

Policy and Planning Board
Spring Consolidated Meeting

March 23-25, 2018

Draft Minutes

Present: *Ronald Rozensky, PhD (Chair); Heather Bullock, PhD; Armand Cerbone, PhD; Nadine Kaslow, PhD; Deirdre Knapp, PhD; Angela Kuemmel, PhD, ABPP; Bruce Overmier, PhD; Kenneth Sher, PhD; and Lori Thomas, JD, PhD.*

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes

P&P voted to approve the minutes of its following 2017 virtual meetings: September 25, October 16, October 23, October 30, November 13 and December 11; and the minutes of its January 15, 2018 and February 12, 2018 virtual meetings.

2. Monitor Reports

P&P members provided updates on their assigned groups. No action is needed by P&P.

3. Policies and Procedures Manual for the Policy and Planning Board

P&P voted to approve the 2018 Policies and Procedures Manual.

4. Amendment to Association Rule 100-1.4: Division Position and Policy Statement and Association Rule 30-8.3: Standards and Guidelines

P&P met with the Committee on Division/APA Relations (CODAPAR) to discuss P&P's proposed amendments to Association Rules 100-1.4 and 30-8.3. CODAPAR inquired about the purpose of amending these rules and sought clarification from P&P on what type of feedback was being requested. CODAPAR noted that it did not have enough time to respond to P&P's substitute motion but expressed support for the original motion. CODAPAR agreed to consult the cluster of divisions that each member interacts with and send their response to P&P's substitute motion to P&P by August 2018.

An information item will be included in Council's August agenda with updates on the progress of this item noting that P&P is awaiting CODAPAR's and the Office of General Council's responses to this substitute motion.

5. Cross-Cutting Items

CC-02 – The Board of Education Affairs (BEA), the Board of Professional Affairs (BPA) and the Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice (CAPP) asked that boards and committees review and provide comments including a recommendation regarding approval of revisions to the Model Education and Training programs in Psychopharmacology for Prescriptive Authority and the Model Legislation for Prescriptive Authority as APA policy. P&P agreed to send the following comment:

The Policy and Planning Board [P&P] is grateful for the opportunity to review the proposed revisions to the APA Model Curriculum in Psychopharmacology for Prescriptive Authority [*Curriculum*] and Related Policies (specifically the APA Designation Criteria for Education and Training Programs in Psychopharmacology for Prescriptive Authority [*Designation Criteria*] and the Model Legislation for Prescriptive Authority [*Model Legislation*]). These were discussed at the March Consolidated Meeting.

First, P&P would like to express its appreciation to the members of the Task Force to Revise the APA Model Education and Training Program in Psychopharmacology for Prescriptive Authority and Related Association Problems. The task taken on by the Task Force was a large one and one critical for advancing this area of practice.

The following issues were raised by P and P in discussing the materials in the Cross-cutting agenda [CC#2] and are being presented here for consideration by the Taskforce and other governance groups.

Total Amount of Training Allowed at the Doctoral Level (i.e., prior to admission into a postdoctoral training program)

In the *Curriculum*, a minimum of 400 hours of didactic training is required but it is unclear what proportion of these hours can be taken at the doctoral level (or in a previous postdoctoral training program). In the earlier *Curriculum* and *Designation Criteria* it was explicitly stipulated that previous coursework that could be transferred to the postdoctoral program was “not to exceed twenty percent (20%) of the curriculum and limited to the back and functional neuroscience domains (Domains I & II).” However, the current version of the *Designation Criteria* lists no such restriction. P&P believes it is important to be explicit as to the amount of transfer credit that is allowable in order to evaluate the extent that training can occur at the doctoral level and to insure designated programs have clear guidelines in this regard.

Time Elapsed Between Beginning Coursework and Completing Postdoctoral Training

Because trainees in the postdoctoral program can have some coursework transferred-in from previous training and because state licensure as a psychologist is required for admission into the postdoctoral program (e.g., *Curriculum*, lines 88-90), it is conceivable that several years could intervene between the earliest coursework and admission to the postdoctoral training program. Although programs will have procedures in place for evaluating previous coursework prior to “transferring” credit and a competency-based evaluation model is assumed, it would seem desirable to limit the amount of time that has elapsed between required coursework and admission to the postdoctoral training program, both for program continuity and because of the rapidly changing knowledge base in this foundational area of coursework. This is especially so since it appears that credits earned or credited from a given doctoral program might been obtained from an earlier doctoral program. (Note that it is stated: “For students admitted to doctoral psychology programs, transfer of credit should be granted on the same basis as transfer of credit for other doctoral level courses leading to the granting of the doctorate in psychology” (*Curriculum*, lines 225-228).

Supervised Clinical Experience

As currently written, the proposed *Curriculum* states (lines 473-475) that “the prescribing psychology fellowship *should* [emphasis added] allow the practitioner to gain exposure to acute, short-term, and maintenance medication strategies, *ideally* [emphasis added] including exposure to inpatient, consultation-liaison, emergency department, and outpatient care.” Use of words such as “should” and “ideally” implies that these are aspirational goals and somewhat discretionary. P&P believes it is important to be clearer about what is *required* in the curriculum to avoid any ambiguity. Similarly, we note in the *Curriculum* (lines 478-482) that “In order to achieve the complex clinical competency skills required for independent prescribing, a sufficient number of supervised patient contact hours must be completed with a minimum of 100 patients, which includes patients representative of all stages of psychopharmacological treatment (initiation and maintenance through termination of treatment).” Further specification of the minimum number of patients/hours of each stage would facilitate interpretation of this requirement even with the knowledge that evaluation is completed within a competency-based framework.

Program Director

P&P appreciates that the new *Curriculum* and *Designation Criteria* specify that a program must have an identified program director. However, there are no protections against this position being more than a nominal figure. It would seem desirable that a minimum FTE level of effort to the program [e.g., .5 FTE] be required in order to help insure program quality.

P&P hopes that the Taskforce finds the comments provided here useful.

CC-03 – Boards and committees were invited to review and comment on the proposed *Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Military Service Members, Veterans, and their Families*. P&P agreed to submit the following comment:

The APA Policy and Planning Board (P&P) reviewed the Proposed Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Military Services Members, Veterans and their Families: Call for Comments and from a policy perspective and found that the document is consistent with the format and content of APA guidelines.

The following issues were raised by P&P while discussing the materials and are presented here for consideration of the developers.

1. The developers use identity first language (i.e. “service-connected veteran”) throughout the document and APA recommends person first language (i.e. “veteran with a service-connected disability”).
2. Ethnic diversity is never addressed.

P&P hopes that the developers find the comments provided here useful.

CC-04 – Boards and committees were asked to recommend that Council adopt the proposed *Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Boys and Men* as Association policy. P&P agreed to submit the following statement:

The APA Policy and Planning Board (P&P) reviewed the Proposed *Guidelines for Psychological Services for Boys and Men: Request for Adoption* as APA Policy and concluded that, from a policy

stand point, they meet the expected structure for APA practice guidelines with proper definitions of what a guide is, and is not. That is, per APA rules, guidelines are noted as "aspirational."

And that "Guidelines are not intended to be mandatory or exhaustive and may not be applicable to every professional and clinical situation." Further, the process of review also meets APA's policy rules. Thus, at this point in time, they are appropriate for content review by the Association and governance.

CC-06 – The Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) and the Committee of Psychological Tests and Assessment (CPTA) asked that boards and committees review, provide comments, and recommend adoption by Council as APA policy, the revised *Principles for Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*. P&P agreed to submit the following statement:

The APA Policy and Planning Board (P&P) reviewed the proposed policy the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* and from a policy perspective and found that the document is consistent with the format and content of APA guidelines. P&P recommends approval of the main motion.

CC-07 - The Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) and the Committee on Human Research (CHR) asked that boards and committees review, provide comments, and recommend adoption by Council as APA policy, the proposed *Resolution Supporting Expansion of Mature Minors' Ability to Participate in Research*. P&P agreed to submit the following statement:

The APA Policy and Planning Board (P&P) reviewed the proposed policy the *Resolution Supporting Expansion of Mature Minors' Ability to Participate in Research* and from a policy perspective and found that the document is consistent with the format and content of APA guidelines. P&P recommends approval of the main motion.

CC-08 – The Committee on Children, Youth and Families requested that boards and committees review the responses to earlier comments and related revisions to the proposed resolution, and recommend adoption by Council as APA policy the proposed *Resolution on Physical Discipline of Children by Parents*. P&P agreed to submit the following comment:

The Policy and Planning (P&P) Board reviews cross cutting agenda items with a primary focus on the foreseeable policy implications that may result from adoption of the item. Based on its review of the Revised Resolution on Physical Punishment of Children by Parents, P & P is concerned that the *Whereas and Be it Resolved* Statements appear to overstate the strength of the scientific findings presented in support of the resolution and may lead to unintended consequences in the field of child protection and in custody contexts.

As mentioned in our previous review of this document, P&P finds this resolution to be "very important" and one that is likely to have "broad implications on the national and international levels." Additionally, P&P continues to be supportive of this item moving forward, once revised, to the APA Council of Representatives.

P&P commends the drafters on their responsiveness to the requests of various groups in revising the original document. Moreover, it acknowledges that the drafters conducted a

thorough review of extant literature on this topic. However, on this second review, P&P offers the following comments with the intent of assisting the drafters with addressing the overarching concerns expressed by P&P and groups such as COLI and BAPPI at the 2018 Spring Consolidated Meetings.

Overstatement of Scientific Findings - The drafters of the resolution take care to point out the methodological improvements made in recent studies to increase the validity of the findings regarding the negative effects of physical punishment on children (e.g. Lines 105, 106, 113-116). Moreover, the drafters address the “strength of the evidence” and conclude that “findings from these “methodologically rigorous studies are clear and consistent in demonstrating that physical discipline can be detrimental. . . (Lines 241, 242).” They do not, however, mention effect sizes or indicate information about the strengths of association found. It is significant then that in the *Whereas* statements, the drafters make multiple references about statistical strength of data that appear to go further than the information presented in the literature review they provided. Specifically, in line 298, they use the phrase “robust.” In line 302, they indicate that the “adverse outcomes . . .” are “strong enough and consistent enough”. Moreover, in the first *Be it resolved* statement, they indicate there is “overwhelming scientific evidence.” The weight of this resolution would be bolstered by ensuring that the statements made are consistent with the scientific evidence presented. For example, in line 298, the statement would be as effective if the authors omit the word “robust” and reference only the rigor of research and its findings. Likewise, in Line 323, the word overwhelming is removed. These omissions would not change the overall message communicate by the drafters – that physical punishment is associated with negative outcomes for children.

Unintended Consequences – Along with the overstatement of scientific findings, the *Be it Resolved* statement in Lines 322-325, which calls for the APA to “oppose physical discipline of children by parents and caregivers,” can lead to unintended consequences in child protection and child custody contexts. The statement, which essentially calls for a ban on caregivers’ use of physical punishment may lead to further disparities in the child protective services context. Child Welfare publications have long described the overrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities in the child welfare system. The drafters of this resolution also acknowledge the role that culture, and race, may play in attitudes towards the use of physical discipline. A ban on the use of physical punishment may foreseeably contribute to continued racial and ethnic disparities in the child welfare system. The drafters have previously countered this concern by indicating that other institutions (lines 262-68) have banned the use of physical discipline. They have also asserted that this proposed resolution would likely have limited policy impact. However, the recognition of APA amicus brief’s in Supreme Court decisions, along with the drafters’ own assertion about the import of this resolution seem to underscore the impact of statements by APA. Moreover, it is possible to see how a total ban by the APA could filter into child custody contexts and used by parents to challenge the custody allocations of parent who may be using spanking as a form of discipline. It is recommended that the drafters amend the first *Be it resolved Statement*. For example, the drafters may consider the following:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the American Psychological Association recognizes that ~~the overwhelming scientific evidence demonstrates on~~ the negative effects of physical discipline of

children by caregivers and thereby ~~opposes~~ recommends that caregivers use of alternative forms of discipline that are associated with more positive outcomes in children.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this cross-cutting item.

6. P&P Response to Joint Membership Agreement

Ronald Rozensky, PhD; Armand Cerbone, PhD; Bruce Overmier, PhD; and Kenneth Sher, PhD provided P&P with an update on the joint 501(c)3/501(c)6 organization membership agreement that was approved by Council at the March 2018 Council meeting. During future meetings, P&P would like to discuss how to make all APA members feel like they are stakeholders in the c6 transformation process.

7. 2018 P&P Business Retreat Meeting

P&P discussed the change in the number of in-person meetings each year. The group discussed the importance of the in-person meetings and the future of the fall consolidated and summer retreat meeting. P&P agreed to include data collection on the efficacy of in-person meetings vs. virtual meetings in the 5 year review of governance groups in 2019. P&P discussed possible dates for the reinstated 2018 Fall Consolidated Meetings (boards only) and agreed it could meet October 12-14 or October 19-21.

8. APA Council Policy Manual – Standards and Guidelines

Lucia Gutierrez, MSc, PhD, outgoing staff liaison to P&P, provided an update on the Council Policy Manual and the Standards and Guidelines webpage redesigns.

9. Association Rule 70-1.3 Assessment of Governance Bodies and Programs – Consistency for Self-Studies

P&P was asked to consider establishing criteria and an evaluation template that could be used in an evaluation of continuing and ad hoc groups, pursuant to Association Rule 70-1.3. P&P began the discussion of criteria and agreed to dedicate its next several virtual meetings to revising and finalizing an evaluation form. P&P will use this form to conduct a self-assessment for its 2018 Annual Report (see item 10). Once the form is complete, P&P will share it with boards in an effort to be as transparent as possible.

10. The Role of the Policy and Planning Board

P&P was asked to consider 3 topics as part of its discussion of the role of the Policy and Planning Board: a) Annual Report Publication Process; b) 2018 Annual Report – Organization of Self-Study; and c) Preparation for Upcoming Review of APA Bylaws and Association Rules.

a) Annual Report Publication Process

Alicia Aebersold, CCO, was scheduled to come by the meeting to discuss options for online dissemination of P&P Annual Reports. She had to reschedule due to conflicts. Staff will follow up and find another time to meet.

b) 2018 Annual Report – Organization of Self-Study

P&P discussed the process for creation of its 2018 Annual Report. P&P began to work on the timeline for the report and agreed to dedicate the next several virtual meetings to drafting,

revising and finalizing the questions for the evaluation of governance groups. P&P will then use that evaluation to conduct its own self-assessment. The self-assessment will be complete in time for the August 2018 breakfast meeting at Convention and will be shared with other boards before their meetings in October. Deirdre Knapp, PhD, offered to take the lead on drafting and revising questions for the evaluation.

c) Preparation for Upcoming Review of APA Bylaws and Association Rules

Deanne Ottaviano, JD, APA General Counsel, attending the meeting to discuss P&P's role in the upcoming review of APA Bylaws and Association Rules. After discussion, P&P agreed to hold on this item until the October 2018 meeting when more progress has been made with the Office of General Counsel's planning for bylaws revisions.

11. Formation of P&P Slates for 2019-2021 Terms

P&P created three slates of candidates and alternates for slates focused on Legal, Professional/Credentialing, and Education/Mid-career to fill the three vacancies caused by the normal rotation of the board. Staff will contact the candidates to see if they are willing to have their names placed on a slate for election to P&P. The resulting slates will be forwarded to the Elections office. Dr. Rozensky recused himself from the discussions as he is asked to be slated; Dr. Sher chaired this section of the meeting.

12. 2018 Convention Activities

P&P discussed its activities at the 2018 APA Convention in San Francisco, CA. P&P has scheduled a business meeting for Thursday, August 9 from 7:00-8:50 AM. P&P will use this time to finish the 2018 Annual Report, a self-study of the board. At the request of P&P, staff will see if the meeting time can be moved to one hour later.

13. Council New Business Item #35B/Aug 2017

P&P was asked to review the Ethics Committee recommendation on NBI #35B/Aug 2017. Nadine Kaslow, PhD, recused herself from the discussion. P&P sent an initial response to the Ethics Committee in November 2017. P&P discussed their initial response and whether the opinion of the group remains the same. P&P believes that it is against the current Ethics Code to bar psychologists from specific sites rather than barring specific behaviors. After discussion, P&P agreed to send the following response to the Ethics Committee:

The Policy and Planning Board's role is to recognize and to comment on policy implications of proposed resolutions. As such it is designated as a referral group on this item.

P&P recognizes that abuses do and have occurred and always occur in settings. P&P further understands that international bodies can and have judged certain military sites as illegal. Hence, P&P understands why there is concern when military psychologists are stationed in sites ruled illegal.

At the same time P&P understands that the present Ethics Code is directed toward the behavior only of psychologists.

Consequently, P&P believes that this NBI addresses the policy implications of barring psychologists from settings rather than the behavior of psychologists in those settings that will engender further consideration by CoR.

14. Request for Nomination for Presidential C3-C6 Workgroup

P&P was asked to provide recommendations for two individuals to nominate to the Presidential C3-C6 Workgroup. P&P nominated Deirdre Knapp, PhD and Ronald Rozensky, PhD.

15. Council Process Issues

P&P discussed two issues that arose during the March 2018 Council of Representatives meeting:

1. Require that any items with changes to the Association Rules not be permitted to be included on the consent agenda. Any items with changes to the Rules should be open for discussion during open session. P&P feels that items on the consent agenda are typically less scrutinized and anything with changes to the Association Rules should be thoroughly reviewed by Council.
2. Rather than introduce an item by reading its content only, the presiding officer will call on the mover of the item present a brief introduction to the item before debate. When a motion is presented to Council for debate it should be introduced in context by the mover or their representative. If the mover of the item or their representative is not present to give a brief introduction, then the presiding officer will provide that introduction in addition to reading the content of the item.

Council Leadership Team (CLT) Chair, Joe Coyne, PhD, and Treasurer Jean Carter, PhD, were present for the discussion and agreed that these are important issues. Drs. Carter and Coyne will ensure these items are considered by CLT at an upcoming meeting.

16. NASCC Request for Information on Board Composition

The Needs Assessment, Slating and Campaigns Committee (NASCC) asked boards and committees to provide information on their own assessment of need with regard to the Board of Directors representation regarding member's characteristics, including personal or professional diversity. After discussion, P&P agreed to submit the following:

The APA Policy and Planning Board (P&P) is appreciative of the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on what the board considers its own assessment of need regarding the Board of Directors (BoD) representation. P&P is aware that NASCC aims to maintain a Board balanced across areas of the discipline, diversity broadly defined and special skills or competencies relevant to current issues. Following is P&P's summary of the board's preferences for BoD member's characteristics.

Characteristics for Members-at-large on the Board of Directors:

1. A key professional characteristic must be "experience". The BoD must have members with experience in successfully leading complex organizations. This would include directors of large, multi-personnel practices; it would also include, but not be limited to, leaders in academic departments, health care organizations, government and the military, and research laboratories, etc.

2. While we tend to focus on including Early Career Psychologists and graduate students in Board leadership, "senior" psychologists bring an overview of the field and interpersonal maturity to support vision and problem solving.
3. The BoD must have a balance of basic and applied scientists, academics, teachers, and practitioners. Independent practice and institutional practice are considered two different types.
4. While other types of diversity (e.g., age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, career stage, and geography) should certainly be considered, these categories should be undertaken in conjunction with vocational/expertise considerations.
5. The BoD must have individuals with expertise relevant to contemporary issues confronting the organization. Currently, these issues may include, for example, health care and challenges regarding diversity and marginalized groups.
6. Knowledge of the functions of the APA and APA Practice Organization (APAPO) as 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(6) organizations, respectively.
7. Experience with understanding the funding process in professional education, science, and research.

Meeting with Arthur Evans, PhD

Following the board chair meeting with Dr. Evans, APA CEO, Dr. Evans agreed to meet with P&P about the strategic plan process and the evaluation of governance groups.

Strategic Plan

Dr. Evans provided P&P with an overview of the strategic planning process. He agreed that it is important that boards and committees are kept updated and have the opportunity to provide feedback throughout the process. He indicated that a website will be created to provide regular updates to the membership.

P&P provided Dr. Evans with feedback from the last strategic plan, including:

1. Boards and committees felt left out of the process
2. Many constituents didn't identify with the end result because they couldn't see themselves in it. P&P feels that is one of the reasons why the current strategic plan is ineffectual.
3. Need to be more inclusive in soliciting feedback.

Governance Evaluation

P&P provided Dr. Evans with an overview of the plan for evaluating governance groups. Dr. Evans suggested that P&P should focus on what makes sense to do before the new strategic plan is complete.