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Necessary Common Knowledge

- Background on the CoA Implementing Regulation IR C-16 on Broad and General education
- Summary of our approach to broad and general education, which I’ve named the “Necessary Common Knowledge Approach”
- Listing of the open issues and dilemmas in this area
Implementing Regulation IR C-16

Issues about CoA process

• All members were not evaluating broad and general in the same way.

• Inter-rater reliability.
Issues about Courses

- Programs were sometimes submitting applied courses for the basic aspects courses (e.g., cognitive therapy for cognitive, group for social)

- Programs were putting forward overly narrow courses for the basic aspect courses (e.g., biological basis of gerontology)

Issues, continued

- Were the courses graduate level?

- Were the faculty appropriately qualified?

- Had programs been appropriately told what the CoA was looking for?
I am convinced that there is *Necessary Common Knowledge* that professional psychologists must have to do their job, even if we have to debate what that might be.

Both law and medicine have such requirements.

- **Law**
  - Evidence, contracts, constitutional law, etc.

- **Medicine**
  - Anatomy, psychopharmacology, etc.
• We could spend the rest of this time talking about necessary knowledge. My list includes:
  ▪ Memory
  ▪ Emotion
  ▪ Neurobiology
  ▪ Diversity
  ▪ Social psychology
  ▪ Social principles
  ▪ Learning, and more

• If we value training evidence-based practitioners, don’t they ALL need to know the evidence about emotion, about memory, and about other substantive areas of science that underlie practice?

• How can this be done within the Chinese menu approach?
Open Issues & Unresolved Dilemmas

• 1. What do professional psychologists need to know?

• 2. What knowledge do all professional psychologists need to have in common?

• 3. How deep does that knowledge need to be?

Open Issues & Unresolved Dilemmas

• 4. Is broad and general most important for basic science and statistics but less important for professional areas and individual differences? (For example, should programs be able to be predominantly psychoanalytic or predominantly cognitive?)
Open Issues & Unresolved Dilemmas

5. What is the difference between a program having an “emphasis” or being overly narrow?

6. How do we take into consideration the quality of the courses, not just the syllabi?

Open Issues & Unresolved Dilemmas

7. What other areas should be required?
   - Organizations?
   - The world of work?
   - Epistemology?
   - Anthropology?
   - Sociology?
   - Economics?
   - Systems?
   - Humanities?