

SPSI
April 12, 2023
Faculty Meeting Minutes Wednesday,
April 12, 2023

Via Zoom

Attending: R. Paulsen, C. Keats, S. Radant, A. Thomas, A. Buchinski, D. Fort, K. Weissbourd, J. DeMott, M. Pauly, C. Bassen, J. Wood, K. McKittrick, A. Crofut, A. Delancey, Clarkie, E. Kristine, P. Crastnopol, S. Case, C. Malkmus, E. Jordan, H. Helze, J. Cardinalli, A. Albert, R. Farr, R. Gottesman, M. Brooks, S. Gibson, G. Sanchez, S. Walker, S. Gibson, R. Bergman, P. Roberts, J. Goyden, R. Meredith, R. Hushka

1. Call to order - 7:34

2. Review and vote on minutes from March Faculty meeting – Approved after correction of a name to Beverly “Stoute”

3. Director Report. C. Keats – See Below

4. Board Report. R. Hushka – See Below

5. Committee and Work Group Reports

a. Curriculum Committee. K. Lippman – Had a retreat, much accomplished, plans to make a report to the faculty in May

b. Diversity Committee. Liz Jordan – Connected with all committee chairs , (admissions committee to follow) Action steps, a space to think together, and presentation of creative responses to D.E.I. matters are planned to be presented in May meeting.

6. Two year follow-up report on the Pilot Project. K. Lippman - Will follow up in May meeting

7. Consulting Analyst Committee: Proposal for Phase One of New P&P. S. Case. - Phase

1. Was to articulate goals, roles, name change: “Consulting Analyst and Analyst of Candidates Committee” “CAAOC” – There are currently 15 AOCs and 19 CAs. Phase 2. Will consist of codifying processes for the committee and ideas for waivers to be presented in the May meeting.

Discussion: centered around the committees function & possible responsibility for “support during times of trial and tribulation” S Walker asked where committee members would go for consultation during such times. S. Case replied, colleagues, ethics, DEI, internal or external. P. Roberts made the point that the current P&Ps create a “level of offense” if an AOC could be found to have a “failure to consult” which could have legal consequences. C. Bassen & D. Fort raised the expectation that AOCs are not “beyond consultation” and raised questions about the committees function for vetting new

members. S. Gibson noting the time elapsing made a motion to table the issue which was seconded, approved & moved to the May agenda.

8. CAAO Proposal to Update the Waiver Procedure for Training Analyses. A. Crofut –

Proposed the creation of a waiver procedure whereby a candidate could obtain a non-SPSI analyst for training purposes. April reviewed the history of difficulty obtaining local AOCs, brought up concerns about minority students who may desire an analyst who shares or knows a cultural/linguistic etc background. Anticipating concerns that candidates may not be equipped to choose their own analyst, April mentioned that there is currently very little formal vetting or guidance currently. The CAAO proposes that in these cases an analyst should be licensed and trained at an IPA institute with no other immersion criteria. She mentioned that ApsA does allow for this. That candidates are in the best position to choose an analyst best qualified. That we are in a non-reporting situation already and for equity reasons the choice of analyst should be private. She offered that perhaps the SPSI progression chair could serve as a point person. The CAAO is open to discussing modifications.

Discussion: M. Pauly supports this waiver policy, but feels that limiting the issue to DEI does not go far enough. He feels that any candidate should be able to choose an analyst to their standards as a matter of personal choice & freedom & that no one should have to justify this choice & that it should be an option for all candidates. A. Albert specified that the analyst should have trained at an IPA 4 year program. C. Bassen expressed concern that this could be disruptive to an ongoing psychoanalysis, could it be an AOC at another institute, & are candidates sufficiently savvy to choose well from such a possibly wide selection. J. DeMott made the point that the privacy of treatment is the responsibility of the analyst and not the analysand. J. Cardinalli remarked that it is heartening to see candidates taking initiative & feels that minority candidates should be able to choose a culturally congruent analyst if they so choose. He raised the issue that dilution of the local AOC cadre could serve as a disincentive for faculty to stay involved over time. C. Malkmus was open to discussing details & stressed importance of consistency with IRRC standards. J. Woods supports the initiative and believes it is consistent with IRRC & current ApsA guidelines & echoes M. Pauly that no candidate should have to justify personal choice of AOC. S. Gibson raised strong concerns that implied in the proposed process is that DEI candidates “need more” & that this infantilizing as is any interference with switching analyst for whatever reason & finally objected to a notion that a “franchise” of local AOCs need protecting. He feels that this issue is a red herring obscuring severe problems with SPSI as in institution. M. Brooks supports the waiver in principle but raised coordination issues with his progression committee and that his group does not have consensus on the matter. S. Walker shares S. Gibson’s concerns & stated that such implications may have a “reverse racist” effect on who analyzes whom. She offered that perhaps the curriculum committee could work on helping candidates think about optimal choices for obtaining AOCs. D. Wolman offered that perhaps the Admissions Committee could facilitate such thinking.

9. Current Crisis at APsaA – not addressed

10. Announcements

S. Radant –

Art Salon 4/28 zoom event to see the film “Infinity” discussed by John Olsen and Mary Saco. Look for an email.

Needs Participants for the collective grant committee – (currently N. Sampley, S. Case, A. Albert, J. Basinski, & D. Shen-Miller.)

K. Lippman –

Please reach out to her about the current ApsA crisis

Attend “Speaking About Race” program 4/24

Discussion space is available on our “Discord” server for SPSI or ApsA issues

M. Brooks –

Attend the NW Alliance forum program & see/hear K. Weissbourd, J. Cardinalli & P. Crastnopol present!

11. Adjourn 9:pm

Director’s Report – C. Keats - Director’s report to the Faculty 4/12/23

First, I want to thank Kelly for keeping us all in the loop by summarizing what has been going on in the APsA listserve. It is hard to imagine that seeing this battle fought out at APsA is not affecting our members here at SPSI, where similar concerns have been raised over structural racism and governance, and we would like to proceed here with more compassion for each other than I think at times has been reflected on the APsA list serve. One problem has been the asynchronous nature of emails, where rupture cannot be captured in real time and there can be no effort to repair in the here and now. And another problem is inferring the will of the group from the statements of a few: many people who do not speak on the listserve may be frightened of being criticized by other more vocal people with whom they do not agree. How does one fix the situation in which one feels differently from what one senses to be the opinion of admired others, and in which one does not want to lose the approbation of these others by bringing up something one surmises they would not want to hear? I do not know the solution to this problem other than to try to build a culture in which we desire to listen to the other and endeavor to see how he or she, or they may be right. We also want to study group forces that may be out of our awareness, and how problems from the past, which have not been dealt with sufficiently, press for resolution. I hope that in this spirit we can look together at a proposal before us tonight concerning analysts of candidates beyond SPSI. One reason for this proposal is that on occasion a minority candidate here may not feel there is sufficient diversity in our cadre of analysts of candidates. An objection has been raised that this would essentially be a waiver to a policy that has not

been revamped, and until the policy for a path to becoming an analyst of candidates has been settled on, we should not look at waivers. But this proposal could amend whatever policy is adopted. I am reminded too that this month we are to assess how we feel the pilot project to select analysts of candidates and consulting analysts has been working. My own feeling is that it had been working well, and I recommend it be continued until we settle on another approach. Soon we will hear the proposal that Cecile and Diane and their committee will make concerning developmental steps towards these positions. Another feeling is that the choice of analyst should be between the candidate and the analyst and there should be an emphasis on finding a good fit. If we followed that guideline no committee would oversee it and no path would be developed. Who should decide this? Whatever occurs we wish to speak to each other with respect and consideration. In addition, the CA committee has begun to revise its P and Ps to reflect more accurately its current functions, and tonight presents some of the P and P changes to the faculty. The name of the committee is proposed to be Consulting Analyst and Analyst of Candidates Committee, or CAACC, to reflect the fact that it contains persons who perform both functions. Finally, the show must go on, and Rock and Zan have pored over the budget and find a shortfall. There are several reasons for this which include that we have lost dues paying members since 2017, and we no longer have income from the Program Committee which is not currently functioning. Rock has researched dues at other institutes and finds that our dues are about in the midrange of what is charged. Our dues have not been changed for several years and yet we have increased expenses with inflation. We expect pushback for any increase in dues and yet we have initiatives we wish to support such as committee chairs' occasional request for operating expenses, and we want to be able to compensate committee chairs and teachers. Overall I want to express my gratitude to Rock and Zan for their careful review of the budget and their effort to keep us in the black. And we would all be very grateful if someone would step forward to chair the Program Committee, both because having outside speakers might return a needed source of revenue and because we can see from the booming attendance at scientific meeting run by Stan Case and Ron Levin the great interest people have in learning which is what brings us all together in the first place.

Board Report - R. Hushka – “SPSI is currently facing a budget deficit of \$19,000 for this fiscal year. This deficit is the result of increased costs due a decrease in dues-pay faculty, inflation-related expenses (salary increase), and the IRS filing fee in support of the Collective Grant. The Board approved using funds from SPSI's accounts with the Seattle Foundation to cover the deficit.

The Board explored potential next steps based on the recommendations from the DEI report. Discussion points covered the possibility of having the Diversity Committee also focus on issues related to equity, potentially organizing two half-day retreats for the SPSI community to focus on the mission and vision of SPSI, supporting the Curriculum Committee's work, encourage support and best practices for instructors of both programs, and help facilitate current work on change at SPSI including the voting by Candidates, the study group related the potential Community Psychoanalysis track, and continuing to explore how psychoanalysis might be applied to address the current mental health needs of our community.”