



Sak til styremøte

1 e-post

Cristina Archetti <cristina.archetti@media.uio.no>

30. oktober 2023 kl. 09:31

Til: Bjørn Reidar Brune - Leder <post@traumeterapeutforeningen.no>

Dear Bjørn Reidar and NTF Styre,

I am contacting you because I would like to suggest a couple of items for discussion for the upcoming NTF styre: PFO and supervision.

1. I would like NTF to provide more information and clarity as to the aim and practical requirements of PFO.

a) What are the guidelines for PFO? At the moment all I can find on the NTF website are a few lines in the Vedtekter (section h). They do not specify any amount of hours or what kind of activity the PFO could include. I have heard in various discussions that the amount of required hours is 30, at least half of which should be supervision. However, this is written nowhere as far as I can see.

b) What counts as PFO? At the moment all I can see offered by the IoPT scene in Norway is taking supervision courses (designed to cover all the 30 hours or more) and attending the IoPT conference (which is not even annual). I see on other organizations' websites (examples from those that openly present the PFO requirements: [Profesjonell Faglig Oppdatering \(PFO\) - Norsk Forening for Psykosynteseterapeuter \(nfpt.no\)](https://www.nfpt.no) and [Profesjonell faglig oppdatering - NFPsykoterapi.no](https://www.nfpsykoterapi.no)), however, that PFO can consist in egenerapi, in organisasjonsarbeid/deltagelse i styrer eller komiteer, and utarbeidelse av faglitteratur. It is also possible to take courses in nærliggende fagområder: I would think that taking courses in other (but still internal parts-based) approaches than IoPT would be a learning experience as it would encourage reflection on what IoPT can or cannot do and how and why it differs from other approaches. In summary, I think the offer for PFO at the moment is very narrow and, in so far as it encourages being inward-looking and always among the same few people, it encourages "sectarianism" (if we can call it that way). Certainly PFO is about faglig oppdatering, but should it not also be about continuous learning and broadening one's horizons and skills?

2. I would like NTF to provide more information and clarity as to the aim and practical requirements of supervision.

a. What are the aims of supervision and what should this consist in? I speak from the perspective of having served as trained supervisor and mentor in higher education for 20 years. I see supervision as the possibility to consult a more experienced peer (more discussion needed also about what "experienced" means, but let's leave it to the side for now) whom I can ask questions related to my IoPT practice (which might also involve theory questions): we can discuss cases I am coming across with clients, especially if there are any challenging situations, or whatever might be relevant to my practice. I am not sure whether all supervision sessions currently involve self-encounters (I have the impression that they do): I think this should not be a requirement. First because I can do a self-encounter with ANY facilitator, second because if the solution to my practical problems lies in the self-encounter, then I do not need a supervisor. What is the role of the supervisor exactly?

b. Amounts of hours of supervision. If one is working full time as IoPT therapist I would expect they come across lots of material to be discussed with a supervisor. If one works only a few hours, that is not at all the case: should not the amount of supervision be proportional? While of course I welcome supervision, at the moment I feel we have to take supervision (a lot of hours of it) because there are so many trained supervisors who need to work (a sort of pyramid scheme...), not because we actually need it. 15 hours a year without including self-encounters is a disproportionate amount for anyone (like me at the moment) who only practices IoPT on the margin of a different full time (and already demanding) job.

- c. In the case when one is not practicing a lot of hours of therapy (and it does not make sense to require massive amounts of supervision) would it be possible to “compensate” with alternative PFO activities?
- d. In other words: I am not disputing the fact we all need PFO and that this is good for our professional development. I just think more balance, fairness and flexibility is needed to cater to the different ways in which different NTF members practice IoPT.

I do hope there is going to be a broader debate on this. The point of PFO is to feel supported in one's development. At the moment I feel there are a series of burdens imposed on me which I am not entirely sure about and (despite having collected a range of activities and far more hours than required—separate email coming about this) I feel I might not be able to entirely fulfil.

Many thanks for your attention and best regards,

Cristina Archetti

Dr. Cristina Archetti

Professor in Political Communication and Journalism

Department of Media and Communication/*Institutt for Medier og Kommunikasjon*

University of Oslo/*Universitetet i Oslo*

P.O. Box 1093 Blindern

N-0317 Oslo

Norway/*Norge*

T: +47-90524868; E: cristina.archetti@media.uio.no

Online profile: [LinkedIn](#); [Academia.Edu](#); [Staff page](#)

BOOKS

NEW! [Childlessness in the Age of Communication: Deconstructing Silence](#) (2020)

[Politicians, Personal Image and the Construction of Political Identity](#) (2014)

[Understanding Terrorism in the Age of Global Media: A Communication Approach](#) (2012)

[Explaining News: National Politics and Journalistic Cultures in Global Context](#) (2010)