

Tilburg University

End of the training Evaluation Project Working Retreat for training Analysts, 26/27 april 2008 o.l.v. Dr. Mira Erlich-Ginor

Oei, T.I.

Published in:
Mededelingenblad Nederlandse Vereniging voor psychoanalyse

Publication date:
2008

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Oei, T. I. (2008). End of the training Evaluation Project Working Retreat for training Analysts, 26/27 april 2008 o.l.v. Dr. Mira Erlich-Ginor. *Mededelingenblad Nederlandse Vereniging voor psychoanalyse*, 23(4), 90-91.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

End of the training Evaluation Project Working Retreat for training Analysts, 26/27 april, 2008, Berlijn, onder leiding van Dr. Mira Erlich-Ginor

The way we work is to ask a presenter to provide examples of the decisions they reach during the assessment process in training – but focusing on specific clinical examples of work that becomes considered as “more adequate” or “less adequate”. Examples might be drawn from one or two supervision sessions or by giving vignettes from different clinical situations over a period of time – perhaps to demonstrate how a candidate’s capacity did or did not develop. As participant of a group work, you are trying to make clear what the presenter *does*, not what you yourself would do.

The groups are asked to focus not on what the individual members of the groups themselves think the criteria should be but in understanding in the greatest detail what the presenter’s ideas are. So this is an opportunity for the presenter to try to set out his or her ideas and to reflect on them with colleagues.

We would like to stress the following general points:

1. The **general task** is to gather information and knowledge about how the criteria of evaluation and judging the competence of a candidate are used in the material presented. In other words: our task is to share knowledge of how we know when the **Goals** of psychoanalytic training have been achieved enough for the candidate to be qualified. These goals are to be illustrated by examples of what candidates *can* do in their consulting rooms with their psychoanalytic patients.
2. The **specific task** should be approached by discovering **clinical examples** describing when the presenter (*not the group*) thought the candidate was **specifically** more or less able to function with a patient like a **psychoanalyst**.

Three important related issues:

- The task is **not** to decide how to train people or how to help them be good analysts – for example how to supervise. (This would be an interesting question but to explore if different ways of supervising are more or less successful we first need to know what we are aiming to achieve – specific and competent psychoanalytic practice).
- The task implies that a process of evaluation takes place at the end of training – that somehow people get to the end and at that point they have become psychoanalysts. This means that the discussion is ultimately about “pass” or “fail”. Probably this really means judging a candidate as “ready now” or “not yet ready”. Past experience suggests it may be worth reflecting on the emotional issues around a decision to delay or fail a candidate and on the function of the Institute.
- The task implies that the assessment should concern actual work as a psychoanalyst. Are there other criteria? How are they assessed?

Regarding the details of the group task **your role** is to **participate actively** by trying to work out in your own mind what criteria the presenter is using. This may help to clarify some specific points:

1. The presenter is asked to bring examples of candidates who are showing signs of working in a specifically psychoanalytic way “good enough” to qualify **and** examples of candidates who are not yet showing signs of working in a “good enough” specifically psychoanalytic way.
2. As a group member you are asked to make it explicit what the presenter think is “good enough” (and why, giving examples) or not good enough. (The group has to respect the presenter’s approach and try to be as curious about it as possible). However, introducing one’s own ideas may help if it is done in a spirit of trying to find out the presenter’s ideas.
3. To discover what is “good enough” it can be helpful also to look at examples of what is “excellent” - and trying to see what “excellence” means to this presenter.
4. It may help to suppose that the criteria anyone uses may in part be explicit and known to the presenter but also implicit and not known until put into words by the group discussion. This

might emerge as the group and the presenter begin to understand what it was that was being assessed.

5. The main aim is to help if the group identify the components which are being judged – such as the various capacities (mentioned in the Tuckett frame and defined in more detail there) to listen like an analyst, to conceive clinical material like an analyst or to talk to the patient like an analyst. But any other components or dimensions can also be considered. Be sure to get enough detailed examples – for instance, it could be that the candidate is considered able “to establish a psychoanalytic process”. You will need to know what a psychoanalytic process means to the presenter, how it is established and what the candidate did that suggests he or she could do it. Similarly with “interpret the transference”, “be in touch with the patient”, “maintain the analytic role”, “hear the “unconscious”, etc.
6. It is also likely to help if you consider what the presenter thinks the candidate can do quite well (with examples) and what is done rather less well (with examples).
7. It may be interesting and useful to look at the pressures (if there are any) the presenter can identify in the assessment judgment – pressures’ arising from the implication for the candidate, the candidate’s other teachers, the candidate’s analyst or supervisors. Such pressures may have important implications for the setting in which assessment is made. Each participant of a group should make sure that she/he has an understanding of the basic way the assessment system works in the presenter’s institute.

During the group and after the work every member of the group should try to create a short written summary of *what they believe the presenter was trying to assess and how it was done*. This summary should aim at making the presenter’s criteria explicit. This summary can take place under the heading of the Tuckett frame categories or under others.

Mira Erlich-Ginor
Working Party on Education, Chair
Jerusalem, October 2007

Eike Hinze
Chair ETEP

Met bovengenoemde woorden in het hoofd betrad ik het Harnack House gebouw, alwaar het genoemde weekend werd gehouden. Het was de 6^e door de EPF georganiseerde bijeenkomst onder leiding van Mira Erlich. De sfeer van dit treffen was zoals de eerdere keren die ik me herinner vertrouwd, veilig en vooral inspirerend. Wat maakt dat de presenter of the would-be presenter altijd een zekere ‘fear to be assessed’ moet zien te overwinnen? Een van de collega’s zei: You will be assessed anyhow and whatsoever! Superviseren is, anders dan de leeranalyse, in principe publiek domein: evaluaties, die worden besproken in de evaluatiecommissie en zo nodig in de opleidingscommissie over de supervisie, behoren immers tot de wezenlijke taken van de supervisor. Deze nuchtere vaststelling door David Tuckett werd dan ook door alle aanwezigen geaccepteerd. De supervisor heeft naast de eigen persoonlijkheid als instrument ook de im- als ook expliciete criteria op basis waarvan wordt gewerkt als supervisor. Daarbij behoren niet alleen de overdracht/tegenoverdracht relatie tussen supervisor/supervisand, maar ook en juist de overdracht/tegenoverdrachtrelatie van supervisand en analysant tot de werkerreinen van de supervisie. Instructief was te zien hoe en dat de drie presenters in de respectievelijke drie groepen zelf veel geleerd hadden van de besproken elementen in de groepen en tussen de groepen leeranalytici. Daarbij werden de gewonnen inzichten benoemd als je eigen blinde vlekken leren opsporen. De eindconclusie van de meeting was: dit is voor herhaling vatbaar. Besloten werd om aandacht te vragen aan de Europese verenigingen teneinde dit initiatief te helpen voortzetten in de vorm van terugkerende intervisies en studiewerkgroepen zoals deze. Einddoel vormt eigenlijk dat de locale verenigingen hun eigen intervisiegroepen van opleiders en supervisoren opzetten waarbij de leeranalytici en supervisoren onderling zelf hun eigen leermomenten zouden kunnen bepalen. Idealiter zou ik me kunnen indenken, dat onze drie locale verenigingen op den duur zulke leermomenten gezamenlijk vorm geven. Dat is evenwel nog een toekomstwens. Intussen wordt de volgende trainingsdag 5 december 2008 in Zürich gehouden wederom onder auspiciën van de EPF. Het valt te verwachten dat er weer velen uit verschillende (ook Rusland en andere voormalige Oostblok-)landen van de partij zullen zijn.

Karel Oei