kept confidential by the committee and panelists. This includes whether someone has applied, the contents of their application, what is discussed during the peer review process, whether there are one or two meetings and any decision of non-approval.