



Commission on Accreditation Update March 2013

Elizabeth A. Klonoff, Ph.D.
Chair

Carl Paternite, Ph.D.
Associate Chair, Program Review

Linda K. Knauss, Ph.D.
Associate Chair, Quality Assurance

CoA Policy Meeting Report

CoA Policy Meeting Actions

The [Commission on Accreditation](#) (CoA) held its annual policy meeting February 28-March 3 in Washington, DC. This meeting was preceded by an orientation day for new members on February 27. A "calibration" exercise designed to ensure consistency of decisions across reviewers was conducted for the second year in a row. As is typical of the annual policy meeting, no programs were reviewed. Instead, the CoA tackled a number of important policy issues that will be relevant in the upcoming year.

Implementing Regulations

- Following 90 days of public comment the CoA approved revised versions of Implementing Regulations (IRs) [C-22](#) and [C-23](#) related to diversity recruitment/retention and education/training, respectively. The updated versions of these policies are now in effect.
- The CoA approved minor revisions to IR [C-20](#) that clarify the data required by programs to post on public websites by October 1, 2013.
- The CoA had a preliminary discussion about the possibility of requiring internships and postdoctoral programs to provide annually updated disclosure information, similar to what doctoral programs are required to do according to IR C-20. In this context, the CoA has solicited input from APAGS regarding the kinds of information that would be useful to students as they consider potential internships and postdoctoral programs.

New Statuses: Eligible and Accredited, on Contingency

The revised *Accreditation Operating Procedures* (AOP) that allow for an "eligible" status and accredited "accredited, on contingency" status became effective on January 1, 2013. The CoA drafted an application for "eligible" status consisting of essential elements from Domains A-D. Applicants for "accredited, on contingency" will use the existing self-study instructions, except for the data requirements contained in Domain F. All forms will be available on the accreditation webpage by mid-April 2013.

The Roadmap: Revising the G&P *A Structure for New Accreditation Standards*

The CoA continues to accept public comment on the second phase of questions for revising the G&P through June 1. To better inform the revision process, selected guests were in attendance to assist the Commission's work in reviewing structures of other accreditation standards as a guide for drafting a potential structure for the APA Commission on Accreditation. It is hoped that the developing framework will offer a mechanism for organizing the responses from public comment as the CoA begins preliminary work on standards at its July meeting. (See page 2, column 2 for further information on *The Roadmap: Phase II Questions Public Comment*).

Important Accreditation Dates 2013

April 4-7	Spring Program Review Meeting
May 13	Annual Report Online (ARO) opens
June 1	Deadlines for public comment on the G&P Roadmap: Phase II Questions and public disclosure
July 17-21	Summer Program Review and Policy Meeting
October 17-20	Fall Program Review Meeting

OTHER CoA NEWS

Virtual Townhall Meetings

As a means for providing additional outreach to the public and constituent groups, the CoA will host 6 virtual townhall meetings in May (2 per each level of accreditation). Sessions are tentatively scheduled for the following dates and times:

Doctoral: May 6 (2 pm ET); May 15 (11 am ET)

Internship: May 8 (4 pm ET); May 10 (4 pm ET)

Postdoctoral: May 6 (4 pm ET); May 16 (1 pm ET)

Further information on registration for these sessions will be included in the April *CoA Update* and will also be posted on the CoA website.

Reminder: All policy and procedure documents including the G&P, AOP, and IRs are available on the front page of the [OPCA Web site](#) (under 'Criteria and Procedures'). IRs are organized by section to improve users' ability to navigate through them.

CoA Welcomes 12 New Members

The CoA welcomed twelve new members during the Policy meeting and recognizes their dedication to quality assurance in psychology education and training.

- **Asuncion Austria, PhD**
- **Rachel Becker, MA**
- **Randall Cox, PhD**
- **Clark Campbell, PhD**
- **William Hathaway, PhD**
- **Carlen Henington, PhD**
- **Barry Hong, PhD**
- **David Mather, PhD**
- **MaryJan Murphy, PhD**
- **Steve McCutcheon, PhD**
- **Emil Rodolfa, PhD**
- **Leonard Tamura, PhD**

Council for Higher Education (CHEA) Recognition

Following a review of eligibility and recognition, including an observation visit, the Council for Higher Education (CHEA) board of directors accepted its Committee on Recognition's recommendation to continue the APA CoA's recognition for another ten-year period. In its decision letter, CHEA asked the CoA to address an issue related to CHEA Recognition Standard 12B(5) regarding public disclosure of program review information. (See *Public Comment*, page 2, column 2).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Disclosure of Accreditation Decisions

In response to guidance from CHEA, the CoA considered options for enhancing the content of information provided to the public regarding decisions on accreditation status. Currently, the CoA reports accredited status and year of next site visit on its website and describes the guidelines for 3, 5, and 7 year decisions in its Notice of Actions published 30 days following each program review meeting. Although the CoA was granted continued recognition, CHEA reiterated an interpretation of its standards that insists on specific information regarding the basis for accreditation decisions. As a result, the CoA has crafted three proposed options for public comment; a fourth is open-ended to allow for additional suggested options from the public. Any changes to public disclosure will necessitate public comment, review by the APA Board of Educational Affairs, and approval by the APA Board of Directors of revisions to [Section 8 of the Accreditation Operating Procedures](#). **The public comment period is scheduled to begin on April 1 and continue through June 1, 2013.**

The Roadmap: Phase II Questions

At the fall 2012 meeting, the CoA reviewed more than 400 pages of comments received from the public on the first phase of questions for the review and revision of the *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation* (G&P). Each of the CoA's policy groups (doctoral, internship, and postdoctoral) analyzed the comments and drafted follow-up questions that are now available for public comment. During the first quarter of 2013, CoA members have met with a number of its communities of interest at scheduled meetings during this second phase of review. **The public comment period on the Phase II Questions is scheduled to continue through June 1, 2013.** (See pages 4-8 for the Phase II Questions).

To download the policy proposals, the Roadmap questions, view comments received, or register to post comments, visit the Accreditation Public Comment website at <http://apaoutside.apa.org/AccredSurvey/public/>.

Comments may be submitted as an individual or as part of a group. Please contact the OPCA at 202-336-5979 with any questions or issues regarding the public comment system.

REMINDERS FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Program Review Decision Outcomes

Consistent with AOP [4.5](#), programs under review will be sent written notification of the review outcome **30 days** following the final day of the program review meeting. All meetings end on Sunday, and authorized representatives of reviewed programs may contact the office after 12 noon ET on the following Tuesday to obtain the final decision. *NOTE:* OPCA will only be able to provide the **year** of the program's next site visit (for accredited programs) over the telephone. Programs are randomly assigned to a review cycle the year prior to their site visit and will be notified of the due date for their self-study at that time.

Site Visitor Nominations

Nominate members of your faculty to serve as a CoA site visitor. One strength of specialized accreditation is that it is indeed a [peer review](#) process requiring the professional knowledge of experts in the profession and discipline. Given the diversity of training models and program goals, it is vital that CoA has a robust cadre of site visitors to provide effective and appropriate observations. Recruitment is ongoing for new site visitors and several training workshops will be offered on the day prior to the start of APA Convention in Hawaii. Also, Current site visitors that have not attended a workshop within the past 3 years are urged to attend a workshop to learn about recent policy and procedural changes to the review process. Please review the [FAQ on Becoming an APA Site Visitor](#) on the OPCA website or [email](#) OPCA for more information.

Notify the CoA of Program Director Changes

Please remember to notify the OPCA in writing (by [e-mail](#) is fine) if there is a change in the program's training director, and provide the contact information (including the e-mail address) for that individual. If the new director was not previously involved with the program, his/her CV should also be provided for Office records. This is consistent with IR [C-19](#), which requires programs to notify CoA in advance of any substantive changes. This will also ensure that the correct individual(s) for the program is listed in our database and receives all of CoA's correspondence.

2014 CoA Self-Study

Programs scheduled for periodic review in 2014 are required to use the [2014 CoA Self-Study Instructions and Tables](#). The Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation (OPCA) encourages program directors to attend one of the CoA's self-study [workshops](#) (as early in the self-study process as possible) and/or contact OPCA at 202-336-5979 for consultation on completing the self-study.

2013 Annual Report Online (ARO)

The 2013 Annual Report Online (ARO) will be open starting Monday May 13, 2013. In addition to adding new records and updating existing ones for the 2012-2013 academic/training year, OPCA Research staff will be asking all accredited programs to review and, if necessary, correct any historical student/trainee or faculty/supervisor record data in their Archives section during this 2013 ARO open window only. The new CoA Portal platform introduced last year will allow for pre-population of self-study tables using ARO data elements once the online self-study is available. It is in programs' best interests to take advantage of this opportunity to ensure historical ARO data records are correct. Further information will be forthcoming, and data preparation forms will be available online approximately April 1, 2013. In the meantime, please contact the OPCA Research office with questions at (202) 336-6016 (or email aro@apa.org).

Phase II Questions: Public Comment November 29, 2012-June 1, 2013

There are two kinds of questions to which we are seeking input. The first set of questions pertains to both doctoral- and internship-level training. The second group of questions focuses on training at the postdoctoral level. The public comment system is organized by each of the numbered questions within the two question groups. You are welcome to provide comments on as many or as few sections as you choose; but please ensure that your responses are specific to the relevant question.

The public comment period began on November 29, 2012, and will continue through June 1, 2013 and may be accessed at the following URL:

<http://apaoutside.apa.org/AccredSurvey/Public/>

In an effort to promote thoughtful discussion, the CoA is providing an electronic-based comment form for public comment submission. Comments and other information, including the users' identity, will be public. Email addresses used for registration will be kept confidential. The CoA will consider all comments received in moving forward with the Roadmap. On behalf of the CoA, thank you for your review and comments. Please contact the APA Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation with any questions or concerns. Address: 750 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20002-4242; Phone: (202) 336-5979; Email: apaaccred@apa.org; Web: <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation>

Questions for Doctoral and Internship Training

Accreditation Framework - Competencies and Program Characteristics

1. There have been many comments in favor of moving CoA accreditation at the doctoral and internship levels toward a uniform, profession-based competency-based assessment. What are the pros and cons of this? If CoA moves to a uniform-professional based competency-based assessment, how might this be implemented? Should CoA identify relevant competencies? Should CoA use previously-identified competencies in the profession (e.g., Benchmark Competencies, NCSPP, etc.)? Are there other competencies that are not fully addressed in existing documents (e.g., research and science) and if so, how should CoA identify and incorporate these into the G&P?
2. What kind of proximal and distal outcome data should CoA require to evaluate whether a training program is successfully training students/interns to be competent?
3. Should clinical, counseling, or school programs be evaluated using the same or different accreditation standards? For purposes of accreditation, does type of training model matter (e.g., scientist-practitioner, practitioner-scholar, or clinical scientist)? Should programs be evaluated for accreditation on their own program goals, objectives, and competencies; on a set of uniform –profession based competencies; or both?

Curriculum

4. Should specialization (e.g., neuropsychology, health) be permitted prior to the post-doctoral level (i.e., at doctoral and/or internship)? What are the pros/cons of such a model? How might this be operationalized given the importance of broad and general training?
5. Several comments have called for increased interdisciplinary training in professional psychology. How and when should interdisciplinary training and collaboration occur? Should it be a required part of doctoral training? internship? What implications does this have for the acceptable qualifications of faculty and internship program contributors (i.e., instructors, practicum supervisors, internship primary/supplemental supervisors, research mentors)?

Sequence of Training

6. Should there be a minimum expectation for entry criteria to an accredited doctoral program? What should that expectation be (e.g., undergraduate coursework, minimum GPA, minimum GRE scores)? How would minimum admissions criteria impact underrepresented/non-traditional applicants? What plans should programs implement to handle exceptions to the criteria?
7. What outcomes should be expected to demonstrate the effectiveness of a program's admissions criteria (e.g., retention, time to completion, internship match rate, job placement, licensure rates)? At what point should CoA identify admissions criteria as problematic?
8. What are the pros and cons of requiring either the dissertation proposal, data collection, or defense prior to application for internship?
9. Should programs be required to send students to accredited internships? If not, how should programs assure quality of internship experience?
10. When should the internship experience occur (pre/post conferral of the degree)? What are the potential consequences of pre versus post?

Diversity

11. How should CoA assess attention to diversity issues at each level of training?
12. Should CoA continue to include a domain specific to diversity issues? Should diversity issues be infused throughout the standards?

13. What should CoA's expectations be for recruitment and retention strategies for diverse students, faculty and staff?

Structural Issues and Resources

14. How does the G&P need to take into account new organizational structures of doctoral and internship programs (e.g., multiple sites, centrally controlled consortia, in-house internships)? What should be the common elements for a program that is located across multiple sites to insure that it is one cohesive program?
15. In doctoral programs, what faculty qualifications should be required to contribute to required program training (e.g., in coursework, practicum supervision, research supervision)? How should faculty qualifications be evaluated?
16. What elements of doctoral and internship training must be in-person vs. other formats? What proportion of online (or other not-in-person) learning is acceptable?
17. Can in-person training be delivered via telehealth, telesupervision, or course videoconferencing? In other words, must individuals always be in the same physical room or are other options acceptable as in-person? Is there a maximum acceptable percentage of training that can be delivered via these technologies? Are there certain elements or placements within the sequence of training where these technologies would be appropriate and other elements or placements in the sequence of training where these technologies would not be appropriate?
18. Should the revised standards establish a maximum number of cumulative hours a doctoral intern can be expected to work per week? Should the revised standards establish enforceable criteria for a livable salary/stipend for interns and benefits? What might those criteria be for each of these?
19. Should the revised standards establish clear criteria defining what constitutes an on-site supervisor? Given that some programs have multiple sites, what are the implications of this for the notion of "on-site" supervisors? What percentage of time does a supervisor need to be in a particular setting to be considered integral to the setting?

Other

20. Are there additional concerns you have about the G and P revision that have not been addressed by the questions above?

Questions for Postdoctoral Training

1. Beyond accreditation of recognized specialties as defined by CoA – should there be other postdoctoral accreditation in other areas?
 - a. If so, what areas?
 - b. What is the role of accreditation at the postdoctoral level for the broad areas covered in doctoral and internship training (i.e.. clinical, counseling, and school psychology)?
 - c. How should CoA address areas of emphasis within broad (as opposed to specialty) postdoctoral programs that are not at the level of a specialty such as a proficiency? (e.g...PTSD, Substance Abuse, etc.)
2. Given the differences between the nature of doctoral training (doctoral and internship), to what extent should CoA conduct the review of postdoctoral residency programs for accreditation?
 - a. How would this impact the nature of the self-study?
 - b. How would this impact the role of site visitors?
 - c. How would this have implications for accreditation decisions?
3. Currently, doctoral and internship training involve preparation for *entry-level* practice, and postdoctoral training involves preparation for *advanced* practice. Please comment on whether this is an appropriate distinction, and if not how postdoctoral training in preparation for practice should be distinguished from doctoral and internship training.
4. What are the most appropriate ways for CoA to collaborate with the various specialty synarchies to ensure currency of postdoctoral standards as well as the specialty review standards?
5. What is the most appropriate way for CoA to collaborate with state licensing boards and ASPPB regarding postdoctoral requirements?
6. How should clinical service delivery/experience be defined at the postdoctoral level of accreditation?
 - a. How much of this can be conducted using standardized patients?
 - b. How much telesupervision and/or telehealth interventions can be included?
 - c. What level of experiential training vs. research-focus is appropriate for the accreditation of a postdoctoral residency program?

7. What areas beyond clinical service delivery should be included as postdoctoral level competencies? How prescriptive should the standards be for these areas that add value to postdoc training?
 - a. Teaching (with a broad definition)?
 - b. Advocacy?
 - c. Interprofessional competence?
 - d. Leadership?
 - e. Consultation?
8. What training areas or competencies can be assumed to be in place at the completion of doctoral and internship training, such that those areas/competencies no longer need to be addressed at the postdoctoral level?
9. Should entrance to a level of training of knowledge and clinical competency be linked to performance on a national examination? Should there be a standard way of measuring benchmark competencies prior to entry to a postdoctoral residency?
 - a. Is this limited to the postdoctoral level or is this something that should be reviewed for entrance to the profession at other levels?
10. What is the role of diversity training at the postdoctoral level? Are there conceptual differences in how this should be approached in terms of the level of training or in terms of the specialty area(s)?
11. How should the qualifications/credentials of training directors and supervisors be assessed by CoA in a residency program? How should sufficiency of faculty be defined?
12. What is the appropriate amount, level, focus, and type of supervision provided to the postdoctoral resident? Should there be common requirements across specialties regarding supervision provided to residents?
13. What role should formal didactics play at the postdoctoral level? How is this different or similar to other levels of training?
14. What outcome measures are appropriate at the postdoctoral level as evidence of quality education and training?
15. How can the CoA better structure the review and accreditation of multiple specialty programs at a single institution?
16. What other standards or areas should CoA address in the revised G&P for postdoctoral residencies?

CURRENT PROGRAM COUNTS
(as of January 2, 2013)

		<u>Accredited Programs</u>		<u>Applicant Programs Under Review</u>	
		PhD	PsyD	PhD	PsyD
Doctoral Programs	<i>Clinical</i>	173	62	3	4
	<i>Counseling</i>	65	4	0	1
	<i>School</i>	57	6	2	0
	<i>Combined</i>	5	3	1	0
	Total Doctoral	375		11	
Internship Programs	Total Internship	475		28	
Postdoctoral Residency Programs	<i>Traditional – Clinical</i>	42		16	
	<i>Specialty – Clinical Neuropsychology</i>	19		2	
	<i>Specialty – Clinical Health Psychology</i>	7		1	
	<i>Specialty – Clinical Child Psychology</i>	7		2	
	<i>Specialty – Rehabilitation Psychology</i>	3		2	
	<i>Specialty – Forensic Psychology</i>	1		0	
	Total Postdoctoral	79		23	
TOTAL		929		61	

Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation (OPCA)

American Psychological Association

750 First Street NE

Washington, DC 20002

Phone: (202) 336-5979 Fax: (202) 336-5978

E-mail (General): APAAccred@apa.org E-mail (ARO): ARO@apa.org

Web: <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation>