

I.S.N.I.P. - Boardmeeting 15

report March 1996

Present Martien Kooyman, Dario Cipani, Inger Johansson, Asa Lööf, Nimet Salem, Thomas Renz, Domingos Neto, Ron Kissick, Terry Cole and Johan Maertens

Absent Jeff Gordon, Fiede Ingewersen and Silvio Quirico

1. ISNIP finances

The ISNIP budget 1995 and 1996 were approved of on the boardmeetings at the international conference in Washington-USA. We agreed to change the bookkeeping into a double bookkeeping and to approve this annually after the control and positive advise of an official revisor.

In annex you can find the bookkeeping report for your information. We are open to all questions. The questions, the answers and the advice of the revisor will be distributed together with the following boardmeeting.

The bookkeeping 95 will be controlled by an official revisor in April 96. The 150.000 BEF loan from De Sleutel has be taken in consideration which will result in a more positive result.

Good work ! > Ron Kissick.
In agreement ! > Terry Cole.

2. Financial budget long term

Ron Kissick proposes to make budgetsettings for a longer period (2 to 3 years) to avoid situations like the approval of the budget of 1995 on a boardmeeting in September 1995 !

If we have an agreement on his proposition, Johan Maertens is willing to present a first draft proposal for the budget 1997 - 1998 - 1999 (based on the real expenses of 1995 and on the new membershipsfees).

<i>Martien Kooyman</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Dario Cipani</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Inger Johansson</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Asa Lööf</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Nimet Salem</i>	<i>/</i>
<i>Thomas Renz</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Domingos Neto</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Ron Kissick</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Terry Cole</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Johan Maertens</i>	<i>yes</i>

3. Consensus procedure

We agreed to prepare a consensus in ISNIP on the definition of the specific factors of NIP. We decided to start with bonding and to develop a procedure ending at each conference with a general consensus meeting with the members.

I propose the following procedure :

1. to gather all information on definition or description of bonding
2. a committee of three teaching fellows, analyzing this material and proposing a definition and a description
3. all the members make an objective observation of bonding in two different groups and describe correctly what they see
4. all this material is sent to the committee to compare and to describe the common part
5. the committee presents the final definition and description with all the used material to all the members of the society in preparation of the consensus meeting at the conference
6. those who do not attend the conference send their remarks to the international office
7. the consensus workgroup (only members) discuss the matter and the committee writes a final definition and description of bonding
8. the board accepts and publishes the final text

<i>Martien Kooyman</i>	<i>no</i>
<i>Dario Cipani</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Inger Johansson</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Asa Lööf</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Nimet Salem</i>	<i>tel.</i>
<i>Thomas Renz</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Domingos Neto</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Ron Kissick</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Terry Cole</i>	<i>pers.</i>
<i>Johan Maertens</i>	<i>yes</i>

No decision to be taken yet. The consensus procedure can be discussed first at the teaching fellow conference in La Soleillette in May > Martien Kooyman. Agreed we need a process and procedure, I would like to discuss with others and hear idea > Terry Cole.

4. Criteria for fellow

Doris Agazzi-Störi, practical co-ordinator of the International Casriel Institute, brought to my attention that the criteria for fellow are not correct. I propose the alterations as you can see in annex

<i>Martien Kooyman</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Dario Cipani</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Inger Johansson</i>	<i>yes</i>

<i>Asa Lööf</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Nimet Salem</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Thomas Renz</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Domingos Neto</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Ron Kissick</i>	<i>/</i>
<i>Terry Cole</i>	<i>pers.</i>
<i>Johan Maertens</i>	<i>yes</i>

We want to discuss the criteria considering the ongoing Swedish program > Inger Johansson.

Needs further discussion. Point 5 and point 6 are not clearly in agreement > Ron Kissick.

We need to talk through procedure / criteria more. We each can bring our recommendations to next board meeting > Terry Cole.

This point will be put on the agenda of the TFC for further discussion > Johan Maertens.

5. ICI co-ordination of travel (by Ron Kissick)

In response to the questions for ICI to arrange transportation for the teaching fellows in a central location. Ron Kissick propose having the practical co-ordinator in Geneva check on prices, and perhaps Ron can have a check done here (USA) so we can compare prices. In addition to possible cost benefit, Ron hopes it would make it more convenient for the teachers to have a central place to arrange travel, and perhaps more convenient for ISNIP as well to have a billing arrangement with a travel agency so the cost of teaching fellow travel was paid by one person routinely.

<i>Martien Kooyman</i>	<i>no</i>
<i>Dario Cipani</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Inger Johansson</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Asa Lööf</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Nimet Salem</i>	<i>tel.</i>
<i>Thomas Renz</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Domingos Neto</i>	<i>abst.</i>
<i>Ron Kissick</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Terry Cole</i>	<i>yes</i>
<i>Johan Maertens</i>	<i>yes</i>

No decision to be taken yet. The travel arrangement can be discussed first at the teaching fellow conference in La Soleillette in May > Martien Kooyman.

Due to exchange provision for foreign currency payment of travel expenses in your own country to a travel agent may be cheaper. This is the situation in Europe until payment in ECU's will be possible. It would be advisable to have ISNIP payment part of the international travelling for teaching fellows. For instance by reducing the membershipsfee of the teaching fellows concerned > Martien Kooyman.

There appears that there is no advantage for arranging European travel from U.S. Cost is the same > Ron Kissick.

I agree we need to coordinate travel plans. We need to develop a relationship with a travel agent who understands we are not for profit and will get us a discount if we centralize to get the best price. The key is to plan ahead the travel > Terry Cole.

6. Training of Fellows in one chapter who wil work and practice in another chapter.

To avoid problems in the future (the German and Swiss chapter were able to solve a problem in this sense), Johan Maertens proposes that in the first interview with a candidate for training, the teaching fellow always asks where the candidate intends to work with the method. The training cannot start without the agreement of this chapter and the second sponsor should be a teaching fellow of this chapter.

The teaching fellow has to prevent (better : to make the trainee aware that) the trainee that in the other case he/she will have to ask for membership of this chapter after the training. The chapter might set extra conditions conform the chapter's rule and the country's laws. This way we can avoid that trainees try to avoid chapter regulations and country laws without excluding training in another country.

Martien Kooyman	/
Dario Cipani	yes
Inger Johansson	yes
Asa Lööf	yes
Nimet Salem	/
Thomas Renz	/
Domingos Neto	/
Ron Kissick	yes
Terry Cole	I agree with this
Johan Maertens	yes

I miss the possibility to respond to this question. In my opinion a fellow trained by a teaching fellow ... by ISNIP should be recognised in any country in the world. If they can work as an individual psychotherapist using the NIP is up to the country's law not to the regional chapter to decide. I suggest a discussion on this point at the TFC > Martien Kooyman.

Note :

the text concerning "the ICI co-ordination of travel" was repeated under item 3 "consensus procedure" and caused some confusing - herefore our apologies.