

**Seattle Psychoanalytic Society and Institute**  
**Faculty Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, January 10, 2024**

1. **Call to Order 7:33 pm.**
2. M. Bullard, C. Keats, R. Hushka, K. McKittrick, L. Jordan, P. Crastnopol, K. Weissbourd, A. Buchinski, J. Wood, A. Thomas, K. Lippman, A. Delancey, K. Weisbard, S. Radant, J. Cardinali, J. Wood, R. Paulsen, D. Fort, K. Weisbard, J. Basinski, M. Brooks, S. Walker, R. Kelly, S. Radant

**3. Review & vote on minutes from November & December Faculty meeting**

Approved –

**4. Director's report – C. Keats**

See Below

**5. Board report - R. Hushka**

The new space on Fairview is available for visiting. Zan is planning on having a monthly open house for interested people. The new space will be used for the SPSI retreat March 9. Retreat planning is underway. There will be a “goodbye” event & fund raiser at the Madison space in the first half of June.

**6. Presentation of ideas for a proposed revision of the SPSI Ombuds program – See draft below. M. Bullard**

Martin will coordinate with the CAAO, Progression re: the candidate handbook; & the diversity committee to sharpen up the proposal. Please send Martin any ideas, issues or concerns

**7. Diversity Committee – L. Jordan**

Holmes Commission reading groups have begun & still have openings. Zan will mail out readings to entire community. The first reading is Chapter 7 on enactments. People interested in attending a small group can email Zan or Liz Jordan.

**8. ApsA report – K. Lippman**

Annual meetings will be February 6-11. There is a colleague outreach program where an ApsA member can sponsor another interested person with entry fee waived. Kelly will send an email asking if any attendees will be willing to sponsor an interested other. Reach out to Kelly for more information.

ApsA elections are underway. S. Walker is running for Director at Large. Kelly & Sandy available to answer questions about candidates for office. Please vote!

### **9. Curriculum Committee – K. Lippman**

2YCP faculty member Helene Russ asked that religious holidays be taken into consideration for scheduling events and classes. After much robust discussion it was decided to keep the schedule as is according to existing policy.

Kelly asks for people interested in serving on the curriculum committee

Look for a faculty survey in your email & please consider teaching. A grid type of document describes the courses and terms and timings for the next 4 years and will be attached.

K. McKittrick presented the grid format of the course offerings for the next 4 years. Essentially it consists of three 9 week terms with a four week intersession. The details will be available with the faculty survey. Look for the email.

### **10. CAAO committee report**

The committee met with C. Keats, S. Walker, A. Thomas, L. Jordan to discuss the “listening” group process last year. The CAAO asks for more activity on the part of SPSI leadership regarding reporting back on the status & outcomes of issues raised by the CAAO group. The intention is to increase transparency and collaboration between candidates and administration. The CAAO president will also now attend planning meeting and report during monthly business meetings.

### **11. 2YCP – K. Wiesbourd**

There will be a potluck “Listening Session” from 6:30-9:pm at SPSI called “All Of Us or None Of Us” to engage current or interested faculty for the program & address the issue of what kind of role SPSI might serve in the future for graduates of the 2YCP. Look for an email from Zan for details.

### **12. Announcements**

Buchinski will be out for the Feb 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. M. Bullard will chair in her place.

Should we meet Feb 14 for valentines day?

M. Brooks asks that we consider in person meetings again for future Business meetings & reminds us that P. Crastnopol, A. Crofut, K. McCormick & C. Bassen will all be presenting at the ApsA meetings

R. Hushka reminds us that the Fairview space will be well set up for hybrid meetings

### 13. Adjourn 8:35:pm

#### Director's report to faculty 1/10/24

We are back after the holiday break for the winter and spring of this academic year. But are we back? Are we even here? A small number of us visited, last Saturday, the new building we will occupy in July. A small number of us signed up for groups to read the Holmes Commission Report. What does it mean that so few are involved together in these ways? Lack of involvement extends, of course, as it has for years, to the problem finding teachers and people to staff our committees.

What has not diminished, it seems to me, is attendance at class by students and those who do step up to be faculty, and the hard work of those who do staff committees. This is a bright spot, reflecting that we are a 'work group' when it comes to the part of our mission which states that we are in the business of educating people to become psychoanalysts. Where we seem to have more difficulty is with the part of our mission which states that we provide a place for analysts to flourish. It continues to be the case, for example, that students feel their concerns are not taken into account. Is this just the way it is? Is that the necessary fall out of there being a faculty – student divide? A group phenomenon of haves vs have nots? Or can we do something to alleviate the situation? And it continues to be the case that our faculty is split, with a small number participating and others finding more compelling uses for their time. Is this because of anticipation of painful feelings in interaction with peers and students?

If the above is true, can we do something to change it? No one wants a situation in which students feel not heard and in which faculty feels unhappy and uninvolved. Are these necessary concomitants of group forces? Is it inherent in the large group phenomenon in which we assume someone else will carry the ball? Think, for instance, of how we feel if we live in a large city, vs how we might feel if we lived in a village, when it comes to volunteering for civic duties. From what I am told of life on a kibbutz, people generally pull their oar, and find this fulfilling. These might be good topics for inquiry at the Retreat March 9. Of course, a first step would be to attend.

Expanding on these thoughts, I associated to my observations that we are alive and well at class and that we used to have good attendance at scientific meetings. Perhaps we are all energized by the clinical enterprise. If you are like me, this excites us more than issues of governance that normally come before us in committee work or at business meetings. I heard, in this connection, that a recent graduation paper given at NPSI had been well received and I gather, well attended. Maxine Anderson, speaking about this, was excited about how this interest in the clinical could be nourished in the intimate gatherings at a small institute. A piece of the puzzle then fell in place for me – small gatherings, focused in

some way on our work – might be energizing. This describes the classroom setting, which I have seen to be quite vital still. The small groups in which I am enrolled have generally functioned very well and I wonder if we could experiment, by flocking in droves to the Holmes commission groups, to see if engagement with these might not help us re-connect with people in a way that is meaningful to us. Then perhaps we could continue in some way with this model in our other work together.

### **Ombuds SPSI proposal DRAFT FOR FACULTY CONSIDERATION – M. Bullard**

"In the interests of broadening the pool of available experience for creative and "learningful" conflict resolution at SPSI I propose the expansion of the current SPSI Ombuds resource from 2 individuals (with one alternate) to a six person cohort that reports to the faculty chair". The proposed expansion would help to address issues of diversity, clinical conflict (& hopefully) foster a collaborative community wide resource as collegial "neutral third" to respond creatively & constructively to the inevitable conflicts that arise in the course of psychoanalytic education.

The scope of the program as I envision it is captured well by the current SPSI P&Ps. See below.

Proposed Changes:

- The number of Ombuds goes from 2 to 6.
- Issues will be handled by pairs, not the entire cohort.
- The Ombuds program will report nominally to the Faculty Chair, but at Ombuds discretion they can & should approach the optimal leadership persons & positions for thorough redress.

### ***The Ombuds***

*The Ombuds are the point of contact for all grievances, disputes, or complaints brought to or coming from within the institute*

1. **An issue may be brought forward** by an analyst, student in training, patient, or a person in the larger community
2. **The Ombuds will review the matter in the following way:** to initiate an inquiry or make a complaint, one of the Ombuds should be contacted by telephone or e-mail. The Ombuds will consult with each other and respond to the individual regarding the matter within a week
  - 1) The concern shall be dealt with in a consultative, facilitative manner in an informal, collegial, and confidential way where individual matters are concerned. Systemic, institutional matters will be managed differently (see D.2)
  - 2) The Ombuds may attempt to directly solve the problem, refer the individual to the right resource for help, offer shuttle diplomacy between two parties, officers or committees of the institute, or suggest referral to the Washington Department of Health if an ethics violation is suspected

3. 3) *In order to come to an understanding of the matter the Ombuds shall have access to institute records relevant to the concern, and shall have the opportunity to speak with members of the institute. A member of the institute is not compelled to speak with them. They shall have no power to administrate or execute changes based on their recommendations. No paperwork, minutes, or records will be required. No lawyers will be allowed*

"in my vision, Prospective Ombuds could come from any portion of our community including a post didactic candidates. They can volunteer or be asked, with a goal of offering a diversity of experience in the ombuds cohort."

"Should an ombudsperson be approached with an issue of concern, the ombuds would enlist a second for perspective and notify the Faculty Chair. The presenting concern would be treated as a confidential matter as appropriate and effective channels of creative redress are identified and engaged".

This would be a change in policy & procedure & require a vote of the faculty for adoption – possibly in the next faculty meeting or the following.

Any thoughts??

**Respectfully Submitted by Martin Bullard**