

- What is the role of the Psychoanalytic Society in all this? Can it play a helpful role, such as perhaps housing some sort of reconstituted ethics advisory body, or a series of workshops or the like? If we set up some sort of ombudsperson system, should the Society be its base? And what are the rights and responsibilities of graduates when they hear of alleged ethics breaches?
- There should be provision for some line of reporting other than to the program director, given that he can't be expected to be impartial in all cases. What would that be? Lew said that anyone in the community could bring a complaint or concern not only to him or Spyros but to anyone on the Executive Committee, to a Track Chair, as well as to any of the GSAS deans.
- If adjunct instructors have no employment rights, how do we protect them in case of false accusations by candidates? They seem to be in a very vulnerable position.
- Candidates are now in a difficult position. Rumors are flying about various possible ethics breaches among their colleagues. Students believe they are in training alongside someone who has committed a boundary violation, but they can't say anything aloud about it or name names, and all this creates a volatile atmosphere, a feeling of un-safety. It affects candidates, as students, as analysts, and they are left to deal with it on their own. There's a lot of anxiety and discontent afoot as a result. One person characterized it as a radioactive environment.
- Last week at an informal meeting of faculty members to discuss these issues, Joyce Slochower informed colleagues that she's been in touch with people at PINC (Psa Institute of North California) which has dealt with a whole range of issues around boundary violations and as a result of having come through that has developed a sophisticated approach. What about bringing people from PINC to Postdoc to provide guidance as we make our way through these waters? In particular they could be helpful regarding the issues the students are raising, the effects on the community at large and especially the candidates.
- Since we can't have an ethics committee that functions in any judicial way, what about creating a forum where the community can together think through and work through ethics issues? Call it the Ethics Forum. What about the Psychoanalytic Society hosting it?

At this point Lew read Sue Grand's letter. (See addendum.) This was followed by more general discussion. Additional points raised:

- Maybe whatever body we now create should not have the word 'ethics' in its title. What about something like Advice and Counsel?
- Ethics considerations have to be formally woven into the work of all the Program's committees.
- The ethics section of the first-year seminar required of all students, while the students rate it highly, is not an optimal setup as the only time these issues are addressed during the course of a student's training.

Lew said that the Ethics Committee did come up with a set of guidelines (concerning confidentiality, student-faculty involvement, and impairment) which the university lawyers are reviewing. Once they're set they will be part of the new student handbook. Lew said that we are

committed to maintaining high ethical standards and to developing policies and procedures that are workable and in accord with NYU policies and procedures.

The next senate meeting will be in September, date to be announced.

Minutes submitted by Shelley Ettinger

Addendum on next page.

Addendum to April 2013 Postdoc Senate minutes: Letter from Sue Grand

The Ethics Committee has done a wonderful job with your help to manage many types of issues. At this juncture, it is time for ethics issues to come out of the silo, and become a community-wide effort and commitment, particularly if we want to find an effective pathway through NYU laws and procedures. Going forward we need two things:

- 1) a way to manage and resolve particular ethics complaints and
- 2) a way to shift our communal culture so that we minimize serious ethics violations.

To achieve this we need to revisit aspects of training. As an analytic institute we need to have the highest level of ethics, as we are training students in their professional role. After having examined sexual boundary violation issues, we have come to the conclusion that we give double messages to our candidates in institutes, with an overt message that such violations are not acceptable and yet a sense that so many respected forebears have married supervisors and analysts, and that this cannot 'really be so bad'. It is even a benchmark of status and power. This creates a cultural permit, and it allows too much space in the analytic mind for the potential realization of erotic desires. As we know, this attitude would come with us into the analytic space and be unconsciously communicated to the patient, prior to actual acting out. Institutes can continue to address individual transgressors, but ultimately more will be gained by changing our implicit culture.

With regard to #1: One idea we have right now is to have ombudspeople, both senior candidates and faculty representatives, who will receive confidential concerns, and help guide the complainant toward the best solution, whether it is mediation, consultation or approaching the director and/or professional organizations.

Working with Lew we hope for further developments as to how PD can work with NYU to formulate a strong ethics pathway. For us, this is a very ambiguous area at present.

With regard to #2: We have had more input and ideas. All of these ideas are 'whole PD' ideas, rather than breaking down into orientations. Some of these are:

A) Require all two-point courses to have one session on related ethics issues. For example, clinical case seminars would talk about confidentiality in presenting and writing. If faculty do not know how to proceed on this, Liz Goren and Sue Grand would consult on what relevant ethics issues might be for various courses.

B) After each candidate has seen her/his clinic patient for two years, she/he would be required to take a one-point course on boundaries and boundary violations. This course would be team taught, would draw on faculty from different orientations, and the faculty would rotate.

C) Candidates would be required to take several workshops (Saturday a.m. or Sunday brunch format) on clinical knots and ethical problems, over the course of training. These workshops

would include topics like: titrating erotic transference; self-care; clinical grandiosity; managing malignant regressions; and the realities of touch in psychoanalysis. All of these issues have bearing on the slippery slope that precipitates sexual boundary violations.

D) Faculty would be encouraged to attend parallel workshops, and we would encourage the community to freely use consultations, so that our graduates do not feel like failures if they need them.

E) It has been suggested by Michael Moskowitz that we have something like the South African 'truth and reconciliation' format for therapists who have transgressed sexual boundaries, in which dialogues would be operative between patient (or student) and the transgressor. It should be noted that the former Ethics Committee procedures would have included this format, insofar as it might have been possible in the context of reporting, but at present this does not seem possible given constraints of NYU.

Liz Goren and Sue Grand are looking forward to hearing input from candidates, graduates, and faculty, so that we can make these ethics concerns our communal concerns.

Thanks,
Sue
Dr. Sue Grand