

SFCT Full Member Reviews

In this section we give a quick update on the fascinating projects that have been submitted as a “piece of work” in order to gain full membership of SFCT. Longer reports are available at: <http://www.asfct.org/memberslist.php> – simply click on the name of a full member to read about his or her “piece of work”.

John Wheeler (UK): Delivering workshops on the SF approach to mandated participants who worked with mandated client and expected training.

Reviewers: Jenny Clarke and Stanus Cloete

Already the heading of John Wheeler’s piece of work sounds very typical: an SF consultant thrown into an unclear situation where people want many different things and are probably not extremely happy to be in a workshop with a consultant. Participants in service B had been marshalled by their organisation to be taught the SF approach. Clients of service A and service B had been very happy with service A’s use of the SF approach and now they wanted service B to use it, too. In the workshop John expected an eager-to-learn group mainly of service B members. However, as it turned out, most were from service A. John had also not been informed that service B practitioners might feel somewhat mandated to work with him. They also worked mainly with mandated clients whereas service A mainly worked with voluntary clients.

Many SF practitioners have been in this or a similar unfortunate situation at the beginning of a workshop and we probably all cringe when we read John’s description. John managed despite the odds to enable 5 groups of 20 practitioners from group B to start using the SF approach effectively with clients. Service B also had a clear plan in place to embed the approach into the service. A colleague from service A who offered supervision to practitioners from service B commented:

“I found the advisors to be highly motivated to begin to use what they had learned from John and even more motivated to tell us about how it had been successful with customers.”

John attributes his success partially to the fact that he managed to match the process and content. His workshop delivery was consistent with the SF approach: he asked service B participants what they wanted out of the session, enabled them to forget the hierarchy between “teacher” and “student” and built on what the participants already knew. He also used future oriented questions, the MQ and scaling.

His reviewers remarked John’s respectful stance toward the participants, treating them as equals and experts. His tentative, non-dogmatic approach won him many allies. He “walked the talk”.

Read more at: <http://www.asfct.org/johnwheeler.php>

André Krämer (Germany): Team and Conflict Coaching in an intensive care unit.

Reviewers: Peter Röhrig and Gabriele Röttgen-Wallrath

André helped an intensive care unit team who had been in a rather hopeless situation. They had unsuccessfully been involved in a “supervision” process for 3 years and were still very much involved in conflicts. The situation was described as a “constant war”. When the situation deteriorated so that there was even negative feedback from other staff, patients and families of patients and some team members were about to resign because of the “unbearable bullying”, the team decided to try “team coaching”. The word “supervision” was not used as they had had negative experiences.

André used a modified “Solution Circle” format (after Daniel Meier’s Solution Circle). He bravely started by interviewing each team member – and he says that this was a very useful method, but that it required “bold serenity”. The main benefit was that it provided the team with a treasure of learning SF in real time. He then had 4 sessions in which he used the Solution Circle method. The established format was

one session every month. It was therefore not possible to do a 2 day workshop. However, André found out that the format also worked very well with some time in between sessions. He communicated with the team via email between the sessions and was happy to find out with his reviewers that this communication can be used as part of the coaching process.

The results of his coaching were astonishing. After the third session the team itself started mentioning positive changes and confirmed this impression in the fourth session. The sick rate had improved by 10% and was at an all time low after the second session. Four months after the end of the process the team rated progress at an 8 (1 being the situation in the beginning, 10 being the optimal state). Integrating new team members, which was something that had been a major problem at the beginning, was now perceived as a new competency of the team. The head of department said: "Atmosphere of trust, facilitation in difficult situations, enabling introverted team members to participate actively . . . all in all very positive feedback of the team members. We reached our goals: Again, a respectful collaboration within the team, acceptance and appreciation in a multi-professional team. The patients are again top priority, new colleagues have been integrated. It is now again possible to work on larger projects with the engagement of all employees."

André perceived his review process as very helpful and a great learning experience.

Read more (in German) at: <http://www.asfct.org/andrekraemer.php>

Gun-Eva Andersson Långdahl (Finland): A process that makes it possible for members of a group to find their goal and relate to each other in a way that feels secure for each member.

Reviewers: Peter Sundman and Marika Tammeaid

Gun-Eva worked with a group of professionals working with treatment, children and their families. Similar to André's

case, this group had also had clinical supervision together but had not been content with their supervisors. They were seeking a supervisor to help them develop a secure way to relate to each other during supervision. The group met every four days for 1.5 hours, for a total of 8 sessions.

Gun-Eva designed an SF supervision process for them in which every member formulated his or her own personal and professional goal. This made it possible for each member to take their own position in the group. It enabled her to focus on each member in a way that related to how the member wanted to be met.

The next step in the process was finding a common goal for the whole group, so that the group was able to work together with both the individual and group goal at the same time. After each member had been seen and heard and the group had found the “common goal”, they had also found a secure way of relating to each other.

Gun-Eva’s reviewers were impressed with her courage in taking the assignment, knowing that two other supervisors had already failed. She seemed to be quite confident about how to go about her assignment. The same sort of skills seemed to be at work in her work elsewhere too, for instance when she at times steered the interaction in a direct way and at other times stepped back and ‘let the talk go around’, as she nicely expressed it.

Gun-Eva has a talent for observing carefully the needs of the group and making the progress both visible and tangible by personalising and embodying the change. She used a broad variety of methods during the sessions and also gave useful exercises for the participants to keep the process alive between the sessions. The participants wanted to learn how to build on clients’ goals in their work and Gun-Eva underlined this learning with her own communication style with the group. This piece of work is an excellent example of how individuals with different views and goals can learn to work together.

Learn more at: <http://www.asfct.org/gunevalangdahl.php>