

MEMORANDUM

To: CCPTP

From: Jim Lichtenberg
Nancy Elman

Subject: Update on CoA activities

Date: February 5, 2007

At the end of 2006, the Committee had a total of **889** accredited programs.

At this time, the Committee has two items currently posted for public comment:

- A clarification of how the Committee defines the phrase “or the equivalent thereof” in the discussion of the residency requirements in Domain A.4 of the Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation (G&P). The “equivalent” language has been in the G&P since it was first published for use in 1996. A copy of the proposed clarification (which would supplement the G&P as a new implementing regulation) is attached to this report.
- The second item is a proposed change to the Accreditation Operating Procedures (AOP) regarding the filing of complaints. Currently the language indicates that all complaints must be filed within a year of the occurrence of the event(s) leading to the filing of the complaint. This one year deadline has made it difficult for students and interns to come forward in filing complaints due to concerns about retribution. The current language would provide students in training up to 18 months to file a complaint after completion of the training program.

The Committee continued work during its policy meeting on several key initiatives begun in 2006.

- **Task Force on practicum training**. This group has been working on language to change the current provisions in the G&P regarding practicum training. The proposed language would include additional specifications and outcome expectations for this important aspect of education and training in professional psychology. The draft language will be reviewed at the CoA meeting at the end of March, 2007. Once approved that language will be posted for six months of public comment.
- **Transition to Commission workgroup**. This group has been working with all the communities of interest to provide CoA with proposals for how the groups will nominate individuals for seats on the Commission. The Committee currently

has the nominating procedures for those already representing and the group has therefore been focused on groups that will be newly represented on the Commission. The Committee will send forward to BEA those procedures after the May 1, 2007 deadline for their receipt to allow BEA to send forward the call for nomination for the seats to be reviewed at the BEA fall meeting.

- **Accreditation Assembly**. The Committee held its first Assembly on January 12 - 13, 2007. There were approximately 160 attendees at the meeting, including COA members and presenters. Sessions at the Assembly included plenary sessions on the nature of accreditation and higher education and the impact on the CoA and strategies for the recruitment of diverse students/interns, as well as an open forum for comments. Breakout sessions included presentations on the review process, feedback from site visitors, ethical issues with students, evidenced-based practice training, degree-model match in programs, and broad and general training in professional psychology. The Committee conducted a survey of respondents which it will review at its spring meeting and will conduct a larger survey to gather information on a preferred date for the 2008 Assembly.
- **Concurrent Accreditation with Canada**. This item calling for ending the concurrent accreditation of programs in Canada at a time certain was reviewed and approved by both CoA and BEA for a second time in the fall of 2006. The item was placed again on the CoR February agenda. An update on this issue will be provided following the CoR meeting.

New policy items: During the Committee's policy meeting it also began work on several policy initiatives including the following:

- A potential change in the Accreditation Operating Procedures regarding the process of selecting site visitors. Once the language is finalized, that change will be posted for six months of public comment.
- The Committee voted on language for a revised Implementing Regulation defining its expectations for education and training in supervision and consultation at the doctoral and internship level. That IR is currently posted as C-1.
- The Committee began a discussion about revising the current language in doctoral and internship programs regarding either empirically supported interventions or treatments. It will discuss a change in the current language to evidence-based practice during its spring meeting. Should a potential change be approved by the CoA, it will be provided for public comment.

Outreach Activities:

- CoA members and staff provided training and made presentations at the following training councils: National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology, Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology, Council of Directors of School Psychology, and Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs. Committee members will also be conducting training sessions at the neuropsychology meeting, the meeting of medical school training programs, Association of Pre- and Postdoctoral Internship Centers and the Association of Psychological Science.
- Dr. Lichtenberg will be presenting to ASPPB in the spring to further assist CoA with two initiatives: more user-friendly licensure passage information; and assisting students from CPA accredited programs in their licensure efforts in the US.

Other Initiatives:

In an effort to provide potential students accountability information regarding accredited doctoral programs in professional psychology, and consistent with the call for information that allows for some comparison regarding these outcomes, the Committee passed Implementing Regulation C-20 (attached).

The Committee has eight new members beginning terms in 2007. Drs. Lichtenberg and Baker provided an in-depth orientation and training session for these new members. APA Legal Counsel also met with the new members to discuss fiduciary duty, the duty of care, and legal risk issues in accreditation.

The Committee continues to be updated on the current issues in higher education regarding accreditation. The Committee through its staff and with the assistance of Jenny Smulson, has been working with the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors and the Council of Higher Education Accreditation to monitor and, where appropriate, influence policy regarding accreditation in higher education. The Secretary of the US Department of Education has begun holding negotiated rule-making on issues not currently in the law and with no congressional mandate. Although ASPA has indicated that it is opposed to moving forward without a congressional mandate, the Secretary has moved forward on negotiated rule-making. The CoA is fortunate in having Betty Horton, one of the CoA's public members, as the primary negotiator for professional accreditors and Susan Zlotlow as the alternate. Some of the key issues for discussion include: the public disclosure of all accreditation reviews and setting "bright line" student learning outcomes linked to specific provided by the Department of Education.

Draft Implementing Regulation

Doctoral Program Residency Requirement

The doctorate is the highest degree of educational accomplishment in professional psychology. The level of sophistication in thought and behavior required for the degree is attained in part through full-time study in residence at an institution of doctoral education. To this end, the *Guidelines and Principles* (Section A.4.) requires of each student “a minimum of 3 full-time academic years of graduate study—at least 2 of which must be at the institution from which the doctoral degree is granted and at least 1 year of which must be in full-time residence or the equivalent thereof.”

Residency fulfills two primary purposes: student development and student assessment. With regard to student development, residency allows students (1) to concentrate on course work, professional training and scholarship; (2) to work closely with professors, supervisors and other students; and (3) to acquire the habits, skills, and insights necessary for attaining a doctoral degree in psychology. Full-time residence provides students other opportunities, including obtaining fluency in the language and vocabulary of psychology as enhanced by frequent and close association with, apprenticing to, and role modeling by faculty members and other students; obtaining valuable experience by attending and participating in both formal and informal seminars; colloquia; discussions led by visiting specialists from other campuses, laboratories, or governmental research and/or practice organizations; and, obtaining support in thesis, dissertation, or doctoral project work through frequent consultations with advisors.

An equally important purpose fulfilled by the one-year, full-time minimum residence requirement is to permit faculty, training staff, supervisors, and administrators to execute their professional, ethical, and potentially legal obligations to assess all elements of student competence. Executing these obligations is an essential aspect of assuring quality and protecting the public. These elements include not only student-trainees' knowledge and skills, but also their emotional stability and well being, interpersonal competence, professional development, and personal fitness for practice. Through such student assessment, accredited programs can ensure—insofar as possible—that their graduates are competent to manage relationships (e.g., client, collegial, professional, public, scholarly, supervisory, teaching) in an effective and appropriate manner. This capacity for managing relationships represents one of the competencies that define professional expertise.

Programs seeking to satisfy the requirement of one year of full-time residency based on "the equivalent thereof" must demonstrate how the proposed equivalence fulfills all of the aspects of the purposes of the residency requirement, as articulated above. In evaluating whether the residency requirement is satisfied, the Committee will consider processes and indicators related to the elements of student development and student assessment detailed in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Implementing Regulation.

Note: The above statement on the purpose of full-time residency is drawn substantially from the Policy Statement of the Council of Graduate Schools titled "The Doctor of Philosophy Degree" (Council of Graduate Schools, 2005), the statement of the Council of Chairs of Training Councils (December, 2003) titled "Comprehensive Evaluation of Student Competence" (<http://www.apa.org/ed/graduate/cctc.html>), and the APA Policy Statement on Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology (August, 2005).

C-20. Disclosure of Education/Training Outcomes and Information Allowing for Informed Decision-Making to Prospective Doctoral Students

(Committee on Accreditation, May 2006; Revised November 2006)

EFFECTIVE January 1, 2007 and for published material for 2007-2008

Domain G of the *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology* (G&P) requires that doctoral graduate programs provide potential students, current students and the public with accurate information on the program and with program expectations. This information is meant to describe the program accurately and completely, include education and training outcomes, and be presented in a manner that allows applicants to make informed decisions about entering the program.

As stated above, the information requested should include education and training outcomes as well as information that will allow applicants to make informed and comparative decisions. The Committee believes that all doctoral programs should therefore minimally provide the following information regarding education and training outcomes and accurate program descriptions as of January 1, 2007 to potential students in its public documents including its website, if it has one: time to program completion; costs (tuition and fees); internship acceptance rates; fellowships and other funding available; student attrition rates; and licensure outcomes. These are further defined below:

1. Time To Completion

In their public materials, programs should provide the mean and the median number of years that students have taken to complete the program from the time of program entrance. These data should be provided for all graduates over the past seven years. Where applicable, these measures should be provided separately for students who began the program as bachelor level graduates and those who began with advanced standing (e.g., after having completed a separate master's program in psychology). The program should also provide the percentage of students completing the program in fewer than five years, five years, six years, seven years, and more than seven years.

2. Program Costs

Programs are expected to make available the costs (i.e., tuition and fees) per student for the current first year cohort. This information should include full time student tuition, tuition per credit hour for part time students, and any fees assessed to students beyond tuition costs. Programs may also provide information regarding current adjustments to tuition including, but not limited to: financial aid, grants, loans, tuition remission, assistantships, and fellowships.

3. Internships

Programs are expected to provide data for at least the most recent seven years of graduates showing their success in obtaining internships. These data should show the number and percentage of students in the following categories:

- Those who obtained internships
- Those who obtained paid internships
- Those who obtained APPIC member internships
- Those who obtained APA/CPA accredited internships
- Those who obtained internships conforming to CDSPP guidelines (school psychology only)
- Those who obtained two year half-time internships

NOTE: In calculating the percentages, the program must use the **total number of students** applying for internship that year.

4. Attrition

Programs are expected to report the number and percentage of students who have failed to complete the program once matriculated. These data should be calculated by dividing the number of matriculated students who have left the program for any reason by the total number of students matriculated in the

program. These data should be provided for all students who have left the program in the last seven years or for all students who have left since the program became initially accredited, whichever time period is shorter.

5. Licensure

This section EFFECTIVE January 1, 2008 and for published materials for 2008-2009

Reporting of program licensure data is an expectation of the US Secretary of Education's National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for program accreditors, including the APA Committee on Accreditation. Programs are expected to report the number and percentage of program graduates who have become licensed psychologists within the preceding decade. This percentage should be calculated by dividing the number of students who have both graduated and become licensed psychologists within the 8 years spanning the period of 2-10 years post-graduation by the number of doctoral degrees awarded by the program over that same period. That is, the figures reported by a program for 2007 would be number of students who graduated from the program during the period 1997-2005 and who have achieved licensure divided by the number of students graduating from the program during that same 8-year period. Program licensure rates are to be updated at least every three years.

Programs may interpret their licensure rate in light of their training model and program goals and objectives.