Oregon
John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners
3218 Pringle Road SE, Ste. 130
Salem, Oregon 97302-6309
(503) 378-4154
FAX (503) 378-4404
www.oregon.gov/obpe

Meeting Notice

Education Committee

April 3, 2013

3218 Pringle Road SE
Salem, OR 97302
Or by Conference Call:
1-800-504-8071
Code: 3784154

9:00 A.M. Executive Session

The Education Committee will convene in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f) for the purpose of considering information or records exempt from public inspection. Executive Sessions are closed to the public.

No final actions or final decisions will be made in Executive Session. Pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute 192.660(4), members of the news media will be allowed to remain in the room, but will be directed not to report on or disclose the specific information discussed during the Executive Session.

9:30 A.M. Public Session

1) Application Files

   Vote to approve education.

2) Policy Issue: Foreign Degrees

   Letter from student- doctoral program in Australia.

3) Policy Issue: EPPP Score for Psychologist Associate Applicants

   Letter from applicant.

4) Review of CE Requirements

   Review letters submitted; current OARs, & ASPPB Guidelines (6/12 publication).

ADJOURN

*** This is the current rule for clinical psychology educational requirements for graduates of foreign programs*

858-010-0010

Education Requirements — Clinical Psychology

To meet the education requirement of ORS 675.030(1), applicants for licensure must:

...

(2) Possess a doctoral degree in psychology from:

...

(c) A foreign program evaluated to be equivalent to American Psychological Association accreditation as of the date the degree was awarded. Evaluation must be completed by a credentialing body recognized by the Board. Submission of proof of foreign degree equivalency and cost of the foreign degree equivalency determination are the responsibility of the applicant.

(3) An applicant who possesses a degree under section (2) must show that his or her doctoral program in psychology meets all of the following requirements:

(a) A minimum of three academic years of full-time graduate study.

(b) A minimum of one continuous year in residence at the institution from which the degree is granted.

(A) One continuous year means two consecutive semesters or three consecutive quarters.

(B) In residence means physical presence, in person, at an educational institution or training facility in a manner that facilitates acculturation into the profession, the full participation and integration of the individual in the educational and training experience, and includes faculty and student interaction.

(C) The doctoral program may include distance education, but a minimum of one continuous year of the program shall be in-residence. Programs that use physical presence, including face-to-face contact for durations of less than one continuous year, (e.g., multiple long weekends and/or summer intensive sessions) or that use video teleconferencing or other electronic means as a substitute for physical presence at the institution in order to meet the residency requirement are deemed not to be acceptable for licensure.

(D) Training models that rely exclusively on physical presence for periods of less than one continuous year (e.g., multiple long weekends and/or summer intensive sessions) or that use video teleconferencing or other electronic means as a substitute for physical presence at the institution do not meet the in residence requirement.

(c) The program, wherever it may be administratively housed, must be clearly identified and labeled as a program in psychology. Such a program must specify in pertinent institutional catalogues and brochures its intent to educate and train professional psychologists.

(d) The psychology program must stand as a recognizable, coherent organizational entity within the institution.

(e) There must be a clear authority and primary responsibility for the core and specialty areas, whether or not the program cuts across administrative lines.

(f) The program must be an integrated, organized sequence of study.

(g) There must be an identifiable psychology faculty sufficient in size and breadth to carry out its responsibilities and a psychologist responsible for the program.

(h) The program must have an identifiable body of students who are matriculated in that program for a degree.

(i) The program must include a coordinated, sequential and supervised practicum appropriate to the practice of psychology as described in OAR 858-010-0012.

(j) The program must include a coordinated, sequential and supervised internship, field or laboratory training appropriate to the practice of psychology as described in OAR 858-010-0013.

(k) The curriculum of the program must:

(A) Encompass a minimum of three academic years of full time graduate study, including a minimum of one continuous year in residence at the educational institution granting the doctoral degree;

(B) Require an original dissertation or equivalent that was psychological in nature that meets the requirement for an approved doctoral program; and

(C) Include at least 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours of credit in graded (not “pass-no pass”) courses.

(l) The core program shall include a minimum of three graduate semester hours or 4.5 or more graduate quarter hours (when an academic term is other than a semester, credit hours will be evaluated on the basis of 15 hours of classroom instruction per semester hour) in each of the following substantive content areas:

(A) Scientific and professional ethics and standards;

(B) Research design and methodology;

(C) Statistics;

(D) Psychometric theory;

(E) Biological bases of behavior such as physiological psychology, comparative psychology, neuropsychology, sensation and perception, physical ergonomics, or psychopharmacology;

(F) Cognitive-affective bases of behavior such as learning, thinking, motivation, emotion, memory, cognitive information processing, or social cognition;

(G) Social bases of behavior such as social psychology, group processes, organizational and systems theory; and

(H) Individual differences in behavior such as personality theory, human development, personnel psychology or abnormal psychology.

(m) All professional education programs in psychology must include course requirements in developed practice areas/specialties.

(n) The program must demonstrate that it provides training relevant to the development of competence to practice in a diverse and multicultural society.

(o) Demonstration of competence in clinical psychology shall be met by a minimum of 18 semester hours or 27 quarter hours in the following areas: personality and intellectual assessment, diagnosis, therapeutic intervention, and evaluating the efficacy of intervention.

(p) If the doctoral program does not meet the core and/or clinical coursework requirements of (l) and (o), the applicant for licensure may remedy a deficiency of up to 6 semester hours or 9 quarter hours by completing graduate level coursework in the deficient content area(s) at a regionally accredited institution.

(4) Provide syllabi or other documentation regarding course content upon the Board’s request.

21 February 2013

To the Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners:

I am writing to you at the recommendation of LaReé Felton, with whom I have been in contact and recently met when in Salem on the 11th of February 2013.

It is my intention to apply for licensure in Oregon at the completion of the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) Forensic degree, as I intend to relocate to Oregon in 2014 for family reasons.

At the end of this year, I will have completed the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC) seven-year sequence of study in Psychology. Alternate to the APA-CoA, which accredits doctoral graduate programs only, an APAC accredited sequence of study includes both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

LaReé Felton has reviewed my educational record in psychology and determined that essentially the core/clinical psychology content areas outlined in the OBPE standards are adequately included in the sequence of study I have undertaken. However, three core program areas, (namely Cognitive-Affective Basis of Behaviour, Social Basis of Behaviour and Individual Differences in Behaviour) were studied prior to the Psy.D. These areas of study were undertaken at The University of Melbourne. This university is ranked number one in Australia and number 28 in the world.

On this basis (which is only a matter of program structure), I would be precluded from licensure in Oregon, despite being able to demonstrate competence in all required core/clinical program areas.

In addition to this, the Australian 'practical placement' (i.e., practicum/internship components) totals 1500 hours. I have requested permission from my university to undertake an additional 300 hours of placement in order to meet the OBPE requirements of 300 hours of practicum and 1500 hours of internship. However, the university has stated this poses an insurance issue and the request is under advisement, although may not be possible.

The following may be of further relevance:

1. I am a psychologist with provisional registration with the Psychology Board of Australia and at the completion of the Psy.D. will be eligible for general registration.

2. I have been offered a paid position providing psychological services as a result of my work while completing the internship.

3. My specific interest is working with a forensic population, particularly at risk young people. I have recently had an article accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal on the topic of offending behaviour during the transition to adulthood. Additionally, I have enquired about undertaking a residency at the Oregon Youth Authority as a clinical psychologist.

4. I have been accepted as a member of the Oregon Psychological Association.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the above matters. As it stands, I would be precluded from practicing in Oregon, as would any other applicant from Australia, simply due to technicalities in the structure of the Australian accredited sequence of study, rather than content. I would greatly appreciate an exercise of your discretion in recognising my competency to practice.

Yours sincerely,

Adelle (Poppy) Edwards

RULES FOR ACCREDITATION AND ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FOR PSYCHOLOGY COURSES

Australian Psychology Accreditation Council

APAC

JUNE 2010

Version 10

Rules for Accreditation & Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses

PREFACE

The Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC) was formed in 2003 and its primary purpose is to set national standards for the education and training of psychologists and to accredit programs which meet those standards. In December 2008, under arrangements set down in the *Health Practitioner Regulation (Administrative Arrangements) National Law Act 2008*, the Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council assigned to APAC the accreditation functions for the psychology profession for the triennium commencing in July 2010.

Only education and training which is accredited by APAC will be recognized by psychologist registration boards as suitable training for the purposes of registration, and by the Australian Psychological Society as suitable for meeting its membership requirements.

APAC assesses psychology education and training programs offered by higher education providers on application. APAC also works cooperatively with higher education providers to assist and advise regarding the design of education programs for which they are seeking to achieve accreditation. APAC publishes accreditation standards and rules, primarily the *Rules for Accreditation and Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses* (this document).

This edition of the *Rules for Accreditation and Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses* (version 10) came into force in June 2010 and replaces the August 2009 version. More information about APAC Rules and Standards and about the process of applying for accreditation can be obtained by contacting the APAC Secretariat at the following address:

APAC Secretariat

PO Box 38, Flinders Lane, VIC 8009 Australia

Phone +61 3 8662 6625 Fax +61 3 9663 6177

Email: apac@psychology.org.au

Website: http://www.apac.psychology.org.au

OVERVIEW OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

APAC's Purpose

The Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC) is the national professional accrediting authority for psychology education and training programs in Australia. In December 2008, under arrangements set down in the *Health Practitioner Regulation (Administrative Arrangements) National Law Act 2008*, the Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council assigned to the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC) the accreditation functions for the psychology profession for the triennium commencing in July 2010. APAC's objects are:

(a) provide a collaborative, coordinating body to develop standards of education and training for psychologists throughout Australia and internationally;

(b) develop standards and implement the process of accreditation for the education and training of psychologists for the purpose of registration;

(c) assess overseas qualifications;

(d) develop, review and manage the framework within which national accreditation operates;

(e) maintain a register of accredited courses, training and internships and other services related to the accreditation of programs of education and training;

(f) ensure that the accreditation process:

  (i) is rigorous

  (ii) is open to external scrutiny;

  (iii) is conducted in a consultative and consensus-building fashion;

  (iv) is collegial, transparent and fair;

  (v) balances academic priorities with those of regulating authorities and the profession; and

  (vi) complies with government policy;

(g) provide an internal merits and process review of decisions made by the Company in relation to the accreditation of education courses and institutions;

(h) provide advice to Australian governments and statutory authorities about the training and practical requirements which need to be met by overseas persons to become registered psychologists in Australia;

(i) develop and review the standards for the accreditation of psychologist training and internships; and

(j) consult and liaise with other relevant bodies.

Accreditation as a Quality Assurance Mechanism

External accreditation is an important mechanism for ensuring the quality of graduates of psychology education and training programs, and for safeguarding the interests of:

- consumers of psychological services;
- psychology students and trainees;
- employers;
- government including registration authorities;
- the wider community and

- the discipline and profession

(International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education Policy Statement, 2004).

Accreditation is instrumental in preventing the educational standards of any psychology education and training program from falling below acceptable standards, ensuring that graduates are suitable for registration and for the workforce, and hence providing a measure of protection for consumers of psychological services.

Accreditation assessment is also a valuable tool for promoting a culture of quality improvement in institutions where psychologists are educated and trained, since regular external reviews provide a periodic stimulus to undertake a systematic process of self-examination and self-directed improvement (Australian Medical Council, 2002). Additionally, the accreditation process promotes an emphasis on key issues such as the selection of suitable trainees, communication and other professional skills, the fostering of professional attributes, and the development of a philosophy of lifelong learning.

For these reasons the accreditation of psychology training programs, based on a process of regular review by an independent external agency, has been chosen as the preferred means of providing quality assurance of the undergraduate and postgraduate phases of education and training in psychology.

Assessment Teams

APAC appoints an assessment team to assess both the School of Psychology itself (hereafter referred to as the "academic organisational unit" or AOU) as well as each of those courses offered by the AOU for which an accreditation application has been made or which already hold a grade of APAC accreditation. Assessment teams work within the APAC *Rules for Accreditation and Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses* (this document).

APAC assessment teams are responsible for:

- assessing the AOU and its courses against the APAC *Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses*;
- conducting a program of meetings and interviews during site visits appropriate to the institution's structure, size, range of activities, and its mix of education and training programs;
- validating the information provided by the institution and other stakeholders in support of its application for accreditation, through a program of interviews, site visits and investigations; and
- preparing a report which reflects a rigorous assessment of the AOU and its courses against the Accreditation Standards and identifies strengths, problems and areas for improvement.

More detailed information about the operation of assessment teams can be found in the APAC *Accreditation Assessment Handbook*, in particular Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, which is available for download from the APAC website.

APAC Secretariat

APAC conducts the assessment of psychology AOUs and their courses using the process described in the *APAC Accreditation Assessment Handbook* and according to the *APAC Rules for Accreditation and Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses* (this document). The APAC Secretariat implements the accreditation process, managing the accreditation work program; implementing APAC policy and procedures; supporting accreditation working parties and teams; and advising AOUs and other stakeholder groups on accreditation policy and procedures.

Institutions undergoing accreditation assessment should correspond with the APAC Secretariat and not directly with the assessment team members (except during the site visit). It is also important to be aware that although Secretariat staff will provide as much assistance and advice as possible on the assessment process, institutions are solely responsible for their preparation for accreditation and the APAC Board is responsible for all determinations regarding accreditation status.

APAC's Assessment Principles

In the course of conducting its assessments, APAC seeks to:

(a) gather and analyse detailed information and ideas from multiple sources and viewpoints, ensuring rigorous analysis;

(b) use clear guidelines and procedures, and implement them in an open, transparent, objective and fair manner;

(c) adopt mechanisms to ensure that members of assessment teams, committees and staff apply standards and procedures in a consistent, collaborative and appropriate fashion; and

(d) review its codes, processes and guidelines on a regular basis, and in so doing ensure wide consultation with stakeholders.

APAC considers accreditation as a collegial process based on self- and peer-assessment for the purpose of publicly and openly assuring adequate standards of education and training of psychologists and the constant improvement of quality in psychologist training. The APAC accreditation process is intended to be constructive and to respect the expertise and academic autonomy of institutions which provide education and training in psychology.

In its accreditation functions, APAC:

(a) focuses on the achievement and maintenance of high educational and training standards, as well as the assurance of competence among practitioners graduating from APAC accredited courses;

(b) following accreditation of a program, monitors the implementation of recommendations and other developments in the program; and

(c) undertakes a cycle of assessments with a full assessment of each program at least once every five years.

Appointment and Training of Assessors

APAC maintains a database of suitably qualified and skilled assessors which is regularly updated. APAC assessors are appointed for a term of three years and, as a condition of their appointment, are required to attain certification as an APAC assessor by attendance at, and successful completion of, an APAC accreditation assessor training course followed by orientation to the process of assessment, usually by accompanying an experienced and senior team leader on a number of assessments. APAC assessors and staff are expected to make decisions responsibly, and at all times to apply standards in a consistent and impartial fashion.

Potential Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality Provisions

APAC requires proposed members of assessment teams to declare any relevant personal or professional interest that may be perceived to conflict with their duties as an assessor. To this end, all assessors must sign an Assessor Declaration Form (available on the APAC website) containing a conflict of interest declaration at the outset of appointment to an assessment team and procedures are in place to deal with potential or perceived conflicts of interest (see the *APAC Accreditation Assessment Handbook* and the *Rules* set out in this document). APAC requires assessors, administrators and members of APAC to keep accreditation information confidential and to use such information only in conjunction with the APAC assessment process and only for the purpose for which it was obtained. There can, however be exceptions to the confidentiality of information, such as

where assessors come into the possession of information suggesting unethical behaviour or of circumstances which represent a danger to others (eg negligent supervision practices). In these cases the APAC Board will be notified swiftly and may make a decision to pass the relevant material over to an appropriate authority (eg a registration board, the police or an ethics committee) for investigation.

Timeliness

Accreditation is a time consuming and expensive process. Educational Institutions and APAC itself invest substantial time and money in the process, and the outcomes can have serious implications for the viability of courses, completion of studies by students, staffing, professional registration of graduates and eligibility for membership of professional bodies. For these reasons it is very important that accreditation processes occur in a timely fashion. Assessors, administrators, and members of APAC are conscious of their responsibility to meet the deadlines which have been built into the accreditation process so as to ensure that the needs of all parties are as far as possible met by the process within a reasonable time frame. Despite this, however, such a rigorous and multifaceted process cannot be rushed and by virtue of its many interconnected elements does take time. APAC strives to conduct the process as efficiently as possible and to meet agreed deadlines without compromising the quality of its work.

Types of Assessments

APAC essentially undertakes course accreditation assessments in the following five circumstances:

- an application is received for the accreditation of a new AOU and its courses;
- an application is received for the accreditation of a new course or courses at an AOU already offering an APAC accredited course or courses;
- an application is received to re-accredit an existing AOU and its accredited courses at the conclusion of its five year accreditation cycle;
- an AOU advises of its intentions to make changes to aspects of its functioning (or changes to its courses) which could reasonably be expected to have an impact on its ability to continue to meet the APAC Standards;
- complaints are received by APAC or other credible information comes into APAC's possession which suggests that an accredited AOU and/or its psychology courses may no longer meet the APAC Accreditation Standards.

In cases where APAC imposes conditions on the accreditation or reaccreditation of an AOU or its courses, APAC also conducts more limited follow-up assessments to track the Institution's progress in meeting or maintaining those conditions.

Overview of the Assessment Process

The timing of accreditation assessments is arranged in consultation with the Head of the AOU. Normal five-year cycle visits are usually required to fit into an annual timetable set down by APAC (which is set out in this document). Review and audit assessments can be made by APAC at any time and where this occurs APAC provides advance notice of the assessment and any required site visit to the AOU. The length of a site visit varies depending on the nature of the visit, the size of the AOU, the number of courses, the location and number of campuses to be visited. Normal cycle assessment site visits are usually three to four days in duration, but may take longer if additional time is required to ensure that the assessment team is able to properly assess the AOU and to consult with it regarding the assessment process.

APAC only assesses programs for which an application for accreditation has been made. The application requires submission of information about a range of aspects of the program(s) and this information is checked and collated by the APAC Secretariat before being provided to an assessment team for examination. This review constitutes the first phase of the assessment process and is

intended to ensure that the members of the assessment team are well prepared for the next phase of the assessment process, a site visit. The composition of the assessment team is explained in detail in the Rules (see Section 2.11) and full account of potential conflicts of interest is taken in making the appointments, with team members rarely assessing in the same state or territory in which they reside and work. In the case of an application from an overseas Institution, a representative of the relevant local licensing/registration authority will also be invited to attend the site visit along with the team, as an observer. The Team Leader will always be an experienced APAC-certified assessor and is responsible for the on-site conduct of the visit, including the preparation and presentation of the team's assessment report.

The assessment team's visit is coordinated by the Secretariat in consultation with the office of the AOU. The program for the visit is pre-arranged with the AOU by the APAC Secretariat and must meet certain requirements (see the application materials), however the assessment team may request any reasonable variation or addition to the program needed to properly make its assessment.

The assessment team can request to inspect any and all physical resources, including teaching and research laboratories, computer-assisted learning facilities, libraries, community and on-campus clinics, and any other teaching or practice settings in use or proposed, as it deems necessary to properly make its assessment.

The assessment team can request to consult any members of the institution's staff, students and supervisors which it deems necessary in order to carry out its assessment including the Vice-Chancellor/President/Head and other senior officers of the Institution, and representatives of any government department or service, regional health authority, or other relevant body external to the Institution. The assessment team may choose to interview supervisors, employers, registration board members or other relevant people external to the Institution which it sees fit in the course of its assessment, before, during or after the site visit.

Maximum opportunities for interactive discussion with the senior staff and with the students of the AOU are provided during the visit and the program is structured to allow on-site changes if necessary, including additional time to allow further consultation with key individuals and groups if required.

The Assessment Report and Checklist

At the conclusion of the site visit, the first draft of a formal report is prepared by the assessment team, with the team leader responsible for coordinating the writing and for ensuring its timely delivery. The report includes: matters of fact regarding the structure, function and nature of the AOU and its courses; relevant details of the assessment activities undertaken by the assessment team; the assessment team's recommendations for accreditation and the grounds on which they are based. The report reflects the collective judgment of the assessment team members regarding the extent to which the AOU and its courses meet the APAC *Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses*, perceived strengths and weaknesses, problem areas requiring attention, and distinctive aspects to be encouraged. The AOU's Head of School or nominee (and where appropriate, other senior officers of the Institution such as the Dean or Vice Chancellor or nominee) are usually provided with a short briefing at the conclusion of the visit outlining the team's preliminary views and likely recommendations. A first draft of the report is normally provided to the Head of the AOU before the team leaves the site and the report is simultaneously forwarded to the APAC Secretariat by the team leader.

Within two weeks of receiving the draft report, the Head of the AOU is required to submit a rejoinder containing comments on the factual accuracy of the report and on the recommendations, conclusions or judgments contained in it. Having considered the rejoinder, the assessment team make any final changes to the report usually within three weeks of the rejoinder deadline.

Final assessment team reports received from team leaders are carefully scrutinised and APAC may choose to modify, call for changes to, or reject any report. APAC may also choose to conduct additional enquiries and/or assessments should it deem necessary before the APAC Board makes a determination of accreditation status. APAC can choose to reject recommendations of the Program Development and Accreditation Committee (the working committee providing assessment services),

call for more assessment or seek out any other advice or evidence as it deems necessary to make a determination. Only APAC can make a determination of accreditation status.

Reporting of APAC Accreditation Determinations

Following an APAC accreditation determination, the assessment outcomes and a summary of the assessment report are made public on the APAC website at: http://www.apac.psychology.org.au and notification of the outcome is sent to:

(a) the Head of the AOU and other appropriate senior officer(s) of the Institution;

(b) the psychologist Registration Board; and

(c) the APS (for advising the APS Board, and relevant APS Colleges).

STATUS OF RULES AND STANDARDS

A. These rules and standards are made by the Board for the conduct of the accreditation process, pursuant to and subject to the provisions of the Constitution.

B. The Rules govern the accreditation process and the Standards set out the minimum requirements for accreditation. Applicants for accreditation are required to follow the Rules and demonstrate that they meet the Standards in order to gain accreditation.

C. The Board has the power to make, amend or revoke these Rules and Standards.

D. A copy of these Rules and Standards as amended from time to time, will be available through the APAC website or upon request from the Secretariat of APAC.

RULES FOR ACCREDITATION

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 DEFINITIONS 11
SECTION 2 APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION 13
2.1 General ... 13
2.2 Failure to apply for assessment for accreditation ... 13
2.3 APS College Course Approval ... 13
2.4 Accreditation Process ... 14
2.5 Applications for accreditation of proposed new courses in psychology ... 15
2.6 Applications for reaccreditation prior to expiry of Accreditation Period ... 16
2.7 Discontinued programs ... 16
2.8 Combined applications ... 16
2.9 Application Forms ... 16
2.10 Fees and costs ... 17
2.11 Composition of an Assessment Team ... 17
2.12 Site visits ... 18
2.13 Timing of accreditation process ... 19
2.14 Exceptional circumstances extension of Accreditation Period ... 19
SECTION 3 TIMELINE FOR ACCREDITATION 19
3.1 Time for making application ... 19
3.2 Late provision of information ... 19
3.3 Tables ... 19
SECTION 4 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS 22
4.1 Importance of Standards ... 22
SECTION 5 ACCREDITATION STATUS 22
5.1 Accreditation of AOU and its courses ... 22
5.2 Accreditation Status ... 23
5.3 Publication of accreditation status ... 24
5.4 Change in accreditation status ... 25
5.5 Impact on students of change in accreditation status ... 25
5.6 Changes to AOUs or courses during the Accreditation Period ... 25
SECTION 6 NEW COURSE DEVELOPMENT 26
6.1 Pre-accreditation course development ... 26
6.2 Requests for assistance in course development ... 26
6.3 Costs of course development assistance ... 26
SECTION 7 MONITORING COMPLIANCE 26
7.1 Annual reporting ... 26
7.2 Auditing compliance with the Accreditation Standards ... 26
7.3 Complaints ... 27
7.4 Costs of an audit ... 27
SECTION 8 APPEALS 27
8.1 General ... 27
8.2 Entitlement to Appeal ... 27
8.3 Lodging a notice of appeal ... 27
8.4 Appointment of an Appeals Committee ... 28
8.5 Conduct of appeals process ... 28
8.6 Site visits in the appeal process ... 28
8.7 Decision of the Appeals Committee ... 29

8.8 Costs of the appeal process 29
8.9 Timetable of the appeals process 29

RULES FOR ACCREDITATION

SECTION 1 DEFINITIONS

Academic Organisational Unit (AOU) means a department or school, or other separately identifiable academic organisational unit of an Institution providing tertiary education and responsible for the psychology programs therein.

Academic staff means all teaching staff in a course/s of psychology and includes continuing, contract and casual teaching staff.

Accreditation Period means the period of time for which an AOU or course in psychology is accredited by APAC as meeting all the *Accreditation Standards*. The Accreditation Period is usually five (5) years commencing on 1 January of the year following the accreditation process and ending on 31 December four years later.

Accreditation Withdrawn means the removal or revoking of the status of Full Accreditation or Conditional Accreditation from an AOU or any of its courses.

APA format means the rules for the publication of manuscripts described in the current Edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA).

APAC means the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council Limited.

APAC website means the web pages accessed through http://www.apac.psychology.org.au/.

Applicant means the Institution making an application for assessment for accreditation of an AOU and/or its course/s in psychology.

Application Fee means all of the monies required to be paid to APAC in consideration of any APAC accreditation assessment as published by APAC from time to time.

Application Form means the appropriate application form published by APAC from time to time.

APS means The Australian Psychological Society Limited.

APS College means the constituent units within the Australian Psychological Society that are concerned with specialist areas of practice in psychology.

APS College (Course) Approval means professional course approval, given by the APS, to those professional courses that meet the APS College Course Approval Guidelines for the respective College/s.

APS College Course Approval Guidelines means the guidelines developed by each APS College Course Approval Committee for the specification of education and training requirements for membership of the College.

Assessment Team means the person or people appointed by APAC in accordance with clause 2.11 of these Rules to assess the Applicant's AOU and courses for accreditation.

Board means the Board of Directors of APAC.

Conditional Accreditation means that the accreditation of an AOU or one or more of its courses has conditions attached, such conditions relating specifically to the AOU itself or to one or more of its courses.

Constitution means the Constitution of APAC.

Core topics means content areas that all students must take in the course of studying for their degree. Core topics are taught in core units which are the compulsory parts of a course.

Course means a series of Units or other program of study, formally approved by an Institution, the successful completion of which results in the award of a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate as defined in Schedule 1 of the Higher Education Support Act 2003.

CPRB means the Council of Psychologists Registration Boards (Australasia) Incorporated Limited, a representative body of Registration Boards from Australia and New Zealand.

Dual Approval means course approval given by two APS Colleges to a specific professional course that meets the APS College Approval Guidelines for each of those Colleges.

Electives means units or subjects which are optional and while students are not required to take any specific elective, they may be required to take a certain number of electives chosen from a greater number in order to complete their course.

Extended Period has the meaning set out in clause 2.14 of the Rules.

Full Accreditation means that an AOU or a course has been assessed as satisfying all Accreditation Standards.

Head means Head of the psychology AOU.

Institution means a University, Australian company, other incorporated body, unincorporated body or Institution established in Australia and registered with and accredited by the relevant state or territory government or federal authorities, offering a course of study leading to a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate and as defined in the Higher Education Support Act 2003, and including overseas Institutions.

Offshore means not physically located in Australian territory.

Overseas Institution means a tertiary academic Institution recognised by one or more of 'The World of Learning' published by Europa Publications Ltd, the Australian Education International's 'Country Education Profile', or Local Regional Accreditation bodies, offering a course of tertiary study leading to a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate equivalent to those defined in the Authority for Learning outcomes of the Australian Qualifications Framework 2002.

PDAC means the Program Development and Accreditation Committee of the Australian Psychological Society Limited. This Committee provides, on contract to APAC, certain expert accreditation assessment and course development advice and services, making accreditation recommendations to the Board of Directors of APAC and recommendations regarding College course approval of specialist postgraduate courses to the Board of Directors of the APS.

Registration Board(s) means any applicable psychologist registration board established pursuant to legislation for the purpose of registering psychologists.

Principal supervisor means the identified main supervisor who is responsible for the work of a student and the majority of his/her supervision.

Program means all of the requirements, formally approved by the Institution, the successful completion of which results in the award of a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate.

Rules means these rules for accreditation of psychology AOUs and courses as prescribed by APAC and amended from time to time.

Sequence means a recognised set of units of study in psychology and the rules governing their completion including the order in which they must be undertaken.

Site Visit Agenda means the schedule of activities during the site visit as approved by the APAC Secretariat for the purposes of accreditation assessment.

Society means The Australian Psychological Society Limited.

Standards means these standards for accreditation of psychology AOUs and courses as prescribed by APAC and amended from time to time.

Unit means a separate and identifiable component of an undergraduate or postgraduate course, usually with its own assessment components and with a member of the Academic staff responsible for coordination, as defined in Schedule 1 of the Higher Education Support Act 2003.

Year in the context of course descriptions, for example "a four year course" means full time study and is taken to involve two semesters or three terms/trimesters of work. Thus a four year course will involve eight semesters of full-time study. In addition, when reference is made to a specific year level, for example third year, this should be read as the third full-time year of study in the course.

SECTION 2 APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

2.1 General

(a) APAC will not be held responsible for any Application Forms or other information not received.

(b) The onus is on the Applicant to demonstrate how its AOU and courses in psychology meet the Standards and how it will continue to meet those Standards during the Accreditation Period.

(c) It is expected that there will be only one accredited AOU in each Institution which has responsibility for all psychology courses offered by that Institution.

(d) Where two or more institutions propose to offer courses in cooperation with each other and intend to establish joint ownership, badging of, and/or responsibility for those courses, it is a requirement that one institution only makes the accreditation application and is responsible for entering into an accreditation contract with APAC. That institution must have an AOU which meets the accreditation standards in order for the proposed jointly branded courses to be accredited.

(e) The accreditation process considers each of the AOU and the courses in psychology offered by that AOU. It is possible that an AOU may be accredited, without all of its courses in psychology gaining accreditation.

(f) In order for an AOU to obtain Full Accreditation, it must meet all of the Standards that apply to AOUs, and the courses in psychology offered by that AOU being assessed for accreditation must meet all of the relevant Standards for those courses.

(g) The Standards may be amended from time to time to reflect changes in government and community expectations of the education standards for psychologists.

(h) In conducting an assessment for accreditation, APAC will have regard to:

  (i) written material provided via the Application Form;

  (ii) a report of observations made by an Assessment Team during a site visit to the AOU of the Applicant;

  (iii) the Applicant's response to any matters that have been raised by the Assessment Team; and

  (iv) any other relevant information or material.

2.2 Failure to apply for assessment for accreditation

(a) An Institution must apply for assessment for accreditation of its AOU and courses in psychology. If no application is received by APAC, no assessment will be made.

(b) The accreditation of an AOU or its courses will not be extended beyond the Accreditation Period as a result of the failure of an Institution to make a timely application for assessment for accreditation.

(c) If an AOU fails to make an application for assessment for accreditation within the first 12 months of commencing any new unaccredited course, then the students who graduated from that sequence of study will be deemed to have graduated from a course that was not accredited for the purposes of their sequence of study. For example, if the AOU offers a three year undergraduate sequence and fails to apply for accreditation before students enrolled in that sequence conclude their first year of study, any assessment for accreditation of that sequence will not be of benefit to those students.

2.3 APS College Course Approval

(a) If an AOU seeks APS College Course Approval of the postgraduate courses in psychology offered by it, the postgraduate courses in psychology must meet the relevant APS Postgraduate Course Approval Guidelines.

(b) Applicants should contact the Society to obtain information about APS College Course Approval Guidelines and assessments.

(c) Assessment for APS College Course Approval is conducted by the APS at the same time as assessment for accreditation as a matter of convenience only, and is otherwise outside the jurisdiction of APAC.

2.4 Accreditation Process

(a) An application for assessment for accreditation or for reaccreditation must be initiated by the submission of a fully completed APAC Application Form to be received by the APAC Secretariat no later than 31 March in any year in which an assessment is to take place.

(b) For Institutions with current accreditation, APAC may write to that Institution in the year immediately preceding the final year of that Institution's Accreditation Period:

(i) reminding it that an Application Form and all required documentation should be submitted to APAC by 31 March of the following year;

(ii) seeking confirmation that the Institution will be making an application for assessment for accreditation;

(iii) requesting information regarding the details of undergraduate and postgraduate courses to be assessed; and

(iv) asking for the nomination of specific dates (usually from June to August) during which a site visit may be conducted.

(c) Upon receipt of an Application Form, the Application Form will be reviewed to assess whether all required documentation has been adequately provided.

(i) If an Application Form is assessed as including all required information to an adequate level, the Applicant will be sent an acknowledgement of receipt.

(ii) If an Application Form is assessed as deficient in any way, the Applicant will receive a request for any missing documentation or additional information. The Applicant should submit missing documentation or additional information in the form requested within two (2) weeks of receiving the request.

(d) Before 31 March of each year a site visit calendar will be prepared for all Institutions which have applied for assessment for accreditation and Assessment Teams will be nominated to assess each application and conduct the site visits.

(e) Applicants will be notified of the dates of their site visit and the proposed members of the Assessment Team conducting their site visit no later than four (4) weeks prior to the commencement of the site visit. Any changes to the membership of the Assessment Team will be notified to the Applicant as soon as practicable.

(f) Upon receipt of confirmation of the dates for their site visit, Applicants should prepare a proposed Site Visit Agenda providing the Assessment Team with sufficient time to conduct all required assessments as set out in Rule 2.12. An example of a Site Visit Agenda is set out in Appendix 1 of these Standards.

(g) At the conclusion of the site visit, the Assessment Team or nominee will meet with the Head of the AOU to discuss the outcome of the visit and any particular concerns that members of the Assessment Team may have.

(h) On the final day of the site visit, the first draft of a formal report is prepared by the Assessment Team. The purpose of this report is to communicate:

(i) matters of fact regarding the structure, function and nature of the AOU and its courses relevant to the APAC Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses;

(ii) relevant details of the activities undertaken by the Assessment Team in the course of making its assessment.

(iii) the Assessment Team's draft recommendations for accreditation and the grounds on which they are based;

(iv) the College assessors' recommendations for APS course approval and the grounds on which they are based;

(i) The first draft of the report will be forwarded to the Head of the AOU and to the APAC Secretariat by the Assessment Team. The Head of the AOU will have two (2) weeks within which to submit a rejoinder containing:

  (i) Comments on the factual accuracy of the report

  (ii) Comments on the recommendations, conclusions or judgements contained in the report

(j) The recommendations and opinions contained within the draft report are those of the Assessment Team, not APAC. The contents of the report are subject to change following review by PDAC and APAC.

(k) If no rejoinder is received from the Head of the AOU within the specified time frame, it will be assumed that there are no errors of fact within the report and that the applicant has no comments to make on the conclusions and/or recommendations contained within.

(l) PDAC will review the report of the Assessment Team and make recommendations to APAC based upon its review of the report and any further comments provided by the Applicant. PDAC will make recommendations about the accreditation status of the AOU and its courses, as well as any specific recommendations for action to be taken by the AOU.

(m) APAC will make a determination as to the accreditation status of the AOU and its courses based on the information and recommendations that it has received from PDAC prior to 15 November in the year of assessment.

(n) The Chair of APAC will notify Applicants of the outcome of their assessment no later than 30 December in the year of assessment. The possible outcomes of an assessment are set out in Section 5.

(o) Any matters which are stated as requiring further action as part of a recommendation for Full Accreditation or Conditional Accreditation will be monitored to determine whether those matters are addressed within the specified time frames.

(p) Any Applicant not satisfied with the assessment may appeal the assessment in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.

(q) Assessments of APS College Course Approvals must be appealed through the Society.

Application for accreditation of an AOU

(r) An application for accreditation of a new AOU must demonstrate on the appropriate application form, how the AOU meets the standards contained in Section 2 of the Accreditation Standards

(s) An AOU applying for accreditation may concurrently apply for the accreditation of one or more psychology courses according to the Rules outlined in 2.5 below.

(t) Accreditation of courses offered by a new AOU will not be retrospective and the accreditation will only take effect from the start of the year following accreditation of the AOU.

(u) APAC strongly encourages AOUs to undertake a self-assessment against the APAC Standards 12-18 months before APAC's scheduled assessment, since it is a valuable quality improvement tool. APAC may require AOUs to provide evidence of having completed such a self-assessment.

2.5 Applications for accreditation of proposed new courses in psychology

(a) It is not possible to complete a full accreditation assessment of a course in psychology or an AOU which has no current students enrolled. As a result, applications for assessment of courses in psychology or AOUs which have not previously been accredited should be made within the first 12 months of students being enrolled in and participating in the course.

(b) Applications for accreditation of new courses in psychology should include:

  (i) full details of the course in psychology submitted on the appropriate Application Form;

  (ii) details of any additional staff who have been appointed to teach in the course in psychology when it is introduced, or any proposal to appoint staff to positions in the AOU in which the course will be taught; and

(iii) full current staffing details of the AOU and any changes to courses in psychology since the last site visit.

(c) A fee will be payable for any assessment (including any site visit) required as part of the accreditation of a course in psychology outside an established accreditation cycle.

2.6 Applications for reaccreditation prior to expiry of Accreditation Period

(a) There is no automatic renewal or extension of the Accreditation Period for AOUs or courses in psychology which have previously been accredited.

(b) An Applicant with accredited AOUs and courses in psychology must make an application for assessment for accreditation in accordance with these Rules prior to the expiry of their Accreditation Period.

(c) Failure to make an application for assessment for accreditation prior to expiry of the Accreditation Period may result in the AOU and its courses in psychology being determined as Accreditation Withdrawn.

2.7 Discontinued programs

Where an accredited course is discontinued (no new students are being admitted) and students remain enrolled in the course (ie the course is being "taught out"), an *Application for Accreditation of a Discontinued (Taught-Out) Psychology Program* should be made and included as part of any cycle assessment application (this application is available from the APAC Secretariat). See also Section 5.5 of these Rules.

2.8 Combined applications

(a) Applications for assessment for reaccreditation of already accredited AOUs or courses in psychology and assessment for accreditation of any new courses in psychology may be made on the same Application Form.

(b) In completing a combined application, Applicants must clearly differentiate between the courses in psychology to be reassessed for accreditation, and the courses not previously assessed.

2.9 Application Forms

(a) Applications must be made on the Application Form specified by APAC.

(b) Application Forms are available through the APAC website or by contacting APAC.

(c) The Vice-Chancellor or President of the Applicant must sign the Application Form cover sheet. Applications submitted without the appropriately signed cover sheet will not be accepted.

(d) One original hard copy of the Application Form with original signatures and attachments must be submitted to APAC by 31 March of the year in which the AOU is to be assessed for accreditation.

(e) Applicants must also submit six (6) electronic copies of the complete Application Form and all attachments, each copy on a separate CD-ROM.

(f) Application Forms must not be submitted by email.

(g) It is expected that the Application Form will be prepared by senior Academic staff involved in the teaching of courses in psychology. The Application Form must identify a senior member of the Academic staff as a contact point for the Assessment Team to seek clarification or request additional documentation.

(h) The Application Form and attachments will be provided to each member of the Assessment Team appointed to assess the application.

2.10 Fees and costs

(a) Applicants are required to pay an Application Fee at the time of submitting their Application Forms. APAC will issue a tax invoice for payment of the fee after receipt of notice from the Applicant of the courses and campuses to be assessed.

(b) The Application Fee is set annually by APAC and listed in the APAC Schedule of Fees which can be downloaded from the APAC website.

(c) Applications for assessment for reaccreditation received after 31 March in the year of assessment for accreditation will attract an additional late fee set annually by APAC and included in the APAC Schedule of Fees.

(d) The Application Fee is calculated as outlined in the APAC Schedule of Fees.

(e) The Application Fee is not refundable.

(f) If, after the site visit, it is determined that there has been an under-calculation of the Application Fee, APAC will issue a tax invoice to the Applicant for payment of the balance due.

(g) The costs of all offshore travel, including business class airfares, accommodation, meals, taxi fares and any other expenses associated with an offshore site visit by the Assessment Team are the responsibility of the Applicant.

2.11 Composition of an Assessment Team

(a) APAC will appoint an Assessment Team for each assessment. The composition of the Assessment Team is usually:

(i) Assessment Team Leader – an APAC-certified and experienced assessor whose usual place of employment is not located in the same State or Territory as the AOU to be assessed and who is responsible for coordinating the assessment.

(ii) PDAC Assessor - an APAC-certified assessor whose usual place of employment is not located in the same State or Territory as the AOU to be assessed.

(iii) Registration Board Representative - A representative of the relevant psychologist Registration Board.

(iv) APS College Representatives - A representative of each relevant APS College joins the Assessment Team on the last 1-2 days of the site visit for the purpose of making, on behalf of the APS, a Course Approval assessment of any specialist postgraduate courses against the College's Course Approval Guidelines.

(b) Observers may also be appointed by APAC to Assessment Teams, and are considered to be full members of the Assessment Team.

(c) Before being appointed to an Assessment Team and before commencement of any assessment each proposed team member is required to sign a confidentiality agreement and a declaration of any relevant personal or professional interest which may be perceived to conflict with his/her ability to undertake impartially his/her duties as a member of an Assessment Team.

(d) Where a potential conflict of interest is drawn to the attention of the APAC Secretariat by persons external to the Applicant, the Secretariat will notify the Head of the AOU. Where this is the case, the Head of the AOU has until four (4) weeks before any site visit to communicate to APAC in writing any concerns arising from the perceived conflict and the nature of those concerns. Where a potential conflict of interest is identified by the Applicant, it must be drawn to the attention of the Secretariat in writing without delay.

APAC will assess any claimed or declared potential conflict of interest and may, at its discretion, choose to:

(i) Replace the relevant member of the Assessment Team.

(ii) Postpone an assessment and conduct a secondary site visit if a suitable replacement for the College approval assessor cannot be found prior to the visit.

(iii) Postpone the site visit to which the accreditation assessor is allocated where no suitable replacement can be found prior to the visit.

2.12 Site visits

(a) After consideration of the Application Form and attachments received from an Applicant, the Assessment Team will make a site visit to the Applicant's AOU at the time notified to the AOU prior to the site visit.

(b) The purpose of a site visit includes:

(i) providing the Assessment Team with the opportunity to clarify or seek further information about any issues arising from the Application Form and attachments;

(ii) enabling the Assessment Team to check that all resources, policies and procedures of the AOU meet the required standard for accreditation;

(iii) enabling the Assessment Team to meet and interview staff, students and other relevant persons, and to review teaching methods, materials and student assessments; and

(iv) allowing the Assessment Team to discuss any matters that arise during the site visit and timeframes for addressing those matters.

(c) The composition of the proposed Assessment Team will be communicated in writing to the Head of the AOU at least four (4) weeks prior to the site visit, together with the name and email contact details of APAC's site visit team leader. Any changes to the membership of the Assessment Team will be notified to the Applicant as soon as practicable.

(d) The Head of the AOU will be responsible for coordinating all arrangements for the site visit in consultation with the APAC secretariat and site visit team leader.

(e) Where an Applicant has more than one campus, the Assessment Team will conduct a site visit to each campus at which a sequence to be accredited is being/will be taught.

(f) Site Visit Agendas must be submitted to APAC at least three (3) weeks prior to the date of the site visit so that appropriate advance planning by the Assessment Team can be undertaken.

(i) It is essential that the Site Visit Agenda is approved by the APAC secretariat at least one (1) week prior to the date of commencement of the site visit.

(ii) APAC will be responsible for all site visit travel and accommodation arrangements unless the site visit is to be conducted at an Offshore campus.

(iii) For Offshore campuses, the Applicant will be responsible for the arrangement and payment of all site visit travel arrangements, including business class airfares and accommodation for assessors travelling to those campuses. The Applicant must provide a copy of the confirmed travel itinerary and Site Visit Agenda to APAC no later than twenty-one (21) days prior to the commencement of the site visit.

(g) The duration of a site visit will depend on the number of campuses and the complexity of the courses to be accredited. Members of the Assessment Team should be given ample time to examine all of the resources and courses in psychology to be assessed.

(h) During the site visit the Assessment Team or members of the Assessment Team will:

(i) meet with the Vice-Chancellor, President, or his/her nominee (eg, Deputy Vice-Chancellor or Dean of Faculty);

(ii) meet with academic, administrative, technical and other staff, students and any other relevant persons;

(iii) inspect facilities including teaching venues, computer laboratories, research laboratories, teaching laboratory equipment, the test library, and the main library on each campus at which psychology is taught; and

(iv) consider examples of students' work, in particular, recently completed Honours and coursework Masters and Doctoral theses along with examiners' reports for these theses.

(i) At the conclusion of the site visit, the Assessment Team will meet with the Head of the AOU and other senior officers of the Institution, to discuss the likely outcome of the visit, any particular matters that members of the Assessment Team may wish to raise, and to provide a confidential draft version of the accreditation report. Note that the final report may differ from

the initial draft, which is presented to facilitate correction of errors and the preparation of a rejoinder by the AOU.

2.13 Timing of accreditation process

(a) The accreditation process has been designed to run for the Accreditation Period, such that an AOU and all the courses offered by that AOU are assessed and considered for accreditation in a particular year and as part of one process.

(b) Full Accreditation will be granted for the Accreditation Period, subject to the Institution continuing to comply with the Standards.

(c) If an AOU has made substantial changes to a course or courses and wishes to have these considered for accreditation before the expiry of the Accreditation Period, a new application and an assessment will be necessary and this may include a site visit, at the Applicant's expense.

(d) If courses are introduced during the Accreditation Period at campuses other than those for which accreditation has been granted, a new application and an assessment will be necessary and this may include a site visit, at the Applicant's expense.

(e) Any new courses introduced or courses substantially changed during the Accreditation Period, such that a new application for accreditation is made by an Institution for the purpose of accrediting those courses, will be assessed for the balance of the Accreditation Period and will thereafter be assessed at the same time as the AOU and all other courses offered by the AOU.

2.14 Exceptional circumstances extension of Accreditation Period

(a) In exceptional circumstances and prior to 16 October in the year before the expiry of its Accreditation Period, an AOU may apply to APAC to extend its period of accreditation for no more than twelve (12) months from the date of expiry of its Accreditation Period.

(b) In the event that APAC, at its sole discretion, extends the AOU's Accreditation Period for no more than twelve (12) months (the **Extended Period**), then:

(i) the AOU and all of its accredited courses will hold a status of Conditional Accreditation for the Extended Period; and

(ii) the AOU must make an application for accreditation prior to the end of the Extended Period, failing which the AOU and all of its accredited courses will then hold a status of Accreditation Withdrawn (revoked).

SECTION 3 TIMELINE FOR ACCREDITATION

3.1 Time for making application

Applicants should submit an application for assessment for reaccreditation no later than the year prior to offering a new course, or the year prior to the year in which their Accreditation Period expires. This will permit an assessment to be scheduled for the following year. Applicants should note also Rule 2.5.

3.2 Late provision of information

Please note that the dates set out below are final dates for receipt of information from Applicants or provision of information by APAC in the normal accreditation process. Documents or information received from Applicants after these dates may not be taken into consideration until the commencement of the assessment process in the following year.

3.3 Tables

The following timetables apply to normal accreditation cycles. Where an assessment is conducted outside of a normal cycle the dates listed will be varied at the determination of the Secretariat.

The **Pre-site visit timetable** consists of the administrative process undertaken in order to prepare for an assessment. In the case of an audit or other assessment conducted outside of a normal accreditation cycle, some steps may be deemed unnecessary by the Secretariat.

Timing	Task
September	Notification of Intended Application form is updated on the APAC website. Application for Accreditation from is updated on the APAC website. Cycle AOUs receive letter and email regarding Notification of Intended Application. Non cycle AOUs receive email regarding Notification of Intended Application for out-of-cycle assessments. Assessment windows posted to APAC website
16 October	Deadline for receipt of confirmation of Notification of Intended Application from cycle and non-cycle AOUs.
16 October	Deadline for AOUs to request an extension on their scheduled assessment cycle.
November PDAC meeting	Secretariat assigns institutions to Assessment Teams with regard for potential conflicts of interest and preferred dates of the institution, and notifies the Assessment Teams.
December	Anticipated fees are calculated and invoices prepared dated 2 January of the following year.
January	Correspondence sent to AOUs acknowledging receipt of form and advising of the date that has been selected for the accreditation site visit.
31 January	Deadline for AOUs to request a change in assessment date.
January - February	Assessment schedule is published on the APAC website. Registration Board assessors appointed.
1 March	Correspondence sent advising AOUs of the composition of Assessment Teams.
31 March	Deadline for receipt of applications for assessment, site visit agenda and payment of accreditation fees, including applications for out-of-sequence assessments.
April	Secretariat checks to ensure documentation is complete.
April and May	Assessor training sessions held. Applications for assessment are distributed to assessors. Course applications entered into the accreditation database.
June - August	Site visits are conducted.
August - September	Out-of-sequence site visits are conducted.

The **Site visit timetable** consists of the process undertaken in order to conduct the assessment. Phases one to three will typically be conducted on consecutive days.

Timing	Task
April - May	Assessors receive application documentation.
4 weeks prior	Assessors notify Secretariat of any missing, incomplete or inconsistent data in applications. Secretariat requests additional information from the AOU
3 weeks prior to site visit	Secretariat coordinates site visit agenda, which is to be confirmed by the AOU and all Assessment Team members.
2 weeks prior to site visit	Deadline for AOU to supply additional information to the Secretariat. Secretariat forwards additional information to assessors.
One week prior to site visit	Any requested audio meetings with interviewees are conducted.
Phase 1 on site visit	Assessment of undergraduate courses completed.
Phase 2 on site visit	Assessment of postgraduate courses completed.
Phase 3 on site	Head has until 12pm to supply the Assessment Team with any additional

visit	information. Assessment team writes the report and recommendation sections of the checklist and forwards a copy to the Head and Secretariat before leaving the AOU. All Assessment Team members are to retain a copy of the report. Secretariat forwards a copy to the Registration Board Registrar.
Phase 4 on site visit	Assessment completed of any off-shore programs. Assessment team writes the report including recommendation sections and forwards a copy to the Head and Secretariat before leaving the AOU. All Assessment Team members are to retain a copy of the report.

The **Post-site visit timetable** consists of the process undertaken following the site visit, including the requirements for the AOU to respond to any conditions placed upon either the AOU and/or its courses.

Timing	Task
Week after Phase	Secretariat cross references report with accreditation database to identify any potential anomalies.
2 weeks after site visit	Deadline for Head to submit rejoinder documentation, including errors of fact, to the Secretariat for consideration. Secretariat forwards supplied information to Assessment Team.
3 weeks after site visit	Assessment team to incorporate any intended changes in the report under direction of team leader and submit to Secretariat.
4 weeks after site visit	Report and rejoinder documentation added to PDAC agenda.
October	All assessments for the year should be completed. Reports considered by PDAC. Accreditation recommendations are forwarded to the APAC Board of Directors and course approval recommendations are forwarded to the APS Board of Directors. Any required revisions to be made to the assessment report by the team leader and forwarded to the Secretariat.
November	Recommendations for accreditation considered by APAC Board. Recommendations for postgraduate course approval considered by APS Board.
30 November	Final report and correspondence outlining accepted recommendations sent to the Head of the AOU by the Secretariat. Copies of the final report and correspondence to be sent to the Vice Chancellor or President of the Institution, the Assessment Team, and the Registration Board Registrar.
28 February	First progress report outlining how any conditions have been met due to be submitted to the Secretariat.
March - June	Secretariat to forward report to the Assessment Team. Response from Assessment Team due. Response from Assessment Team considered by PDAC. Recommendation forwarded to APAC for consideration. Correspondence outlining accepted recommendations sent to the Head by the Secretariat. Copies sent to the Vice Chancellor, the Assessment Team, and the relevant Registration Board Registrar. Correspondence outlining accepted approval recommendations sent to the Head by the Secretariat. Copies sent to the Vice Chancellor, the Assessment Team, and the relevant College Chair/Course Approvals Convenor.
1 July	Deadline by which all courses with conditions attached must be listed on the APAC website.
31 August	Second and final progress report outlining how any conditions have been met to be submitted to the Secretariat.

September	Secretariat to forward final report to the Assessment Team. Response from Assessment Team considered by PDAC. Recommendation forwarded to APAC for consideration. Correspondence outlining accepted recommendations sent to the Head by the Secretariat. Copies sent to the Vice Chancellor, the Assessment Team, and the relevant Registration Board registrar. Correspondence outlining accepted approval recommendations sent to the Head by the Secretariat. Copies sent to the Vice Chancellor, the Assessment Team, and the relevant College Chair/Course Approvals Convenor.
31 October	Any AOUs or courses with outstanding conditions to receive a recommendation of Accreditation Failed/Withdrawn.
28 February	Annual Update form to be submitted to the APAC Secretariat.
March	Annual Update forms to be distributed to assessors.
31 March	Flying minute to be sent to APAC recommending conditional accreditation for all AOU's which have failed to submit.
12-18 months prior to the AOU's scheduled assessment	AOUs undertake a self-assessment against the APAC Standards 12-18 months before APAC's scheduled assessment.

SECTION 4 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

4.1 Importance of Standards

(a) The Standards have been developed to ensure that all accredited AOUs offer courses which are of a high quality and meet the needs of consumers, students, the community as a whole, government, the discipline and the profession, while allowing flexibility in content and design.

(b) Applicants for assessment for accreditation must meet all of the Standards before being granted Full Accreditation.

(c) An AOU will be granted accreditation only in respect of its accredited courses.

(d) Failure to meet the relevant Standards for a course may result in an Applicant AOU not being accredited for the purpose of providing that course.

(e) An accredited AOU can offer courses in psychology that are not accredited provided that it clearly informs all students proposing to enrol in those courses that the course(s) do not fall within the AOU's accreditation and either do not meet the Standards or have not been assessed for accreditation.

(f) The Standards take precedence over all APS College Course Approval Guidelines for the purpose of accreditation.

SECTION 5 ACCREDITATION STATUS

5.1 Accreditation of AOU and its courses

(a) Accreditation applies to both the AOU and the courses offered by it.

(b) An AOU and the courses in psychology offered by it are assessed separately, however:

(i) An AOU may obtain an award of Full Accreditation provided that at least one course in psychology offered by it also obtains an award of Full Accreditation.

(ii) If all courses in psychology offered by an AOU are awarded no better than Conditional Accreditation, then the AOU will also be awarded Conditional Accreditation, provided that it meets the Standards.

(iii) If an AOU obtains Conditional Accreditation then no course in psychology offered by that AOU can obtain an accreditation status higher than Conditional Accreditation until the AOU gains Full Accreditation.

5.2 Accreditation Status

(a) An Applicant can obtain the following accreditation status:

(i) Full Accreditation;

(ii) Conditional Accreditation;

(iii) Accreditation Failed; or

(iv) Accreditation Withdrawn.

(b) Full Accreditation will only be awarded if the Applicant's AOU/s and all of the courses for which it has applied for accreditation meet all of the Standards.

(c) An award of Conditional Accreditation may be made if it is determined that:

(i) the Applicant does not meet all of the Standards but does meet most of the Standards and the Standards not currently met by the AOU or its courses are in APAC's view likely to be addressed within 12 months of the date of determination of accreditation status; or

(ii) a previously accredited Applicant makes a change to its courses or resources such that the AOU or its courses no longer meet the Standards and the Standards not currently met by the AOU or its courses are in APAC's view likely to be addressed within 12 months of the date of determination of accreditation status; or

(iii) a course has not previously been accredited in the form in which it is now being proposed and the first students to graduate from that course are yet to graduate; or

(iv) an AOU has not previously been accredited and the first students to graduate from an assessable course of that AOU are yet to graduate; or

(v) an AOU has provided insufficient evidence that satisfaction of all relevant Standards has been maintained; or

(vi) if APAC audits an Institution which has Full Accreditation and finds that the Institution has not maintained the Standards and the Assessment Team that conducts the audit determines that the Standards not currently met by the AOU or its courses are likely to be addressed within 12 months of the date of determination of the audit.

(d) An award of Conditional Accreditation will be accompanied by a detailed list of matters to be addressed and a date, normally within 12 months, by which those matters should be addressed (Conditional period). If all matters are addressed by the prescribed date, then the Conditional Accreditation may be withdrawn and Full Accreditation may be granted. If they are not addressed to APAC's satisfaction within the Conditional period then the AOU or its courses may be determined as having Accreditation Failed status. A course that has not previously been accredited and/or an AOU that has not previously been accredited may be identified with the additional notation "under development".

(e) Accreditation Failed status means that a previously accredited course or AOU loses its accreditation status, or in the case of a new application, does not gain accreditation.

(f) An award of Accreditation Failed will only be made:

(i) if serious concerns arise in regard to the AOU or its courses, which the Institution cannot adequately demonstrate it is able to fully address within a 12 month period; or

(ii) if the AOU modifies accredited courses after a site visit which are in clear violation of the Standards, without prior consultation with APAC.

(g) A determination of Accreditation Failed will be accompanied by a statement of reasons which:

(i) outline the areas of concern to APAC;

(ii) state the time in which any appeal against the determination must be made; and

(iii) may offer additional course development advice.

(h) A determination of Accreditation Withdrawn (revoked) may be made for a previously accredited AOU in which the courses or resources of the AOU have changed such that the AOU or its courses no longer meet the Standards.

A determination of Accreditation Withdrawn will be accompanied by a detailed list of matters to be addressed and a date, normally within 12 months, by which those matters should be addressed. If all matters are addressed to APAC's satisfaction by the prescribed date, then Accreditation Withdrawn status may be removed and Full Accreditation may be granted.
Summary table - grades of accreditation:

Status on website or response to enquiry	Explanations
Full Accreditation	Application for accreditation was made and the course and AOU have been assessed as meeting all of the accreditation standards [Rule 5.2(b)].
Conditional Accreditation	Application for accreditation was made and the course and or AOU failed to meet all of the accreditation standards, but are likely to meet those standards within a period of less than 12 months of the date of assessment, [Rule 5.2(c)(i) and (ii)] or this is a new AOU or a new course for which the first cohort of students is yet to graduate [Rule 5.2(c)(iii) and (iv)]. May also include the reference "under development" [Rule 5.2(d)]. An audit of the AOU or course within the accreditation period has determined that the standards have not been maintained, or there is insufficient evidence to support that the standards have been maintained [Rule 5.2(c)(v) and (vi)].
Accreditation Withdrawn (revoked)	The course was previously accredited but having changed significantly since accreditation no longer meets the Standards [Rule 5.2(h)].
Accreditation Failed	An application for accreditation or re-accreditation was made and the course and or AOU have failed to meet the accreditation standards [Rule 5.2(e)]. The course was assessed as holding a status of Conditional Accreditation and the conditions have not been met within the time limit stipulated.
Accreditation Expired	The course was previously accredited and either: - The accreditation period has come to an end and no application for re-accreditation has been made, or - An application for re-accreditation has been made after the expiry of the accreditation period and the course has not yet been re-assessed.

5.3 Publication of accreditation status

(a) It is the responsibility of an AOU to at all times accurately inform students and the public of the accreditation status of its courses.

(b) APAC will maintain a publicly available list of all APAC-accredited courses and AOUs on the APAC website. The list will state whether a course or AOU holds Full Accreditation, Conditional Accreditation or a status of Accreditation Withdrawn and will be amended to reflect any change in status of courses or AOUs from time to time.

(c) The change in status of an AOU or any of its courses in psychology from Full Accreditation to Conditional Accreditation will be published on the APAC website.

(d) APAC will publish on its website a summary of the outcomes of each assessment conducted.

5.4 Change in accreditation status

(a) An Institution's accreditation status may be changed as a result of:

(i) the closure of the Institution's relevant AOU;

(ii) the withdrawal of a course/s in psychology;

(iii) an accreditation process;

(iv) an audit process; or

(v) compliance or non-compliance with the requirements of conditions of Conditional Accreditation.

(b) An Institution's accreditation status may be changed by APAC as a result of an assessment for accreditation, whether at the commencement of an Accreditation Period or otherwise.

(c) An AOU which has its accreditation status changed may resubmit an application for accreditation at any time.

5.5 Impact on students of change in accreditation status

(a) Students completing a course in psychology with an accreditation status of Full Accreditation or Conditional Accreditation as at the date of their completion of that course will have completed an accredited course.

(b) Where a student completes a course which has an accreditation status of Accreditation Failed, Accreditation Withdrawn or no accreditation status (due to lack of assessment for accreditation either at all or in a timely manner) then that student will not have completed an accredited course.

5.6 Changes to AOUs or courses during the Accreditation Period

(a) Each Institution with an accredited AOU and accredited courses in psychology must consistently monitor the AOU and courses to ensure that the AOU and courses continue at all times to meet the Standards.

(b) Institutions are expected to inform APAC of; changes in its AOUs, new courses introduced, substantive changes to course structure, discontinuation of accredited courses, changes to unit codes and/or names, changes to core and elective unit requirements, changes to course names and to resource levels including staffing (particularly resignations and other ways in which the number of staff decreases or the staffing profile shifts significantly) immediately, and where the changes are planned, no later than one month after the proposed changes are announced.

(c) Major changes to courses or AOU resources may affect the accreditation status of the AOU and, by informing APAC, a cooperative effort can be made to accommodate any short-term difficulties that may arise.

(d) Where an AOU or course holds a status of Conditional Accreditation, reports setting out the progress toward satisfaction of all Standards must be submitted to APAC prior to 28 February and 31 August in the year immediately following Accreditation. Progress reports are mandatory and must detail:

(i) actions that have been taken towards satisfying those Standards which were not satisfied at the time of assessment for Accreditation; and

(ii) how the satisfaction of all other Standards remains met.

(e) Failure to inform APAC of any changes may adversely affect the future accreditation status of a course or an AOU or result in the AOU or one or more of its courses being determined as Accreditation Withdrawn.

SECTION 6 NEW COURSE DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Pre-accreditation course development

(a) APAC views the provision of assistance to Institutions for the development of courses in psychology as an important role, which it undertakes in a cooperative manner. The involvement of APAC at the development stage can greatly assist with the accreditation process.

(b) Any information or advice provided by a team appointed by APAC to participate in a course development process should be regarded as opinion only and will be provided in good faith. The provision of such information or advice does not automatically guarantee that a course in psychology will be accredited in an assessment for accreditation and it remains the responsibility of an AOU to demonstrate how its courses meet the Standards.

6.2 Requests for assistance in course development

(a) Requests for course development advice should be directed in the first instance to the APAC secretariat which will appoint appropriate consultants to participate in the course development process.

(b) All Institutions planning new schools of psychology or courses in psychology may request development assistance from APAC. APAC provides assistance for the development of courses:

(i) in an Institution that is not currently accredited and so does not offer accredited courses; and

(ii) for the development of any new courses in psychology in an accredited AOU.

6.3 Costs of course development assistance

Any costs involved are borne by the Institution directly.

SECTION 7 MONITORING COMPLIANCE

7.1 Annual reporting

(a) Each Institution with an accredited AOU and accredited courses in psychology must submit the APAC Annual Update Form prior to 28 February each year.

(b) Failure to submit the Annual Update Form prior to 28 February may result in a determination of Conditional Accreditation for the AOU and all of its courses.

(c) Where an Institution is scheduled for a full assessment of the AOU and all of its courses that year, the requirement to submit the Annual Update Form will be waived.

7.2 Auditing compliance with the Accreditation Standards

(a) APAC may audit an Institution at any time during the Accreditation Period.

(b) APAC will provide Institutions with twenty-one (21) days written notice of an audit.

(c) Institutions agree to provide APAC with full access to all staff, materials and facilities provided by the Institution for the purpose of APAC conducting an audit, as required and to facilitate access to students, as required.

(d) APAC will determine the extent of its audit of an Institution. An audit process may include any one or more of the following:

(i) A request for confirmation of information provided in the immediately preceding accreditation assessment participated in by the Institution;

(ii) A request for copies of current course documentation for review;

(iii) A request for interview with any one or more members of staff, students, or other stakeholders who might reasonably be expected to contribute information useful to the conduct of the audit; and

(iv) A site visit to any one or more campuses of an Institution, as well as other locations where practica are conducted.

7.3 Complaints

(a) APAC may investigate any complaints about an Institution received by it in regard to the standards of teaching, assessment or resources in psychology, or any other matter referred to in the Standards.

(b) If the Institution complained about has not previously been accredited by APAC, APAC must inform the complainant that it has no power to investigate the complaint. Where APAC encounters evidence suggestive of a breach of the law or conduct which is unethical, APAC will take steps to draw the matter to the attention of the relevant authorities.

7.4 Costs of an audit

If a site visit is conducted as part of an audit process, the Institution being audited shall be liable for the cost of all travel, accommodation, meals and taxi fares of the audit Assessment Team and an itemised invoice for any such costs incurred will be forwarded to the Institution within six (6) weeks of the end of the audit site visit. That invoice will be payable by the Institution within thirty (30) days.

SECTION 8 APPEALS

8.1 General

In this Section, the Applicant or Institution which lodges an appeal is referred to as the Appellant.

8.2 Entitlement to Appeal

(a) An Applicant may appeal a determination of Accreditation Failed or a determination of Accreditation Withdrawn.

(b) A person or entity other than the Applicant or the relevant Institution cannot appeal a determination of APAC.

(c) A determination of Conditional Accreditation cannot be appealed. Any Applicant dissatisfied with a determination of Conditional Accreditation may submit proof of satisfaction of the matters to be addressed at any time after the date of the determination of Conditional Accreditation (and before expiry of the Conditional period), for the purpose of gaining Full Accreditation.

(d) A determination by the APS not to grant APS College Course Approval must be appealed through the Society and cannot be appealed through APAC.

8.3 Lodging a notice of appeal

(a) An Appellant may appeal a determination of Accreditation Failed or Accreditation Withdrawn in respect of the AOU or any of its courses, provided that a notice of appeal:

(i) is made in writing addressed to the Chair of APAC;

(ii) is received by the APAC secretariat no later than thirty (30) days from the date of the determination of Accreditation Failed or Accreditation Withdrawn;

(iii) briefly sets out the areas of determination with which the Appellant takes issue; and

(iv) states whether or not the Appellant requires a site visit to be conducted as part of the appeal process.

(b) A notice of appeal received by APAC more than thirty (30) days after the date of the determination of Accreditation Failed or Accreditation Withdrawn is invalid and will not be considered.

(c) A notice of appeal is not required to be in any specific format, provided that it is in writing and contains the information set out in subparagraph (a).

8.4 Appointment of an Appeals Committee

(a) Upon receipt of a notice of appeal, APAC will form an Appeals Committee made up of not less than four (4) people with prior experience in the accreditation assessment process.

(b) The following persons will not be members of the Appeals Committee:

(i) members of the Assessment Team which assessed the Appellant's application for accreditation Approval;

(ii) members of PDAC at the time the Appellant was assessed for accreditation; and

(iii) members of the Board at the time Appellant was assessed for accreditation.

(c) The Appeals Committee may appoint a chairperson from amongst their number.

8.5 Conduct of appeals process

(a) The Appeals Committee will determine its own processes and procedures for conduct of the appeals process.

(b) The Appeals Committee may inform itself in any way it sees fit, including but not limited to considering any one or more of the following:

(i) the original Application Form;

(ii) the report of the Assessment Team;

(iii) the determination of the APAC Board;

(iv) any further information supplied by the Appellant about the AOU and its courses during any site visit conducted by the Appeals Committee (where relevant); and

(v) any and all further information provided by the Appellant during the appeals process.

(c) In conducting the appeal, the Appeals Committee must determine whether or not the Appellant's AOU and/or courses in psychology meet the Standards.

8.6 Site visits in the appeal process

(a) If the notice of appeal states that the Appellant requires a site visit, the Appeals Committee will appoint a time for a site visit.

(b) If the notice of appeal sets out issues of concern about findings made in respect of the resources of an AOU, the Appeals Committee may, at its discretion, determine that a site visit is appropriate and appoint a time for a site visit.

(c) If the Appeals Committee appoints a time for a site visit, the Appellant shall do all things reasonably necessary to accommodate the site visit at that time. The time for a site visit will only be changed in exceptional circumstances.

(d) The Appeals Committee will notify the Appellant of the time for the site visit no less than fourteen (14) days prior to the date the site visit is to commence.

(e) When notifying the Appellant of a site visit by the Appeals Committee, the Appeals Committee will specify any matters it wishes to address during the visit, which may include:

(i) people to be interviewed;

(ii) resources to be reviewed;

(iii) assessments to be reviewed; and

(iv) any other relevant matter.

(f) The Appellant will have the opportunity during the site visit to present any material relevant to the Standards that it wishes to present in support of its appeal.

8.7 Decision of the Appeals Committee

(a) The decision of the Appeals Committee is final and no further correspondence will be entered into.

(b) A copy of the decision of the Appeals Committee will be provided in writing to the Appellant within fourteen (14) days of the date of the decision.

(c) An Applicant unsuccessful upon appeal may make a new application for assessment for accreditation at any time.

8.8 Costs of the appeal process

(a) There is no fee for lodging a notice of appeal of a determination of Accreditation Failed or a determination of Accreditation Withdrawn.

(b) If a site visit is conducted as part of the appeal process, the Appellant shall be liable for the cost of all travel, accommodation, meals and taxi fares of the Appeals Committee and an itemised invoice for any such costs incurred will be forwarded to the Applicant within six (6) weeks of the end of the site visit. That invoice will be payable by the Appellant within thirty (30) days.

8.9 Timetable of the appeals process

(a) The appeals process should be completed in a timely manner.

(b) APAC will endeavour to ensure that the appeal process is completed within six (6) months of the date of a determination of Accreditation Failed or a determination of Accreditation Withdrawn.

(c) For an appeals process that runs over the December – January holiday period, the dates between 21 December and 9 January shall not be included in any calculation of time.

(d) The following table sets out an example of the anticipated timetable of the appeals process:

zero	Determination of Accreditation Failed
+ 30 days	Lodgement of notice of appeal
+ 45 days	Appointment of Appeals Committee
+ 60 days	Notification of site visit (if any)
+ 75 – 90 days	Site visit conducted
+ 60 – 90 days	Decision of Appeals Committee
+ 90 – 104 days	Notification to Appellant of decision of Appeals Committee

ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Table of Contents

APAC's Purpose 2
Accreditation as a Quality Assurance Mechanism 2
Assessment Teams 3
APAC Secretariat 3
APAC's Assessment Principles 4
Appointment and Training of Assessors 4
Potential Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality Provisions 4
Timeliness 5
SECTION 1 DEFINITIONS 31
SECTION 2 GENERAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS 33
2.1 The Psychology AOU 33
2.2 Multi-Campus Institutions 33
2.3 Degree Nomenclature 34
2.4 Academic Staffing 35
2.5 Resources 37
2.6 Teaching Materials and Methods: Managing the Learning Process 39
SECTION 3 UNDERGRADUATE 3-YEAR SEQUENCE COURSES 40
3.1 Three year courses 40
SECTION 4 UNDERGRADUATE 4TH YEAR AND FOUR YEAR COURSES 43
4.1 Fourth year courses 43
4.2 Four year courses 46
4.3 Four year integrated bridging courses 46
SECTION 5 POSTGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL COURSES 46
5.2 Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology (5th year) 54
5.3 Fifth and Sixth Year Masters Courses of Professional Education 56
5.4 Professional Doctorates 60
5.5 Graduate Certificate or Diploma in Psychology (Area of Specialisation) (GCP) 62
SECTION 6 HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH (HDR) PROGRAMS 63
SECTION 7 APPENDICES 64
Appendix 1 - Example of site visit agenda 64
Appendix 2 - References 66

ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

SECTION 1 DEFINITIONS

Academic Organisational Unit (AOU) means a department or school, or other separately identifiable academic organisational unit of an Institution providing tertiary education and responsible for the psychology programs therein.

Academic staff means all teaching staff in a course/s of psychology and includes continuing, contract and casual teaching staff.

Accreditation Period means the period of time for which an AOU or course in psychology is accredited by APAC as meeting all the *Accreditation Standards*. The Accreditation Period is usually five (5) years commencing on 1 January of the year following the accreditation process and ending on 31 December four years later.

Accreditation Withdrawn means the removal or revoking of the status of Full Accreditation or Conditional Accreditation from an AOU or any of its courses.

APA format means the rules for the publication of manuscripts described in the current Edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA).

APAC means the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council Limited.

APAC website means the web pages accessed through http://www.apac.psychology.org.au/.

Applicant means the Institution making an application for assessment for accreditation of an AOU and/or its course/s in psychology.

Application Form means the appropriate application form published by APAC from time to time.

APS means The Australian Psychological Society Limited.

APS College means the constituent units within the Australian Psychological Society that are concerned with specialist areas of practice in psychology.

APS College (Course) Approval means professional course approval, given by the APS, to those professional courses that meet the APS College Course Approval Guidelines for the respective College/s.

APS College Course Approval Guidelines means the guidelines developed by each APS College Course Approval Committee for the specification of education and training requirements for membership of the College.

Assessment Team means the person or people appointed by APAC in accordance with clause 2.11 of these Rules to assess the Applicant's AOU and courses for accreditation.

Board means the Board of Directors of APAC.

Conditional Accreditation means that the accreditation of an AOU or one or more of its courses has conditions attached, such conditions relating specifically to the AOU itself or to one or more of its courses.

Constitution means the Constitution of APAC.

Core topics means content areas that all students must take in the course of studying for their degree. Core topics are taught in core units which are the compulsory parts of a course.

Course means a series of Units or other program of study, formally approved by an Institution, the successful completion of which results in the award of a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate as defined in Schedule 1 of the Higher Education Support Act 2003.

CPRB means the Council of Psychologists Registration Boards (Australasia) Incorporated Limited, a representative body of Registration Boards from Australia and New Zealand.

Dual Approval means course approval given by two APS Colleges to a specific professional course that meets the APS College Approval Guidelines for each of those Colleges.

Electives means units or subjects which are optional and while students are not required to take any specific elective, they may be required to take a certain number of electives chosen from a greater number in order to complete their course.

Extended Period has the meaning set out in clause 2.14 of the Rules.

Full Accreditation means that an AOU or a course has been assessed as satisfying all Accreditation Standards.

Head means Head of the psychology AOU.

Institution means a University, Australian company, other incorporated body, unincorporated body or Institution established in Australia and registered with and accredited by the relevant state or territory government or federal authorities, offering a course of tertiary study leading to a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate and as defined in the Higher Education Support Act 2003, and including overseas Institutions.

Offshore means not physically located in Australian territory.

Overseas Institution means a tertiary academic Institution recognised by one or more of 'The World of Learning' published by Europa Publications Ltd, the Australian Education International's 'Country Education Profile', or Local Regional Accreditation bodies, offering a course of study leading to a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate equivalent to those defined in the Authority for Learning outcomes of the Australian Qualifications Framework 2002.

PDAC means the Program Development and Accreditation Committee of the Australian Psychological Society Limited. This Committee provides, on contract to APAC, certain expert accreditation assessment and course development advice and services, making accreditation recommendations to the Board of Directors of APAC and recommendations regarding College course approval of specialist postgraduate courses to the Board of Directors of the APS.

Registration Board(s) means any applicable psychologist registration board established pursuant to legislation for the purpose of registering psychologists.

Principal supervisor means the identified main supervisor who is responsible for the work of a student and the majority of his/her supervision.

Program means all of the requirements, formally approved by the Institution, the successful completion of which results in the award of a degree, diploma, advanced diploma or certificate.

Rules means these rules for accreditation of psychology AOUs and courses as prescribed by APAC and amended from time to time.

Sequence means a recognised set of units of study in psychology and the rules governing their completion including the order in which they must be undertaken.

Site Visit Agenda means the schedule of activities during the site visit as approved by the APAC Secretariat for the purposes of accreditation assessment.

Society means The Australian Psychological Society Limited.

Standards means these standards for accreditation of psychology AOUs and courses as prescribed by APAC and amended from time to time.

Unit means a separate and identifiable component of an undergraduate or postgraduate course, usually with its own assessment components and with a member of the Academic staff responsible for coordination, as defined in Schedule 1 of the Higher Education Support Act 2003.

Year in the context of course descriptions, for example "a four year course" means full time study and is taken to involve two semesters or three terms/trimesters of work. Thus a four year course will involve eight semesters of full-time study. In addition, when reference is made to a specific year level, for example third year, this should be read as the third full-time year of study in the course.

SECTION 2 GENERAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

2.1 The Psychology AOU

2.1.1 The Psychology AOU must be an identifiable core of psychologists with a recognised Head.

2.1.2 The Psychology AOU must feature the term 'Psychology' in its title (eg, School of Psychology, School of Psychological Science, Department of Psychology).

2.1.3 The Psychology AOU must demonstrate it possesses a milieu of research and scholarship in which staff are actively involved in conducting and publishing their research work and where their research informs teaching.

2.1.4 A Psychology AOU must demonstrate that it has

(i) the necessary and appropriate level of staffing and other resources and facilities; and

(ii) sufficient academic, financial and administrative control

to ensure provision of a high standard of education and training in psychology in all courses for which it is seeking or has obtained accreditation.

2.1.5 The Head of the Psychology AOU must be a senior, experienced and recognised academic who has postgraduate qualifications in psychology and publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals, who has attained appointment as an academic at level C or higher, or an equivalent rank.

2.1.6 To obtain Full Accreditation, the AOU must have a Full-Time Level E appointment in the discipline of psychology (APAC provides a set of benchmarking criteria for a Level E academic position on its website).

2.1.7 The staff of an AOU must at all times comply with all applicable codes of ethical conduct, including any staff code of conduct which the Institution has in place.

2.1.8 Grades of assessment employed in courses offered by the AOU should conform to the guidelines set down in the *Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee Grades for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Degree Subjects 2002* available from Universities Australia.

2.1.9 No student may progress within the sequence of accredited psychology units if that student receives any grade of less than 50% for a required psychology unit, without first repeating the unit and achieving the minimum grade of 50%. Grading systems in which any student's grade is dependent on the calculation of a median, aggregation or averaging of the marks of multiple students must not be employed.

2.1.10 The AOU must demonstrate that it has in place a documented process of regular quality review which focuses on the teaching and training in its psychology courses, as well as considering the qualifications and ongoing education of the staff who teach into them.

2.2 Multi-Campus Institutions

2.2.1 Where an Institution offers psychology courses across different campuses it must be able to clearly demonstrate that:

(i) there are appropriate staffing and resource levels on each campus;

(ii) students on each campus have equivalent levels of access to units, courses and facilities;

(iii) students on each campus receive an equivalent standard of teaching and course experience;

(iv) students on each campus are required to meet equivalent standards of academic performance and have equivalent assessment requirements.

2.2.2 The geographical locations of campuses relative to each other may be sufficiently close to function effectively as one in so far as students have direct access to units, courses and all resources on both, without any special arrangements being put in place.

2.3 Degree Nomenclature

APAC will give consideration to the nomenclature for degrees which are awarded following successful completion of sequences of study in psychology offered by the AOU. APAC is of the firm view there should be consistency in the naming of degrees and that nomenclature must convey the level of a degree completed as well as giving an appropriate indication of the content. Course titles must be consistent with the current version of the *Australian Qualifications Framework*.

2.3.1 Three year undergraduate courses of study should lead to a generic degree in psychology. Acceptable titles are; *Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Social Science*, *Bachelor of Psychological Science* and *Bachelor of Arts*. The degree title should not make reference to specialisation or application in psychology. Unacceptable titles include *Bachelor of Applied Psychology* and *Bachelor of Educational Psychology.* It is however possible to embed the accredited 3-year sequence of psychology units within other degrees that do not include psychology in the title.

2.3.2 Three year undergraduate courses available to existing graduates with a conferred bachelors (or higher level) degree (in any discipline) and which provide a psychology major Sequence should be termed *Graduate Diploma in Psychological Science* or some similar title, but without any reference to areas of specialisation or application.

2.3.3 The nomenclature Bachelor of Psychology is to be reserved for integrated four year sequences.

2.3.4 Four year undergraduate courses of study should result in a degree in which the only discipline name appearing in the degree title is 'Psychology' and there must be no reference to a specialisation or application. Acceptable titles include Bachelor of Science with Honours in Psychology, Bachelor of Arts with Honours (Psychology) and Bachelor of Psychology (Hons). Unacceptable titles include Bachelor of Science with Honours (Geography), Bachelor of Disability Studies, and Bachelor of Applied Psychology (Honours).

2.3.5 Four year integrated undergraduate bridging programs which combine the three year undergraduate major sequence in psychology available to graduates possessing a conferred bachelors (or higher) level degree (ie Graduate Diploma in Psychology) with a fourth year course (as outlined in these Standards) must bear a generic Masters degree title appropriate to the AOU's faculty, such as *Master of Arts* or *Master of Science* and must not use the name *Master of Psychology*, which is to be reserved for professional 5th and 6th year programs. Examples of unacceptable titles are Master of Psychological Studies or Master of Educational Psychology (Pass).

2.3.6 Bachelor degrees must require at least three years of full-time study or equivalent. Bachelor degrees with Honours must require at least at least four years of full-time study or equivalent.

2.3.7 Fourth year courses should exist only for the purpose of allowing students who have completed an existing accredited three year course, within the last 10 years, and who have had their degree conferred, to complete the fourth year. These courses must be equivalent to Honours standard. Fourth year courses in psychology should lead to an Honours degree or a Graduate Diploma in Psychology so they are distinguishable from the Graduate Diploma in Psychological Science (or similar title) referred to in 2.3.2. This title will make clear reference to the discipline and avoid reference to areas of specialisation or application within the discipline. Unacceptable titles are Graduate Diploma in Education, Graduate Diploma in Applied Psychology and Graduate Diploma in Organisational Psychology. Where an AOU has adopted the title Postgraduate Diploma in Psychology it may retain the use of that title if preferred, but must also avoid reference in the title to areas of specialisation or application within the discipline.

2.3.8 Postgraduate fifth year coursework courses intended to prepare candidates for the 5+1 pathway to registration must be no less than one calendar year of full-time study or equivalent and should lead to a Graduate Diploma or Postgraduate Diploma. The diploma

title should include the term 'Psychology' but must not reflect any area of specialisation or application, either as part of the main diploma title or following the main title.

2.3.9 Postgraduate fifth and sixth year coursework courses must be no less than two calendar years of full-time study or equivalent and should lead to a Masters degree. Where the course can be undertaken in an accelerated mode, the minimum length of the course must be no less than 18 months in duration. The degree title should include the term 'Psychology' and, where relevant, reflect an area of specialisation or application, either as part of the main degree title or following the main title. Examples of acceptable degree titles are Master of Psychology (Clinical), Master of Educational Psychology and Master of Psychology (Organisational). Examples of unacceptable titles are Master of Arts and Master of Science (Psychology).

2.3.10 Postgraduate coursework courses (fifth and sixth years only) may also be offered as generalist courses, in which case no specialisation or application is implied. The accreditation requirements in Section 5 of the Standards will apply and it should be noted that the APS has no parallel APS College approval process. A suitable degree title would be *Master of Psychology*.

2.3.11 Postgraduate doctoral level courses which include all the components of the postgraduate coursework requirements for an accredited Masters course within that AOU should include clear reference to the area of specialisation or application in the degree title. In addition these doctoral courses can only be referred to as PhDs if they include a course of research leading to a thesis equivalent in status to other PhDs by research. For this reason it would be expected that such degrees would be the equivalent of no less than four years of full-time study. Acceptable titles for these degrees include PhD (Clinical Psychology) and PhD (Educational Psychology).

2.3.12 DPsych or PsyD courses must have a thesis or dissertation requirement which is of the highest quality and which reflects the fact that the degree is at the doctoral level. Further, these degrees are required to include a research component which involves at least the equivalent of one year full-time spent on the thesis component of the course. These degrees must be equivalent of no less than three years of full-time study and must give an indication of the area of specialisation or application. Examples of acceptable titles are DPsych (Clinical), PsyD (Organisational) and DPsych (Clinical and Clinical Neuropsychology). Examples of unacceptable titles for such courses are PhD and PhD (Psychology).

2.3.13 Postgraduate bridging programs (see Standard 5.5) should lead to a Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma. The diploma title should include the term 'Psychology' and reflect an area of specialisation or application, either as part of the main degree title or following the main title.

Note: APAC advises that in order to reduce the potential for confusion, Institutions should take care to avoid a situation in which degrees for which accreditation is sought bear the same name as other degrees offered by the Institution which contain an unaccredited psychology major. APAC advises that in situations where doubt may arise, the Institution should identify on student transcripts where an APAC accredited sequence has been completed.

2.4 Academic Staffing

This section provides general information about academic staffing in an AOU. These accreditation standards provide details of the requirements that are stated by APAC in order to ensure that an education in psychology is offered at a standard which merits accreditation. AOUs should note that meeting the staffing requirements does not necessarily mean that APAC will deem the level of staffing to be acceptable for the profile of a particular AOU. The staffing profile of an AOU comprises the number of staff, the spread of appointments (Level A through Level E), their qualifications and experience (including qualifications at a level which would confer eligibility for membership of the APS and for registration), and whether they are tenured or on fixed-term appointments.

The actual staffing requirements will depend on the number and range of courses offered, the student:academic staff ratio, and the areas of expertise of the staff, which should provide adequate coverage of all areas in which courses are offered.

The requirements will also take account of the teaching commitments of staff, and in AOUs which teach three trimesters in one year (that is, which offer courses during a summer and/or winter semester in addition to the other two semesters), it is expected that staffing levels will be higher to ensure that the staff have sufficient time for ongoing professional development, research, and for course development. These issues should be borne in mind when making a submission for accreditation. In the case of multi-campus Institutions, these accreditation standards apply to each campus which has an AOU offering an undergraduate course and/or postgraduate coursework and research degrees.

2.4.1 An AOU proposing to offer undergraduate and professional postgraduate courses in psychology will only be considered for accreditation if there are 10 or more full-time (or full-time equivalent) psychology academic staff members in that AOU. At least eight of the staff must hold full-time appointments, be based full-time on the campus at which the Head and the administration of the AOU resides, and must possess qualifications which meet the eligibility requirements for full membership of the APS. (Note: this requirement should not be read as stating that all academic members of staff in the AOU should be full members or eligible for full membership of the APS. It is recognised that academic staff with training in areas related to psychology can make a significant contribution to courses in psychology. Although that contribution will be recognised and taken into account, such staff will not count towards the requirement of 10 members of full-time staff, or equivalent, who meet the eligibility requirements). If the Head is not located at the campus where the main administration of the AOU is located, the AOU must be able to demonstrate convincingly that the head has direct responsibility for the running of the AOU as well as effective and close operational oversight of the AOU including its courses.

2.4.2 The requirement of 10 full-time equivalent staff is viewed as sufficient only for the AOU to offer one full four year undergraduate sequence, one professional postgraduate course (at least fifth and sixth year) and some postgraduate research supervision. The number of staff in the Psychology AOU should be greater than 10 if more courses are offered.

2.4.3 The student:academic staff ratio calculated across all currently accredited courses within the AOU should be similar to other science-based disciplines, must never be greater than 22 to 1, and should also meet the requirements set out in Standards 2.4.4 to 2.4.11, and 5.1.2 to 5.1.3. The required method for calculating a student:academic staff ratio is set out in detail in the APAC student:staff ratio calculation form (available from the APAC website).

2.4.4 The staffing profile must include at least one full-time Level E appointment in Psychology (APAC provides a set of benchmarking criteria for a Level E academic position on its website).

2.4.5 In an AOU with the 10 full-time equivalent psychology staff there should be at least three appointments at Levels C or D and this number should increase in proportion to the total number of staff so that the ratio of full time equivalent staff to level C and D staff is always 10:3.

2.4.6 In an AOU with the 10 full-time equivalent psychology staff with expertise relevant to the teaching of psychology, at least 80% of staff should have PhDs, established or promising research records with demonstrated research activity in the forms of grants, conference presentations, and publications in peer-reviewed international journals, and should be involved in the teaching of undergraduate psychology.

2.4.7 The psychology academic staff must have demonstrated teaching and research supervision experience. Whereas it would be expected that most would have demonstrated ability in teaching at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, including the supervision of honours and postgraduate research, each staff member should have a demonstrated ability at least at one of these levels. An AOU should be able to demonstrate systematic monitoring of teaching quality such as participation in regular formal teaching/unit evaluation and a staff performance management scheme.

2.4.8 For each professional postgraduate program there should be at least three staff who hold a doctoral degree in a relevant area of psychology and no less than half of the total staff EFT teaching into the program must have qualifications which make them eligible for full membership of the relevant APS College. Of these at least two staff members must be full-time appointments within the Institution and all should make a substantial contribution to the relevant program. Each program should be supported by appropriate Level D/E involvement with sufficient time available and relevant professional expertise to provide academic leadership for the program. A program must be directed by a full time staff member appointed at least at Level C, who has qualifications which clearly make her/him eligible for membership of the relevant APS College and also suitably qualified and experienced to run a professional postgraduate program. In deciding on the suitability of the Level D/E leadership for the program, account will be taken of the number of professional postgraduate programs offered within the AOU relative to the number of Level D/E appointments. It would be expected that a Level D/E would have responsibility for no more than two cognate programs, and that other Level D/E staff would be available where more than two programs are offered. The onus is on the Psychology AOU to demonstrate that it has appropriate academic and administrative responsibility for the delivery of the program. These requirements need to be met even in dual professional courses.

2.4.9 The areas of expertise of the psychology academic staff must be sufficient to cover the core subjects and some specialist options in the three and four year courses (see Sections 3.1.6 to 3.1.10 and 4.1.4 to 4.1.7 of the Standards). The expertise should also cover most of the areas taught in any postgraduate coursework course(s) offered by the AOU, recognising that the AOU may employ, on a part-time or casual basis, individuals with particular expertise to teach in some specialist areas in postgraduate courses. Professional postgraduate courses should only be offered if the resources and staffing dedicated to them do not impact negatively on the capacity of the AOU to teach the core topics in the three and four year undergraduate courses.

2.4.10 Multiple professional postgraduate courses will be examined carefully with respect to the adequacy of their staffing and the impact that this staffing has on the capacity of the AOU to support the undergraduate curriculum adequately. Each AOU and its programs is assessed on individual basis, taking into account all of the factors relevant to the particular AOU and courses in question. To meet accreditation Standards, the AOU may be instructed by APAC that it needs to reduce the number of professional courses offered before it could a grade of accreditation.

2.4.11 In a multi-campus Institution where on one of the campuses only the three or four year undergraduate sequence is taught, there must be at least eight full-time (or full-time equivalent) psychology academic staff based on that campus or courses should be supplemented through distance education methods, consistent with the Standards in Section 2.6). At least one of the appointments must be at Level E or D and a further two at least at Level C. At least fifty percent of these staff should hold research higher degrees and should have established research records with demonstrated research activity in the forms of grants, conference presentations, and publications in refereed journals. All staff should also have demonstrated teaching experience at the undergraduate level, including the supervision of Honours research. The areas of expertise of these psychology academic staff should be sufficient to cover the core subjects and some specialist options in the three and four year undergraduate program (see Sections 3.1.6 to 3.1.10, 4.1.4 to 4.1.7, of the Standards).

2.5 Resources

The resources available in the AOU will be given careful consideration by APAC. The required resources include secretarial, administrative and technical support as well as adequately equipped teaching and research facilities, fully networked computing facilities, test library materials, and general library resources. The following accreditation standards provide more information about these resources. When interpreting the accreditation standards it is important that applicants recognise that the amount and extent of resources required will depend on the number of courses offered and the number of students enrolled in these courses. It is important that AOUs provide adequate resources and facilities for students with disabilities to undertake study within the AOU.

2.5.1 The Psychology AOU must demonstrate access to adequate secretarial, administrative, technical and computing resources to support its research and teaching activities, including mixed mode and distance teaching. These may be dedicated or shared within a School or Faculty or other appropriate organisational unit.

2.5.2 The Psychology AOU must have access to lecture theatres, tutorial rooms and computer facilities that meet all of its teaching requirements. Specifically:

- Lecture rooms must be equipped with appropriate audiovisual facilities.
- Some rooms used for professional skills training must have video recording facilities.
- Units taught by distance or in mixed mode must be supported by an online learning management system.

2.5.3 The Psychology AOU must have assured access to adequate and guaranteed laboratory space, including at least one undergraduate laboratory with computer facilities for undergraduate classes.

2.5.4 The Psychology AOU must have assured access to adequate and guaranteed laboratory facilities sufficient to meet the needs of the research programs of the academic staff and of the students completing courses with research components.

2.5.5 Laboratories must be equipped with standard psychological apparatus, and/or computers, required for demonstrating and running a range of experiments and other exercises which form part of modern, up-to-date psychology curricula.

2.5.6 Students must have adequate access to computers beyond those required in formal laboratory sessions to support their research and teaching needs.

2.5.7 The Psychology AOU must provide access for staff and students to a range of software including packages for statistical analysis, spreadsheets, data presentation and word processing.

2.5.8 The Psychology AOU must have access to a computer network which has full electronic mail facilities and is linked to the Internet and on-line databases.

2.5.9 The Psychology AOU must have a test library which has up-to-date copies of the most frequently used psychological tests including copies of tests required to support postgraduate teaching programs and research programs in specialist areas. Sufficient copies of tests and associated materials (e.g., response booklets) should be held to meet teaching and research needs. The AOU(s) making use of the facilities should be able to demonstrate that a portion of the budget commensurate with the size of the AOU(s) is allocated to the purchase of tests and associated materials. In the case of multi-campus Institutions, there should be a test library with adequate holdings on each campus at which psychology courses are taught or an effective and satisfactory means of ensuring rapid and secure test/document delivery between campuses.

2.5.10 A member of the psychology academic staff who is at Level B or higher should have responsibility for the test library and the AOU should be able to demonstrate that procedures are in place to restrict access to psychological test materials to qualified psychologists and students enrolled in assessment and testing units who are under the supervision of a suitably qualified staff member and who require access as part of the syllabus for the unit in which they are enrolled.

2.5.11 The Institutional library or libraries must provide ready access to a comprehensive and up-to-date range of psychology texts, monographs, journals and databases. Where postgraduate courses are offered, there should be sufficient specialist monograph and journal holdings to support each course. The library should also provide substantial and widespread access to appropriate and commonly used Psychology electronic data bases and provide regular training to staff and students in their use. The AOU should be able to demonstrate that funding commensurate with the number of psychology courses offered and the number of students enrolled is allocated to the purchase of library materials for psychology.

2.5.12 In the case of multi-campus Institutions, the onus is on the AOU to demonstrate that there is guaranteed equity of access to these holdings for all students irrespective of the

campus at which they are based. APAC will give consideration both to the holdings on each campus and to the total holdings with respect to the number of courses offered and the arrangements in place to meet requests for library materials sent from another campus.

2.6 Teaching Materials and Methods: Managing the Learning Process

The minimum required content for psychology courses is set out in the sections of these Standards relevant to the level of the course (see Standards 3.1.6 to 3.1.10, 4.1.4 to 4.1.7 and 5.1.12). APAC recognises that there are diverse ways in which the material can be taught, including face-to-face teaching, distance education, and mixed modes. In evaluating an application for accreditation of a course, the following Standards will be applied:

2.6.1 Distance education and the use of online learning management systems must not be considered cheaper ways of teaching and they must be resourced at the same level as face-to-face teaching.

2.6.2 For each unit, students must be provided with a unit outline specifying the content of the unit, the nature of the assessments, details of textbooks and readings and any other relevant information.

2.6.3 Unit material should be regularly updated to ensure the information reflects the current knowledge in the area.

2.6.4 Where a unit is delivered in more than one mode, the content, objectives, and methods of assessment should be the same for all modes of delivery.

2.6.5 In undergraduate courses, there must be laboratory training offered. The laboratory training offered to off-campus students must be equivalent in content, duration and quality and outcome to that undertaken by on-campus students.

2.6.6 Undergraduate research units should have residential schools if they are offered to off-campus students (departure from this approach must be carefully justified with regard to the quality and equivalence of the learning experience and outcomes).

2.6.7 Where there is some practical skills training in undergraduate courses, opportunities must also be available for off-campus students to complete these components.

2.6.8 All students should have some means of regularly gaining timely access to staff so that questions can be answered and difficulties resolved.

2.6.9 At the fourth, fifth and sixth year level, each unit must offer a residential school for off-campus students.

2.6.10 All units should provide the opportunity for formative assessment aimed primarily at facilitating learning as distinct from contributing to the final assessment e.g., electronic quizzes, comments on essays and peer assessment, and marked according to the same criteria and standards as those applying to on-campus assessments.

2.6.11 Assessments which count for the final grade must be the same for all modes of delivery of the unit.

2.6.12 Assignments and other forms of assessed work should be marked and returned in a timely manner.

2.6.13 Student evaluations of coursework units should be obtained and academic staff should use other additional methods to assess the adequacy of the student learning experience. These might include peer evaluations and external assessors.

2.6.14 Where units are offered in different modes, periodic comparisons between the performance of students in the different modes must be made to ensure the standard of the offerings is comparable.

Special Arrangements for Offshore Teaching

2.6.15 In addition to the conditions set out above, the following features are considered particularly important and must be clearly present in offshore delivery of courses:

(a) the appointment of suitably qualified local tutors to assist with educational advice and support (i.e., eligible for Associate Membership of the APS)

(b) local administrative assistance

(c) direct access to staff members (i.e., not just through any agents)

(d) where the home Institution does not intend to offer residential schools in the other country, written agreement be undertaken with the students that they can attend residential schools in Australia

(e) access to adequate library, test library and laboratory facilities in the other country, supplemented by the provision of and arrangements with local universities for library, test library and laboratory access to the same standard as that provided to students at the Australian AOU. This includes adequate electronic access to the home Institution's library resources.

(f) provision of local computer support

(g) evidence of on-going scrutiny of students' academic progress to ensure they are meeting the same standards as those required of Australian students.

Note: A site visit to an Offshore location is deemed essential to the accreditation assessment process.

SECTION 3 UNDERGRADUATE 3-YEAR SEQUENCE COURSES

This section provides accreditation standards for undergraduate 3-year sequence courses in psychology.

APAC only recognises for accreditation, courses designed to provide an education in psychology. It does not recognise courses designed to provide education in another discipline or profession, even if these have a substantial psychological content.

It is necessary that students complete an integrated and planned four year sequence in psychology to ensure that systematic coverage of the discipline is achieved. This may be accomplished either as a combination of a three year sequence plus a fourth year, or as an integrated four year sequence within a single AOU**.** The following sections (3.1 and 4.1 of the Standards) describe the Standards where this four year sequence is undertaken in two separate components.

3.1 Three year courses

These standards apply to all three year courses in psychology which lead to a Bachelors degree or Graduate Diploma in Psychological Science (or similar), and to three year sequences which are integrated into four year Honours or Pass degree courses. It is important to note that three year sequences are expected to form adequate foundational preparation upon which later study at the advanced level is built (see Standards Section 4.1).

The main objective of the three year course or sequence is to provide students with a thorough education in the scientific discipline of psychology, while also providing students with some material of an introductory nature regarding the application of the discipline. Taking account of the nature of the discipline and its applications as well as developments in psychology and allied disciplines, a three year course in psychology should cover the core areas of the discipline including the main theoretical positions; recognise the scientific bases of the discipline; and provide education in the range of methods and analyses that form an integral part of the scientific approach adopted by the discipline as outlined in Standard 3.1.7. The course will also include laboratory work in which the students are expected to participate, and the APS *Code of Ethics* and the complementary *Ethical Guidelines* must be covered.

Length

3.1.1 The length of the course should be three years of full-time study, or the equivalent.

Course Structure

3.1.2 The first year of the course must include a minimum of 25% psychology.

3.1.3 The second year of the course should include a minimum of 50% psychology. In AOUs where structural limitations preclude this, then students must be able to average a minimum of 50% psychology across their second and third years (e.g., 33% in second year, followed by 67% in third year). In these cases, the acceptable minimum at second year is 33%.

3.1.4 The third year of the course must include a minimum of 50% psychology and there should be the option for students to enrol in more psychology units.

3.1.5 The course must be structured to ensure that the core areas (see Standard 3.1.7) within the discipline are covered by all students, while also offering the opportunity through elective components for students to study some areas in greater depth. It is recognised that the elective components in any AOU are likely to reflect the particular areas of strength and expertise of the AOU.

Course Content

3.1.6 The emphasis of the course must be on providing an education in the core discipline of psychology and not in one or more specialist areas of the discipline. Over the three years, students must be continuously introduced to the scientific study of psychology so as to prepare them to enter fourth year equipped to pursue advanced studies in a wide range of topics and to design and conduct quality research in an area of their choice. They must also have developed skills in conducting a range of practical laboratory experiments (including with humans), and acquired appropriate report writing skills which conform to accepted psychological standards.

3.1.7 The accredited three-year sequence must provide students with a solid foundation in the core psychology graduate attributes (based on the *Graduate Attributes of the Four-Year Undergraduate Psychology Program*, available from the APAC website) including, but not limited to, each of the following:

Graduate Attribute 1: Core knowledge and understanding

Acquire an understanding of core topics in the discipline, including:

- abnormal psychology
- biological bases of behaviour
- cognition, information processing and language
- individual differences in capacity and behaviour, testing and assessment, and personality
- learning
- lifespan developmental psychology
- motivation and emotion
- perception
- social psychology
- history and philosophy of psychology
- intercultural diversity and indigenous psychology

Graduate Attribute 2: Research methods in psychology

- describe the basic characteristics of the science of psychology
- describe, apply and evaluate the different research methods used by psychologists
- demonstrate practical skills in laboratory-based and other psychological research
- design and conduct basic studies to address psychological questions: frame research questions; undertake literature searches; critically analyse theoretical and empirical studies; formulate testable hypotheses; operationalise variables; choose an appropriate methodology; make valid and reliable measurements; analyse data and interpret results; and write research reports

Graduate Attribute 3: Critical thinking skills

- apply knowledge of the scientific method in thinking about problems related to behaviour and mental processes
- question claims that arise from myth, stereotype, pseudoscience or untested assumptions
- recognise and defend against the major fallacies of human thinking

Graduate Attribute 4: Values, research and professional ethics

- evaluate psychologists' behaviour in psychological research and other professional contexts in relation to the Australian Psychological Society "Code of Ethics" and the complementary "Ethical Guidelines", as well as the Australian "National Practice Standards for the Mental Health Workforce"
- use information in an ethical manner (e.g., acknowledge and respect work and intellectual property rights of others through appropriate citations in oral and written communication)

Graduate Attribute 5: Communication skills

- write a standard research report using American Psychological Association (APA) structure and formatting conventions
- demonstrate effective oral communication skills in various formats (e.g., debate, group discussion, presentation) and for various purposes

Graduate Attribute 6: Learning and the application of psychology

- apply knowledge of legislative frameworks (including privacy, human rights)
- apply knowledge of consumer and carer participation in psychological care
- apply knowledge of psychology, society and the workplace/influencing systems
- describe major areas of applied psychology (e.g., clinical, organizational)
- demonstrate a capacity for independent learning to sustain personal and professional development in the changing world of the science and practice of psychology

3.1.8 The AOU must clearly demonstrate that the course provides substantial coverage in the core topics. Some core topics (such as research and professional ethics) may be naturally integrated within other topics, but must be clearly in evidence in the curriculum.

3.1.9 The content of the lectures, tutorials and laboratories in the course must be supported by relevant and up-to-date evidence-based scientific reference material. This material should include peer-reviewed empirical articles in the best international scientific journals, preferably at all year levels and certainly at all levels beyond first year.

3.1.10 At all three year levels, students must have formal practical work as part of their coursework in psychology, with much, though by no means all, of this practical work taking place in laboratory sessions. It is recommended that consideration be given to the application of the science of psychology to real-world problems and issues. That is, science and application should be integrated wherever possible.

Assessment

3.1.11 The assessment of components of the course should involve coursework, submissions by students including essays and laboratory reports, and formal examinations. An AOU must not rely solely on multiple choice assessments in a course. If oral presentations are included as an assessment component of any course, then the basis upon which these are graded should be clear. See also Standard 2.1.9.

3.1.12 Assessment must ensure that the breadth and depth of knowledge and skills of the core subjects in the discipline are assessed in accordance with the unit learning outcomes.

3.1.13 Students should receive detailed and timely feedback on their assessments.

3.1.14 Appropriate procedures must be in place (e.g., Boards of Examiners) to ensure that standards are maintained and that all assessment and awarding of final marks or grades is treated with the utmost care and attention. Regular external independent moderation should be undertaken at intervals to benchmark the assessment practices of the AOU

against other APAC-accredited AOUs. The APAC Secretariat can assist with advice about how to set up a benchmarking exercise.

3.1.15 Appropriate procedures which meet modern governance standards must be in place to deal with student appeals.

3.1.16 Appropriate procedures must be in place to deal with cases of plagiarism or other instances of unethical conduct.

Awarding of credit or advanced standing

3.1.17 Any students transferring from one AOU to another in Australia while completing a three year course or entering an accredited course following the completion of a degree or studies in another course must only be given credit for studies in psychology previously undertaken if the AOU at which they completed these studies is APAC-accredited and the completed units for which advanced standing is to be granted are part of an APAC-accredited sequence. The onus is on the AOU to which the student is transferring to ensure that this is the case. AOUs should be prepared to justify such decisions should APAC conduct an audit of the AOU's transfer credit practices.

3.1.18 Studies undertaken at non-Australian Institutions must be carefully evaluated by the AOU to determine their strict equivalence to the studies for which credit is to be granted, and the AOU must be prepared to defend its decisions regarding the granting of credit should APAC conduct an audit of the AOU's transfer credit practices.

3.1.19 It is the responsibility of the AOU to which a student is transferring to make sure that all core areas of the discipline are covered by the point of completion of the degree. Because there is some flexibility in the structure of courses, and AOUs may vary in the way in which core subjects are covered, it is not sufficient to assume that completion of a particular year at one Institution, (for example second year), will necessarily provide adequate preparation for what would usually be the next year's work in the sequence at the receiving Institution (in this example, third year). It may be necessary to prescribe an individually tailored course to ensure that such students cover all core subjects. This prescription must enable students to complete the equivalent of an accredited course. Please note that APAC does not accredit individual students' courses of study.

SECTION 4 UNDERGRADUATE 4TH YEAR AND FOUR YEAR COURSES

4.1 Fourth year courses

The main objectives of the fourth year psychology course are to provide for the completion of an integrated and comprehensive education in the discipline of psychology, to permit advanced level study in a range of areas, and to develop competence in conducting research. Fourth year topics must include education in the theoretical and empirical bases underpinning the construction, implementation, and interpretation of some of the more widely used cognitive and personality assessments, and evidence-based approaches to psychological intervention.

These Accreditation Standards apply to fourth year courses in psychology which lead to a degree as specified in Section 2.3.7 of the Standards. It is recognised that, in some AOUs, students may take out a three year degree (e.g., BSc) and then complete the fourth year and take out an Honours degree (e.g., BSc Hons) either at the same or a different Institution.

Entry Requirements

4.1.1 The entry requirement for a fourth year course is previous successful completion within the last 10 years, of an accredited three year sequence in psychology or the first three

years of an integrated accredited four year course. The fourth year course is intended only for those who have previously completed an accredited three year sequence and wish to complete the fourth year**.** The minimum entry standard must be a Credit average in second and third year units, including Credit in the majority of the psychology units.

Length

4.1.2 The length of the course must be one year full-time or the equivalent part time.

Course Structure

4.1.3 The fourth year course should normally be 100% psychology, though it is recognised that in some cases it may be appropriate to have up to a maximum of 20% of the course in a cognate discipline. The onus is on the AOU to demonstrate the relevance of any cognate discipline to the study of psychology at this level. In all cases there should be the option for students to take 100% psychology.

Course Content

4.1.4 The accredited fourth year must provide students with advanced education and training in the core psychology graduate attributes (based on "*Graduate Attributes of the Four-Year Undergraduate Psychology Program*", available from the APAC website) including, but not limited to, the following:

- advanced theoretical and empirical knowledge in the core research areas of the discipline (see Standard 3.1.7, Graduate Attribute 1)
- knowledge of the theoretical and empirical bases underpinning the construction, implementation, and interpretation of some of the most widely used cognitive and personality assessments
- knowledge of the theoretical and empirical bases underpinning evidence-based approaches to psychological intervention
- understanding and explaining how the science and practice of psychology is influenced by social, historical, professional, and cultural contexts

4.1.5 The accredited fourth year may offer some opportunity for coverage of applied topics and basic skills (e.g. interviewing skills, fundamentals of psychological testing). Applied material must be based on the scientist-practitioner model. The basis for subsequent training should be emphasized, rather than mastery of advanced professional skills.

4.1.6 The content of all lectures, seminars and tutorials in the course must be supported by relevant and up-to-date reference material which includes references to peer-reviewed scientific journal articles.

4.1.7 A placement component may be included in the fourth year of the course consisting of no more than 10% of the total fourth year credit points. Procedures should be in place to ensure students on placement are adequately prepared, closely supervised, and that they conduct themselves in an ethical and professional manner.

Research Methods and Professional and Research Ethics

4.1.8 Prior to undertaking any research or supervised testing and assessment and preferably in the undergraduate course, students should be given sufficient grounding in relevant research methods and in professional and research ethics.

Research Project

4.1.9 The fourth year must contain a substantial research project.

4.1.10 Students in the fourth year of a psychology course must undertake a research project which carries a final assessment weight reflecting a minimum of one third of the credit point weight for the year. It is expected that the credit point weight will reflect the percentage of the year's work.

4.1.11 The research project must include an individual research question, individual intensive empirical literature review, individual data analysis, individual reporting of results and discussion, but may involve shared data collection. The research project should be

structured so that students participate in all of the steps involved in research including the formulation of research questions, the design of the study including selection of appropriate methodology, the collection and analysis of data to test the research question, the interpretation of the findings and the writing up of the report.

4.1.12 The research question being pursued must address issues specifically relevant to the field of psychology.

4.1.13 The research project may be supervised either solely or jointly, but in all cases at least one supervisor must be a member of the academic staff from the Psychology AOU.

4.1.14 The research project should be written up, adhering to APA format, and presented as a report for assessment. The report should include a substantial literature review and may take the final form of a traditional thesis, or a literature review accompanied by a report of the research presented in the format of a peer-reviewed scientific journal article.

4.1.15 The total length of the text of the written research report should be between 9000 and 15000 words. Data collected for the research project must be available for inspection by APAC on request.

Assessment

4.1.16 The assessment of components of the course should involve coursework, submissions by students including essays and laboratory reports, and examinations. If oral presentations are included as an assessment component of any course then the basis upon which these are graded should be made clear. See also Standard 2.1.9.

4.1.17 Students must receive detailed and timely feedback on their assignments.

4.1.18 The research report or thesis must be assessed by at least two examiners. The supervisor should not normally be an examiner. If the supervisor is an examiner, then at least three examiners are mandatory.

4.1.19 Each examiner of a research report must provide a grade and a comprehensive examiner's report. In addition, appropriate procedures must be in place to resolve any discrepancies that arise between examiners.

4.1.20 Appropriate procedures must be in place (e.g., Boards of Examiners, external audits) to ensure that standards are maintained and that all assessment and awarding of final marks or grades is treated with the utmost care and attention. Evidence of an external audit of students' work conducted within the previous three to five years must be made available for inspection by APAC, which may, if this has not been undertaken, require that one be conducted.

4.1.21 Procedures which comply with good governance practices must be in place to deal with student appeals.

4.1.22 Procedures which comply with good governance practices must be in place to deal with cases of plagiarism or other instances of unethical conduct.

Awarding of credit or advanced standing

4.1.23 Students transferring from one AOU to another in Australia in order to undertake a fourth year course in psychology can only be granted recognition for studies in psychology completed if the AOU(s) at which they completed the previous three years is(are) APAC accredited and the completed units were part of an APAC accredited sequence. Credit for any previous studies at the 4th year or higher level and undertaken within Australia, cannot be awarded toward an APAC accredited fourth year unless the units in question were part of an APAC accredited sequence.

4.1.24 Studies undertaken at non-Australian institutions must be carefully evaluated by the AOU to determine their strict equivalence to the studies for which credit is to be granted, and the AOU must be prepared to defend its decisions regarding the granting of credit should APAC conduct an audit of the AOU's transfer credit practices.

4.1.25 Apart from exceptional circumstances, students should not be able to transfer from one Institution or AOU to another during the fourth year of a program and should complete their fourth year at one AOU.

4.2 Four year courses

The three year undergraduate sequence and fourth year requirements set out in these Standards can be integrated into a four year course. Such courses must meet all of the Standards set down herein for the three year undergraduate sequence as well as all of the Standards for fourth year courses. Where such a course is offered it is possible to relocate elements from the three years and fourth year within the four year period to provide additional flexibility as long as all standards are still met (including nomenclature requirements for four year degrees which are set out in Standards 2.3.3 and 2.3.4).

4.3 Four year integrated bridging courses

A four year integrated bridging program which combines the requirements of the three year undergraduate sequence in psychology available to graduates possessing a conferred bachelors (or higher) level degree (ie Graduate Diploma in Psychology) with a fourth year course (as outlined in these Standards) must meet all of the requirements set out in the APAC Standards for both the three year undergraduate major sequence as well as those for fourth year courses. The four year integrated bridging program must also require no less than two calendar years of full-time study or the equivalent. These programs must bear a generic Masters degree title appropriate to the AOU's faculty, such as *Master of Arts* or *Master of Science* and must not use the name *Master of Psychology*, which is to be reserved for professional 5th and 6th year programs.

SECTION 5 POSTGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL COURSES

5.1 This section (5) provides detailed requirements for all postgraduate courses in psychology (with some exceptions where indicated) which are designed to prepare candidates for entry into the profession of psychology, especially registration as a psychologist. It covers:

- 5th year Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology courses;
- Masters courses which incorporate the fifth and sixth years of professional education and training;
- Professional Doctoral courses (which require additional years of study), and
- Certificate and Diploma courses which assist bridging from one specialty area of psychology to another.

All work in these professional courses should adhere to the scientist-practitioner model and always direct students to the relevant scientific empirical evidence base for each and every aspect of the course.

For the purposes of specialist recognition APAC recognises the APS determination of approved specialist courses.

It should be noted that the Board of the APS permits the development of doctoral degrees which are dually approved, the completion of which enables membership of two APS Colleges.

The requirements in this section apply to fifth year courses that lead to a Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology, fifth and sixth year professional courses in psychology and professional bridging courses leading to a Graduate Certificates (Diplomas).

The primary objective of the fifth year Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology should be to provide a general education in the professional practice of psychology which would result in a graduate obtaining the basic skills needed to prepare for a final year of supervised practice under the authority of the Registration Board before gaining full registration. This education must be at an advanced level, building on and extending the knowledge and skills of the APAC-accredited four-year undergraduate sequence and should not be highly specialised in nature.

The primary objective of the fifth and sixth year courses offered either as a Masters degree or the equivalent part of a DPsych or combined Masters/PhD course, should be to provide an education in the professional practice of psychology such that the graduate has the skills and knowledge to gain

registration and practice as a psychologist. This education must be at the advanced level, building on and extending the knowledge and skills of the APAC-accredited four-year undergraduate sequence It should include full coverage and mastery of the general knowledge and skills required by psychological practitioners as well as knowledge and skills in any applicable area of specialisation of the course. This should occur through the careful integration of coursework, research and practical placement experiences. For DPsych courses there is an additional objective of providing advanced level specialist knowledge and skills.

The primary objective of bridging Graduate Certificates or Diplomas (Standard 5.5) should be to offer additional education and training to psychologists who are already eligible for membership of one APS college and have completed an accredited professional postgraduate coursework degree to accumulate coursework and study which might assist when applying for membership of another APS college, or for other professional purposes.

These Standards set the requirements that must be met by all courses in order to establish and maintain the highest standards of education and training. In addition, the accreditation of Masters and Doctoral courses providing professional training includes approval by the appropriate APS College (where one exists for a particular specialisation). The APS College Course Approval Guidelines for each APS College should be read in conjunction with the Standards in this section. It is highly desirable that a degree course with a specialisation reflected in the title and which meets all accreditation Standards also meets the relevant APS College Course Approval Guidelines.

Upon completion of Masters course requirements, the student should be eligible for Associate Membership of the appropriate APS College. Note that APAC will not accredit coursework Masters courses with dual specialisations in the one stream as it would not be possible to meet all the requirements of coursework, placement and research for two separate specialisations.

Staffing

5.1.1 All professional postgraduate courses must meet the staffing requirements set out in Standards 2.4.8 to 2.4.10.

5.1.2 The student:academic staff ratio for postgraduate coursework Masters and Doctoral courses must be no greater than 8 to 1 when calculated using the same method as required in Standard 2.4.3. Where there is more than one specialisation and/or a generalist course, the postgraduate coursework student:academic staff ratio is not to be averaged across the different streams (eg Forensic, Counselling, Clinical). The academic staff component of the ratio is calculated by totalling the Effective Full Time equivalent (EFT) staff contribution made by each staff member to the postgraduate Masters and Doctoral programs only. A second separate calculation using the same method should be made for any 5th year Graduate Diploma in Professional Psychology program, the student:staff ratio for which must never be greater than 15:1.

5.1.3 Staff members who are responsible for any practical placement supervision associated with a course must be registered psychologists, and must also have at least two years' relevant full-time professional experience as a psychologist following completion of their own specialist postgraduate qualifications. For Masters and Doctoral specialist professional courses, such staff must be members of, or eligible for full membership of, the appropriate APS College.

Advisory/Liaison and Quality Review Committee

5.1.4 The AOU must have in place for each course an effective quality review committee through which there can be full consultation with representatives of the field supervisors and of organisations likely to employ the Institution's graduates regarding the standards of training being achieved in the course. The committee must be able to show written evidence of activities aimed at auditing and improving the quality of the training offered (such as reports) and must be a formally constituted Advisory or Liaison Committee involving staff representatives from the AOU responsible for the course(s), student representatives with at least one representative from each year of the course(s), and at least four representatives from agencies providing practical placements and future employers.

Resources

The following resource requirements should be read in conjunction with Section 2.5 of the Standards.

5.1.5 There should be adequate facilities available to the School or Department for training students in interviewing, testing and assessment. These facilities should include rooms which are sufficiently well sound-proofed to carry out training and confidential assessments and which have video-recording equipment and/or one way viewing facilities. These rooms should also be appropriately furnished for conducting formal testing and for interviewing.

5.1.6 The test library should hold a sufficient range of tests and sufficient copies in the area of specialisation for each course, where relevant, to meet the needs of that course.

5.1.7 The Institutional library should have substantial holdings of, or electronic access to, journals, monographs and relevant peer-reviewed international journal databases in each area of course specialisation offered by the AOU.

5.1.8 All students in each course should have access to computers with a range of software for word-processing and data analysis and presentation, as well as access to the Internet.

Credit for Previous Study/Experience

5.1.9 Students should only be given credit for any coursework if it is strictly equivalent to coursework in the current course, and in the case of prior studies at an Australian institution, the coursework for which credit is to be granted must also have been successfully completed in an APAC accredited course within the previous ten year period. Studies undertaken at non-Australian institutions must be carefully evaluated by the AOU to determine their strict equivalence to the coursework for which credit is to be granted, and the AOU must be prepared to defend its decisions regarding the granting of credit should APAC conduct an audit of the AOU's credit practices.

5.1.10 Students can only be given credit for placement experience completed as part of their current employment if it is of direct relevance to the course, if the work would ordinarily be undertaken by a qualified psychologist, and if supervision is arranged to fulfil all of the usual requirements of placements which are part of the course. Any such experience must not amount to more than one placement component and in must not constitute more than 30% of the total placement requirements of the course. AOUs must not give credit for previous employment experience (prior to entry into the APAC accredited professional course) as it is not integrated into the overall learning undertaken during the course. Placement experience completed as part of current employment should not normally be credited in a fifth year Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology course.

5.1.11 Students should not be given any credit for any previous research experience including research higher degrees as the research component is integrated into the course.

Core capabilities and attributes

5.1.12 Core capabilities and attributes:

The following table lists the essential core capabilities and attributes (and the knowledge underpinning them) to ensure that graduates are equipped to practice psychology safely upon registration. The list is not intended as a comprehensive list of course content. Neither is it intended to direct the content of a particular specialty. Further, demonstration of having achieved many of the capabilities listed cannot be done in isolation from other capabilities, and because of the complexity of the learning, may require integrated simultaneous assessment.

For 5th and 6th year professional courses (Masters and Doctoral levels) each of the core capabilities and attributes must be covered in detail. Since graduates of 5th year Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology courses are required to complete one year post-graduation supervision in order to obtain registration, they would be expected to demonstrate the same capabilities and attributes as 5th and 6th year graduates for 5.1.12(b) but will have covered all the others in less detail.

5.1.12(a) **Knowledge of the Discipline**	Overall knowledge of the discipline underpins all of the other capabilities and includes knowledge of psychological principles, professional ethics and standards, theories of individual and systemic functioning and change, dysfunctional behaviour, psychopathology, the cultural bases of behaviour and organisational systems. Demonstrated capabilities: Strong knowledge of at least: • relevant psychological theories and models; • published empirical findings supporting theories (especially those which underpin the major forms of psychological intervention) and the methods employed to establish them; • the major methods of psychological investigation and techniques of measurement, and their application and interpretation; and • design and implementation of psychological interventions.
5.1.12(b) **Ethical, Legal and Professional Matters**	The ethical, legal and professional aspects of psychological practice. Demonstrated capabilities: • Familiarity with legal and professional matters including: o the main provisions of the State and Commonwealth Acts and Regulations of Parliament relevant to psychologists' work; o codes of conduct relevant to psychologists' work including those published by relevant psychologist Registration Board(s); o the Australian Psychological Society's Code of Ethics and Ethical Guidelines; o confidentiality and privacy issues; o administrative and record keeping procedures (including adequate clarification of any financial arrangements); o consent issues; o issues concerning practice with minors and those unable to provide informed consent; o boundary issues; o sexual propriety; o psycho-legal issues; o role and cultural issues, including issues for minority or marginalised groups; o gender and sexuality issues; o service needs of vulnerable groups in society; o registration issues; o advertising and public statements; o billing practices; o the role of the psychologist within the profession and the workplace; o the roles of other professions and the capacity to report to other professionals appropriately and to work collaboratively; o the propriety of relationships amongst psychologists, and between psychologists and other professionals, employers and clients; o the mechanisms for the resolution of conflict between psychologists and clients, colleagues, employers and other professionals;

	○ negotiated workplace agreements ○ note-taking and record keeping • Conduct or behaviour consistent with the legal requirements and codes of conduct relevant to psychologists, especially: ○ ethical and professional behaviour and manner ○ State, Territory and Federal Codes of Behaviour for Psychologists and statements of Clients' rights; ○ the Australian Psychological Society's Code of Ethics and Ethical Guidelines; ○ appropriately clarifying and negotiating the role and responsibilities as a trainee psychologist; ○ record keeping, including demonstrated knowledge of the ethical and legal implications of administrative and record keeping procedures including confidentiality; • Self-evaluation or self-assessment skills, including identification of the limits of one's professional competence; • Ability to apply ethical principles to ethical dilemmas.
5.1.12(c) **Psychological Assessment & Measurement**	The ongoing, interactive, and inclusive process that serves to describe, conceptualise, and predict relevant aspects of a client (be that client an organization, group or individual). Demonstrated capabilities: A strong level of skills and knowledge in conducting systematic psychological assessment using a wide range of assessment techniques, including: • the theoretical basis for the assessment techniques used in psychology; • knowledge of psychometric properties of psychological tests and the ability to use this knowledge to inform problem formulation; • test selection - ability to select appropriate assessment techniques and instruments with proper consideration of issues relating to reliability and validity; • test administration and interpretive skills, including experience in the skilled administration and interpretation of at least: ○ the current version of an individually administered adult or child test of intelligence (some examples of appropriate tests include - WISC IV, WAIS IV, WPPSI-III, Stanford-Binet V, Kaufman Adolescent and Adult Intelligence Test, Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Differential Ability Scales); ○ the current version of at least one major standardised test of personality (examples of appropriate tests include - 16PF, MMPI, CPI, OMNI, NEO-PI); ○ the current version of at least one specialised memory assessment (e.g. Wechsler Memory Scale, Wide Range Assessment of Memory and Learning); and ○ other tests, appropriate to the learning objectives of the course, which are based on empirically validated approaches and equivalent accuracy in the measurement of cognitive or behavioural functioning or an accurate measurement of aptitude, abilities or skills. • awareness of limitations of psychological tests with particular reference to notions of validity, reliability, and cultural issues; • proficiency in interviewing (structured and unstructured interviews,

	selection interviews, survey interviewing, history taking, clinical interviewing for diagnostic purposes and group-based interviewing); • systematic observation of behaviour involving both naturalistic and clinical observation and in using predetermined procedures for observing the behaviour of one or more persons; • knowledge of psychopathology and of diagnostic classification systems (including current versions of DSM and ICD); • assessment and diagnostic processes (selecting the appropriate assessment tool(s), administering the assessment tool(s), interpreting the assessment results, interviewing /micro counselling skills involved in the assessment process, problem formulation and hypothesis testing); • the ability to competently undertake a mental status examination; and • writing informed, succinct, valid and well organised reports.
5.1.12(d) **Intervention Strategies**	Activities that promote, restore, sustain or enhance cognitive functioning and a sense of well being in individuals or groups of clients through preventive, developmental or remedial services and/or in the case of groups or organizations, restoring or enhancing group or organizational functioning. Demonstrated capabilities: Strong skills and knowledge regarding intervention strategies, including: • superior interpersonal skills (including the ability to form a professional relationship including positive working alliances with clients and colleagues); • ability to skilfully negotiate a treatment or service contract; • ability to use a theoretical system that explains aetiology and remediation of psychological, social or organizational problems; • ability to investigate identified issues relevant to the delivery of the interventions (e.g., ethical dilemmas, stakeholders); • ability to identify the nature and documented efficacy of potential interventions; • ability to design and/or plan preventative, developmental or remedial interventions to achieve the best possible outcomes; • formulation of treatment plans, goals and strategies for intervention including the ability to justify the link between diagnosis formulation and intervention chosen; • researching the empirical literature to develop plans for interventions and drawing on published studies and theories/models relevant to the problem and intervention; • justifying the link between diagnosis/formulation and the intervention chosen; • implementing preventative, developmental or remedial programs and interventions; • familiarity with a range in intervention techniques and strategies as well as their theoretical and empirical bases, for both individuals and groups; • counselling skills; • highly skilled use of core behaviour change skills including counselling and cognitive behavioural approaches to helping as appropriate in group individual or organizational settings; • organisational interventions; career development (i.e., helping with career planning in private or organisational contexts);

	• ability to design and implement evaluations of the impact of the interventions (including the ability to employ appropriate research designs to evaluate the effectiveness of psychological interventions) including: o measuring attitude and behaviour change o evaluation of a client's response to the initial intervention o revision of problem formulation and initial intervention if necessary o program evaluation
5.1.12(e) **Research and Evaluation**	(Note: See also Standards 5.3.11 – 5.3.16 for 5th and 6th year professional Masters research thesis requirements, and Standards 5.4.6 – 5.4.11 for professional Doctoral thesis requirements. 5th year Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology and Graduate Certificate or Diploma in Psychology courses are not required to have a research thesis but must cover this capability by means of other assignments or coursework). Systematic inquiry involving problem identification and the acquisition, organisation, and interpretation of information allowing critical analysis and disciplined, rigorous, careful and scientific inquiry into psychological phenomena. Demonstrated capabilities: The application of research knowledge and skills to psychological practice, including: • finding, understanding, collating and critiquing published empirical research findings relevant to a phenomenon or problem of interest; • identifying and defining problem situations based on observation and other assessment; • generating hypotheses based problem definition and other information; • designing interventions, therapeutic programs or other means to test hypotheses including an understanding of the principles of single case designs; • designing and implementing program evaluation; • collecting, recording, and analysing responses to interventions or therapeutic programs; • use of qualitative and quantitative methods, skilled analysis of data, and the ability to draw accurate research inferences • critical evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions and programs including: o suggesting modifications for future use and o awareness of issues regarding reliability and validity of observations.
5.1.12(f) **Communication and Interpersonal Relationships**	The capacity to convey, appraise and interpret information in both oral and written formats and to interact on a professional level with a wide range of client groups and other professionals, including: • the ability to establish and maintain constructive working relationships and in clinical settings therapeutic alliances with clients; • the ability to communicate, interact and liaise for a range of purposes (e.g., discussing research with other professionals; discussing relevant psychological services with clients, potential clients); • the ability to develop knowledge of theories and empirical data on professional relationships, such as: o interpersonal relationships;

	○ power relationships; ○ therapeutic alliance; ○ interface with social psychology; ○ more specific knowledge of the fluctuations of the therapeutic/professional relationship as a function of intervention setting; and Demonstrated capabilities: • high level oral communication and interpersonal skills in communicating effectively with clients, other psychologists, other professionals, the community; individuals, small groups and agencies from varied cultural, ethnic, religious, social and political backgrounds, including: ○ rapport building skills ○ professional personal presentation ○ clarity, accuracy, coherence, organisation and succinctness of communication ○ style of communication (appropriateness for audience) ○ organisation of communication ○ seeking out and understanding information ○ personal and professional boundaries in communications • seeking out, understanding and responding appropriately to information provided by a range of persons in order to adequately meet their needs; • excellent written communication, including the ability to write, in an organised fashion, reports and other documents: ○ which are informed, succinct, accurate, lucid and well-organised; ○ for a range of audiences, including educational, health and legal professionals, courts, government departments, insurance companies, corporations and other entities and which clearly communicate the intent of the writer taking into consideration the sensitivity of the matters under discussion and the capacity of the reader to accurately interpret the information

Core Capabilities assessment

5.1.13 No student must be permitted to graduate from the course without undergoing formal documented assessment of his/her competence, proficiency and professionalism in *each* of the core capabilities and attributes listed in Standard 5.1.12 (a-f).

5.1.14 No student must be permitted to graduate from the course unless he/she is assessed as having attained a sufficiently high level of competence, proficiency and professionalism in each of the core capabilities and attributes listed in Standard 5.1.12. Documented evidence of this assessment must be available for inspection by APAC.

5.1.15 The AOU must be able to provide clear documented evidence of the assessment procedures used to assess the competence, proficiency and professionalism of each student for each of the core capabilities and attributes listed in Standard 5.1.12 and in particular must be able to show the recorded outcomes of those assessment procedures for each student.

5.1.16 The AOU must require that the passing grade for each and every assessment task relating to the core capabilities and attributes listed in Standard 5.1.12 is never lower than 50%.

Log Book

5.1.17 On commencing the 5th year, every postgraduate professional coursework student must commence a single log book of practica, casework and supervision experiences. The log book must detail the nature and hours of all placement or other practica undertaken (internal and external), as well as the dates, nature and hours of supervision, with group supervision clearly differentiated from individual (ie one-on-one) supervision and the log book clearly specifying the nature of client work undertaken. Supervisors are required to regularly endorse, by signed notation, that the log book is a true reflection of the practica undertaken and log books must be available for inspection by APAC if requested during an audit or accreditation assessment. The log book should be carried over into the 6th and subsequent years of professional postgraduate training and a copy retained by the AOU for a period of ten years following the graduation of the student which can be inspected by APAC or the Registration Board on request. A final check of the log book must be a requirement of the course and this check must be confirmed by the signature of the/a primary supervisor on the log book itself.

Assessment

5.1.18 The assessment of coursework must ensure that students have gained a sound knowledge of all areas presented and must involve comprehensive documented examination of that knowledge.

5.1.19 In addition to the assessment procedures specified in Standards 5.1.13 to 5.1.16 and 5.1.17, and in keeping with the requirements at the undergraduate level, the Institution is expected to have in place procedures (e.g., Boards of Examiners) to ensure that standards are maintained and that all assessment and awarding of final marks or grades is treated with the utmost care and attention. In addition there must be clearly stated procedures for student appeals against unfair assessment, and for dealing with cases of plagiarism and other unethical conduct. Students must be required to pass each and every component of the course before the degree can be awarded.

5.2 Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology (5th year)

The Standards in this Section are additional requirements to those set out in Section 5 above (Standards 5.1–5.1.19).

The objective of the Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology is the provision of one year of full time education in the professional practice of psychology sufficient to prepare candidates for a final year of supervised internship in the field prior to registration. This education must:

- be at the foundational (professional) level, building and extending on the knowledge and skills of the APAC-accredited four-year undergraduate sequence;
- take an evidence-based approach and be based on the scientist-practitioner model;
- be broad and generalist (rather than specialist) in nature (note however, that inclusion of a limited number of specialist units is possible) and
- concentrate on the core professional capabilities outlined in these Standards (see Standard 5.1.12(a-f)).

Entry Requirements

5.2.1 Students accepted into a Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology course must have successfully completed a four year, or three year plus a fourth year, APAC-accredited sequence in psychology within the last 10 years, and be eligible for registration with the Registration Board as a conditional/provisional psychologist. An exception to this Standard may be made for currently registered psychologists who can demonstrate current compliance with Registration Board CPD requirements seeking to gain a professional postgraduate qualification.

5.2.2 Selection procedures should include consideration of each applicant's details as set out in an application form, referee reports from at least two referees, and the checking of

original degree certificates. It is required that the procedures should also include interviews for shortlisted candidates, either face-to-face or via teleconferencing, by a panel comprising at least two members of academic staff of the AOU, one of whom has qualifications equivalent to those required for full membership of the APS.

Length

5.2.3 The length of Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology courses must be one calendar year of full-time study or the equivalent.

Course Structure

5.2.4 At least 90% of the coursework must comprise study in psychology and be taught by psychologists, with any portion of the course that is not psychological or taught by psychologists being in an area of direct relevance to professional practice as a psychologist.

5.2.5 There must be two main components in the course: (1) coursework and (2) practica. The course must be structured so that the learning experiences across the coursework and practica components are clearly integrated.

5.2.6 The two components must be weighted according to content and the Institution's required unit weightings, so that each falls within the following specified ranges:

Coursework	60-75%
Practica & skills training	25-40%

The percentages are estimated by a matrix including the credit point value of the units, the number of hours spent per unit and the relative value of the unit to the total course and this matrix should be available for inspection by APAC accreditation assessors.

Coursework

5.2.7 The coursework component of the course must include foundational education and training in the core capabilities and attributes listed in Standard 5.1.12(a-f) and should link with the practical and skills training components of the course.

Practica and skills training

5.2.8 There should be provision for education and training in practical professional skills and knowledge within the course which should primarily be aimed at adequately preparing the student for a future 6th year of Registration Board approved supervision before registration.

5.2.9 The content of the practica should be of a nature which supports the achievement of the capabilities set down in Standard 5.1.12 and, in addition to supervised placement experience with psychological issues, can include, but not be limited to, role playing and skills practice, simulated learning environments, observation of supervisors working with clients and case analysis.

5.2.10 Students in the Graduate Diploma of Professional Psychology must complete a minimum of 300 hours of logged supervised practica and skills training.

5.2.11 There must be adequate education and training in professional skills and knowledge, including ethical decision making for the practitioner, within the course for all students prior to beginning their first placement. In addition, there should be ongoing class contact with students that relates to and builds on their placement experiences.

5.2.12 All reports and casenotes written by the student and arising from training undertaken as part of any placement must bear the signature of the responsible supervisor.

5.2.13 Supervision of the placement component should involve on average one hour of direct contact for each full day (7.5 hours) of placement. Direct contact may include telephone or video conference contact.

5.2.14 Ideally, the placement should occur within the AOU itself and be supervised by suitably qualified academic staff (see standard 5.1.3).

5.2.15 Any placements external to the AOU and not supervised by an academic member of staff must be supervised by a field supervisor who is formally recognised by the AOU offering the course and who holds current registration as a psychologist with the relevant Psychologist Registration Board. Each field supervisor should submit a brief curriculum vitae with details of his or her qualifications and relevant experience for consideration by the course coordinator. These must be held on file in the AOU and be available for inspection by APAC if requested during an audit or accreditation assessment.

5.2.16 A member of staff from the AOU who holds qualifications at a level clearly making him/her eligible for membership of the APS, and who is registered as a psychologist with the relevant Psychologist Registration Board should be appointed as practica and skills training coordinator and should have the responsibility for liaising directly with field supervisors and for ensuring that students have appropriate placement experiences.

5.2.17 Prior to the placement the student and supervisor must complete and sign a supervision contract stating the objectives for the placement including the range of activities to be covered and the skill base to be developed.

5.2.18 At the end of the placement the supervisor must complete a final assessment of the students performance. That information, together with an assessment of the student's performance on the other components of the practica and skills training undertaken, will be used to assess whether or not the student has acquired the required professional skills and knowledge. The final decision regarding whether the student has passed or failed the placement should be made by the placement coordinator in full consultation with the field supervisor.

5.3 Fifth and Sixth Year Masters Courses of Professional Education

The Standards in this Section are additional to those set out in Section 5 (Standards 5.1 – 5.1.19), which also apply.

Entry Requirements

5.3.1 Students accepted into a fifth and sixth year Masters course must have successfully completed a four year, or three year plus a fourth year, APAC-accredited sequence in psychology, within the last 10 years, with an upper second class Honours (2A) or equivalent overall mark, and be eligible for registration with the psychologist Registration Board as a conditional/provisional psychologist. An exception to this Standard may be made for currently registered psychologists who can demonstrate current compliance with Registration Board CPD requirements seeking to gain a professional postgraduate qualification.

5.3.2 Selection procedures must conform to the requirements set out in Standard 5.2.2, with the additional requirement that selection panels for candidates being selected into Masters and Doctoral postgraduate professional programs should include a staff member who has qualifications clearly equivalent to those required for membership of the APS College relevant to any area of specialisation of the course.

Length

5.3.3 The length of coursework Masters courses must be two calendar years (eight semesters) of full-time study or the equivalent part-time study. Where the course can be undertaken in an accelerated mode, the minimum length of the course must be no less than 18 months in duration.

5.3.4 The length of a doctoral course which includes the equivalent of the fifth and sixth year education and training and leads to a PhD should be a minimum of four calendar years of full-time study or the part-time equivalent.

Course Structure

5.3.5 At least 70% of the coursework must comprise study in psychology and be taught by psychologists, and any portion of the course that is not psychological must be in an area of direct relevance to the particular specialisation. In this context it is recognised that other subjects and skills may form an essential part of a professional education and training course. For example, knowledge of educational systems may be an essential part of the education and training of educational psychologists and knowledge of management and organisations may be an essential part of the education and training of organisational psychologists. APS College Course Approval guidelines are a useful source of guidance in this regard.

5.3.6 There must be three main components in the course: coursework, research and practical placement. The course must be structured so that the learning experiences across these three components are integrated.

5.3.7 For Masters level courses, the three components must be weighted according to content and the Institution's required unit weightings, so that each falls within the following specified ranges:

- Coursework 40-50%
- Research 20-33% (The dissertation should be at an equivalent standard to Honours)
- Practical placement 25-30%

The percentages are estimated by a matrix including the credit point value of the units, the number of hours spent per unit and the relative value of the unit to the total course. The matrix must be available on request for inspection by APAC assessors. For Masters courses, all coursework prescribed by the relevant APS College must be covered if APS College Course Approval is to be attained. The dissertation must be equivalent to an Honours standard and there should be a minimum of 1000 hours of supervised placement. In a PhD course, the research component should carry a weight of 67% while the time spent on coursework and practica should be no less than that which is required in the relevant coursework Masters course.

5.3.8 There must be evidence that Students are required to pass each of the three components in order to successfully complete the degree.

Coursework

5.3.9 In addition to specialist content, all courses must;

(a) address all of the core capabilities outlined in Standard 5.1.12;
(b) cover the current version of the *National Practice Standards for the Mental Health Workforce;*
(c) include considerable depth of teaching in practice management, storing and accessing psychology files and record keeping and
(d) managing people.

5.3.10 The coursework component should clearly link with both the research and practical placement components. It is recognised that some areas of knowledge and some of the skills will be acquired in conjunction with these other components. However, there should be documentary evidence that the knowledge and skills specified in 5.3.9, as well as those specifically related to any area of specialisation, are taught in the coursework component. It is not sufficient, for example, to allow the administration and interpretation of complex psychometric instruments to be learned only while the student is on a placement.

Research

5.3.11 The research project should be conducted in an area of relevance to any area of specialisation of the course and must have as its central focus the scientific analysis of a problem.

5.3.12 The research project can be undertaken under supervision as an individual or a group project. As students will have completed a major research project previously, they should be demonstrating greater independence than at the fourth year level. The project must be designed so that each student is required to undertake all of the steps involved in conducting an empirical investigation or enquiry, including:

- review of the relevant scientific literature;
- the formulation of a research question or questions (or in the case of a literature review and a paper for publication, explication of a model or theoretical proposition);
- the design of an appropriate rigorous scientific method for investigating the question;
- the collection and analysis of data; and
- the interpretation of findings and the preparation of a report.

5.3.13 The research project must take the form of one or more of the following:

- a program evaluation study;
- a study based on experimental single case design;
- a critical review, pilot study and full grant application;
- a critical review and a meta analysis;
- a critical review and secondary data analyses;
- a traditional empirical research project; or
- a literature review and an article suitable for submission to a peer-reviewed international scientific journal

and the total length of the project report must be no less than 5000 words. Data collected for the project must be available for inspection by APAC.

5.3.14 The research project may be supervised either solely or jointly, but in all cases at least one supervisor must be an academic member of staff from the AOU presenting the course, and at least one supervisor should hold doctoral qualifications.

5.3.15 In the case of Masters students intending to upgrade their enrolment to a professional doctoral degree (i.e., DPsych or equivalent), the research component must be of high quality and reflect the fact that the student will be enrolling in a degree at the doctoral level. Further, doctoral degrees must have a research component which consists of at least the equivalent of one year full-time spent on the thesis component of the course (see Standards 2.3.11 and 5.4.4).

5.3.16 The final classification of the thesis must be decided by the appropriate Committee or other body within the Institution, based on the examiners' reports.

Practical Placements

5.3.17 There must be adequate education and training in professional skills and knowledge, including ethics, within the course for all students prior to beginning their first placement. In addition, there should be ongoing class contact with students that relates to and builds on their placement experiences.

5.3.18 For a Masters, or combined Masters/PhD degree, each student must complete a minimum of 1000 hours of supervised practical placement experience. This experience must be of a nature appropriate to an area of specialisation covered by the course, with the expectation that many placement opportunities would be in agencies which would be future potential employers of psychologists who have the particular specialisation. Generalist courses, or those specialist areas which are just developing, must ensure a range of suitable professional placements are undertaken. Specific APS Course Approval requirements (where applicable) should be met.

5.3.19 Practical placements must provide students with experience and skill development in a range of settings. Placements must include casework which involves face-to-face work with clients (individuals, groups or organisations as appropriate to the course). Face-to face work is defined as real time verbal communication in the presence of client(s) in the room with the trainee or interacting with the trainee by means of videoconference technology where there is a real time image of the each of the parties, including a clear

view of facial expressions. While casework with clients by means of other electronic media or use of simulation is permissible, face-to-face casework must never be less than 66% of the total casework undertaken as part of the course. There must be at least three different practical placements in different settings, with at least two of these being external to the AOU offering the course.

5.3.20 One placement in each course conducted within the AOU itself and supervised by suitably qualified academic staff (see standard 5.1.3) is encouraged as long as the facilities provide practical experience with "real life" issues (e.g., a psychology clinic within the AOU itself where the public receive services). A log book of casework and supervision must be maintained by each student as outlined in Standard 5.1.17. Supervisors are also required to endorse, by signed notation, that the log book is a true reflection of each placement.

5.3.21 All external placements must be supervised by a field supervisor who is formally recognised by the AOU institution offering the course. Each field supervisor must submit a brief curriculum vitae with details of his or her qualifications and relevant experience for consideration by the course coordinator. These must be held on file in the AOU and be available for inspection by APAC if requested during an audit or accreditation assessment.

5.3.22 All reports and case notes written by the student arising from training undertaken as part of any internal or external placement must bear the signature of the responsible supervisor.

5.3.23 All field supervisors should be members or hold qualifications which make them eligible for membership of the appropriate APS College, or of an APS College for supervision for a generalist course, and additionally, should have at least two years relevant full-time experience as a psychologist, following the award of their postgraduate psychology degree. All field supervisors must also hold current full registration as a psychologist with the Registration Board in the supervisor's country of principal residence.

5.3.24 In instances where there is an appropriate placement opportunity but the requirements stated in Standard 5.3.23 cannot be met, then a staff member from the Institution meeting the requirements stated in Standard 5.1.3 should be assigned the responsibility for the placement in conjunction with a member of staff at the agency. (Note this should only occur during one practical placement and must constitute no more than 30% of a student's total placement experience for that course. In addition, if the student is also completing a placement within the AOU, the supervising staff member must be a different person in each case).

5.3.25 Supervision of all placements must involve one hour of direct contact for each full day of placement (7.5 hrs). Direct contact supervision may include telephone, video conference or other electronic forms of real-time interaction, as long as the total percentage of supervision conducted by such electronic means across all casework units is never greater than 40% for any given student. Additionally, APS College Approval Guidelines for distance supervision should be met. Where supervision comprises a mix of individual and small group formats, no less than 50% can be individual supervision. For specific details see the APS College Course Approval Guidelines.

5.3.26 A member of staff from the AOU who is a member, or can clearly demonstrate eligibility for membership, of an APS College or the appropriate specialist APS College, must be appointed as placement coordinator and should have the responsibility for liaising directly with all field supervisors and for ensuring that students have an appropriate range of placement experiences.

5.3.27 At the beginning of each placement the student and supervisor must complete and sign a supervision contract stating the objectives for the placement including the range of activities to be covered and the skill base to be developed. This form should be approved and signed by the placement coordinator.

5.3.28 Once approximately half the placement has been completed, an interim review should be conducted which involves the student and supervisor reviewing progress, the student's performance and the extent to which the placement objectives are being met. A copy of this review should be given to the placement coordinator and any action that is required as a result should be taken. Placement reviews must be held on file by the AOU and be made available for inspection by APAC if requested.

5.3.29 At the end of the placement the supervisor must complete a final assessment and make a recommendation whether the student has completed the placement to an acceptable level, whether further time should be spent on that placement because the student has not yet met requirements, or whether the student has failed to meet the required standards and is not likely to do so with further work. The final decision regarding whether the student has passed or failed the placement should be made by the placement coordinator in full consultation with the field supervisor.

5.3.30 No more than 33% of external placement may be undertaken at any workplace where the student is employed.

5.4 Professional Doctorates

The requirements in this Section apply to all professional doctoral degrees and are additional to the requirements set out in Sections 5.1 – 5.1.19, which also apply.

The primary objective of the professional doctorate should be to provide an education in the professional practice of psychology and in applied psychological research. This education and training should be clearly evidence-based and founded on the scientist-practitioner model. Taking account of the nature of the discipline and its applications to professional practice, education in psychology at this level should include full coverage and mastery of the general knowledge and skills required by psychological practitioners as well as advanced knowledge of the area of specialisation/s of the course. This should occur through the integration of coursework, research and practical placement experience.

These standards for accreditation set the requirements that must be met by all courses in order to establish and maintain high standards. In addition, as the accreditation of a course providing professional education and training will be accompanied by a process of assessment for approval by the appropriate APS College (where one exists for a particular specialisation), the APS Course Approval Guidelines for each APS College should be read in conjunction with the standards in this section. It is highly desirable that a degree course with a specialisation reflected in the title that is accredited by APAC also meets the relevant APS College Course Approval Guidelines and achieves course approval by the APS, so that upon completion of the course requirements, the student should be eligible for full membership of the appropriate APS College(s).

APAC will accredit professional doctorate degrees with dual specialisations where it can be clearly demonstrated that the course has the capacity to meet all the requirements of coursework, placement and research for two separate APS Colleges according to the relevant APS College Course Approval Guidelines.

Entry Requirements

The entry requirements are the same as set out in Standards 5.3.1 and 5.3.2.

Length

5.4.1 The length of a doctoral course that leads to a PsyD or DPsych should be a minimum of three calendar years of full-time study or the part-time equivalent.

Course Structure

5.4.2 At least 90% of the coursework must comprise study in psychology and be taught by psychologists, with any portion of the course that is not psychological being in an area of direct relevance to the particular specialisation. In this context it is recognised that other subjects and skills may form an essential part of a professional training course. For example, knowledge of educational systems may be an essential part of the education and training of educational psychologists and knowledge of management and organisations may be an essential part of the education and training of organisational psychologists. Refer to APS College Course Approval Guidelines for further detail regarding specialist content.

5.4.3 There should be three main components in the course: coursework, research and practical placement. The course must be structured so that the learning experiences

across these three components are integrated. Students must be required to pass all three components in order to complete the course.

5.4.4 For DPsych or PsyD courses, the following structure should apply:

* **Coursework:** The amount and spread of coursework meets: (1) all of that as set out in Standard 5.3.7; (2) the relevant APS College Course Approval Guidelines and (3) in addition, the DPsych/PsyD includes additional coursework of greater depth and/or breadth than is generally found in a Masters coursework degree (note that this additional work may be introduced following the fifth and sixth years or integrated across the three year course).
* **Practicum:** Students should undertake 1500 hours of supervised practicum. The additional 500 hours of practicum must involve supervision which emphasises a higher level of autonomy and responsibility, and a higher level integration of theory and practice. Reference should be made to the APS Course Approval Guidelines of the relevant APS College/s to ensure appropriate placement experiences. Training in supervision will also feature during the final year of study, either as part of the advanced practicum work, or as part of advanced coursework, or some combination of both.
* **Thesis or Dissertation:** The thesis or dissertation must be of high quality and reflect the fact that this is a doctoral level degree. Further, these degrees are expected to consist of a research component that requires at least the equivalent of one year full-time work spent on the thesis component of the course (see Standard 2.3.12). The thesis topic should be relevant to any specialist aspects of the degree, and both examiners should be external to the Institution. Where a thesis is being submitted as part of a course of study that is designed to meet two specialist streams, examiners should be selected with expertise that ensures both areas are adequately examined.

5.4.5 Students must be required to pass each of the three components as set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 in order to complete the course.

Coursework

Standards 5.3.9 – 5.3.10 must be met.

Research

5.4.6 The research project must require an empirical research thesis and should be conducted in an area of relevance to the area of specialisation/s of the course.

5.4.7 The research project must involve an individual project conducted under supervision. As students will have completed a major research project previously, they should be demonstrating greater independence than at fourth year level, while working under supervision.

5.4.8 The project should be structured so that students undertake all of the steps involved in the research including the formulation of the research question(s), the design of the study including the selection of appropriate methodology, the collection and analysis of data, the interpretation of the findings and preparation of the report.

5.4.9 The research project may be supervised either solely or jointly, but in all cases at least one supervisor must be an academic member of staff from the AOU presenting the course, and both supervisors should hold doctoral qualifications.

5.4.10 The examination for a thesis completed as part of a professional doctoral degree (i.e., DPsych or equivalent) should be conducted by at least two examiners external to the Institution with qualifications at least equivalent to the degree being examined.

5.4.11 The final classification should be decided by the appropriate Committee or other body within the Institution, based on the examiners' reports.

Practical Placements

Standards 5.3.17 – 5.3.30 must be met.

Credit for Previous Experience

5.4.12 In addition to the requirement that Standards 5.1.9 – 5.1.11 are met, entry to a DPsych/PsyD degree with advanced standing resulting from the prior award of a Masters coursework degree in the same professional area should be possible. However, the candidate must be required to complete a new thesis, equivalent in standard to that required for the DPsych/PsyD. Credit should only be granted for coursework that can be demonstrated to be equivalent in terms of content and depth of study to the DPsych/PsyD subjects and undertaken preferably in the last 5 years. Although such credit may be granted, the course of study should include at least 18 months of full-time study or its equivalent and a minimum of 50% of the total course content, including the thesis, additional 500 practicum hours and any DPsych/PsyD coursework subjects for which credit cannot be awarded.

5.5 Graduate Certificate or Diploma in Psychology (Area of Specialisation) (GCP)

The Graduate Certificate or Diploma in Psychology (GCP or GDP) offers additional education and training for a psychologist who is already eligible for membership of an APS college and has completed an accredited professional postgraduate coursework degree to accumulate coursework and study which might assist when applying for membership of another APS college, or for other professional purposes.

Entry Requirements

5.5.1 Students accepted into the Graduate Certificate or Diploma must meet the following three criteria:

(i) a postgraduate professional degree in a specified accredited specialisation and eligibility for or full membership of the college of that specialization;

(ii) the original postgraduate training must have provided at least 500 hours of supervised practice appropriate and relevant to practise in the specialty area of the second or additional college; and

(iii) the original postgraduate thesis must be appropriate to the area of the second or additional college

Length

5.5.2 The course must be a minimum of one year part-time.

Course Structure

There are two components to the course: practicum and coursework.

Practicum

5.5.3 500 hours of relevant placement experience supervised by psychologist(s) who are members of the second or additional college. This additional supervised practice should be in parallel/be linked to additional coursework.

5.5.4 The placement should be consistent with standards 5.3.17 – 5.3.30

Coursework

5.5.5 All coursework required for the second or additional specialty must be covered either in the original postgraduate training in psychology, or by additional units in the GCP. The additional coursework must include the equivalent of at least four semester-long units covering knowledge, competencies, and skills in the new specialty and include placement requirements.

SECTION 6 HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH (HDR) PROGRAMS

This section refers to research higher degree programs with a duration of two or more years of full-time study, or equivalent. These degrees may be research Masters degrees or research Doctorates with the title Doctor of Philosophy.

Such programs are not specifically accredited for the purpose of registration as a psychologist or membership of the APS, however the inclusion of research higher degree programs is regarded as important to the fostering of a milieu of scholarly scientific endeavour and for the education of research psychologists. Research topics vary in their relevance to psychology and some may have insufficient psychological content to permit registration as a psychologist or membership of the APS.

The AOU must demonstrate that it has sufficient qualified staff to provide adequate supervision and teaching across all research and professional programs offered, irrespective of whether they are all being put forward for accreditation.

SECTION 7 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Example of site visit agenda

Institution: (Name of Institution)
Date: (Date/s of AOU Review)
Address: (Address of School and location of Psychology Department)

DAY ONE

Time	Description
9:00am – 9:45am	Venue: Meeting with Head of Department
9:45am – 10:15am	Inspection of laboratories, libraries, online facilities, etc.
10:15am – 11:15am	Venue: Meeting with undergraduate teaching staff
11:15am – 11:45am	Venue: Morning tea and inspection of undergraduate work samples
11:45am – 12:45pm	Venue: Meeting with undergraduate students
12:45pm – 1:30pm	Venue: (To be held away from student meetings.) Lunch with staff
1:30pm – 2:30pm	Venue: Meeting with fourth year students
2:30pm – 3:00pm	Venue: Afternoon tea and inspection of fourth year work samples
3:00pm – 4:00pm	Venue: Meeting with fourth year teaching staff
4:00pm – 4:20pm	Venue: Meeting with administrative and technical staff
4:20pm – 4:40pm	Venue: Meeting with Postgraduate Research Students
4:40pm – 5:00pm	Venue: Meeting with the Departmental Research Coordinator
5:00pm	Venue: Assessment Team Meeting

DAY TWO

Time	Description – Please provide separate venues for each College specialisation	
	Specialisation 1	Specialisation 2
8:30am – 9:00am	Venue: Assessment Team Meeting	
9:00am – 9:30am	Inspection of test library and Psychology Clinic.	
9:30am – 10:00am	Venue: Meeting with Psychology Clinic Coordinator (where relevant)	Venue: Meeting with course convenor (where the Clinic is not relevant)
10:00am – 10:45am	Venue: Morning tea and inspection of coursework Masters/Doctoral work samples	
10:45am – 11:45am	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral staff	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral staff
11:45am – 12:45pm	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral fieldwork supervisors	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral fieldwork supervisors
12:45pm – 1:30pm	Venue: Lunch with staff and fieldwork supervisors	
1:30pm – 2:30pm	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral students	Venue: Meeting with coursework Masters/Doctoral students
2:30pm – 3:30pm	Venue: Afternoon tea, Assessment Team Meeting and any required follow up meetings.	
3:30pm – 4:00pm	Venue: Meeting with the Head of Department	
4:00pm – 4:30pm	Venue: Meeting with the Vice Chancellor or his/her nominee	

DAY THREE

Time	Description
8:30am – 12:30pm	Venue: Assessment Team to draft assessment report. Head of Department and course coordinators should be available for consultation.
12:30pm – 1:00pm	Lunch
1:00pm	Venue: Assessment Team to draft assessment report.

Appendix 2 - References

American Psychological Association (2008) *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology*. APA Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation, Washington, DC, Author.

Australian Medical Council (2002). *Assessment and accreditation of Medical Schools: Standards and procedures*. Kingston, Author.

Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (2008). *Rules for Accreditation and Accreditation Standards for Psychology Courses*. Melbourne, Author.

Australian Psychological Society (2008). *Professional Practice Handbook*. Accessed from: http://www.psychology.org.au/prac_resources/pphandbook/ on 12/02/09.

Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing *(2002). National Practice Standards for the Mental Health Workforce*, endorsed by the AHMAC National Mental Health Working Group, Canberra, Author.

Commonwealth of Australia. (n.d.). Country Education Profiles (CEP) Online. Retrieved 13/03/09, from http://aei.gov.au/AEI/CEP/Default.htm .

Consortuim for Accreditation in Higher Education, (2004). *Accreditation in the European Higher Education Area*. Document accessed on 20/10/08 from www.aic.lv/ace/ace_disk/Bologna/contrib/Statem_oth/ECA_on_Bergen.pdf.

Dunn, D.S. et al (2007). Quality benchmarks in undergraduate psychology programs. *American Psychologist, 62(7)*, 650-670.

Epstein, R.M. and Hundert, E.M. (2002). Defining and assessing professional competence. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 287(2)*, 226-235.

Europa Publications. (2010). The Europa World of Learning (60th ed.). London: Routledge.

European Federation of Professional Psychologists Associations (2006). *EuroPsy – the European Certificate in Psychology*. London, Author.

Hall, J.E. and Altmaier, E.M. (2008). *Global Promise: Quality Assurance and Accountability in Professional Psychology*. New York, Oxford University Press.

International Standards Organisation (2005). *Conformity assessment – General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies ISO/IEC 17011*. Geneva, ISO.

Kaslow, N.J. e al (2007). Guiding principles and recommendations for the assessment of competence. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38(5)*, 441-451.

McDaniel, S.H. et al (2002). A training curriculum for professional psychologists in primary care. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33(1)*, 65-72.

New South Wales Psychologist Registration Board (2008). *Supervision Guidelines*. Sydney, Author.

New Zealand Psychologists Board (2008). *Standards and Procedures for the Accreditation of Qualifications Leading to Registration as a Psychologist in New Zealand*. Wellington, Author.

New Zealand Psychologists Board (2006). *Core competencies for the practice of psychology in New Zealand*. Wellington, Author.

Psychologists Board of Queensland (2008). *Supervision guidelines: Guidelines for the supervision program for probationary registrants and supervisors*. Brisbane, Author.

Psychologists Registration Board of Victoria (2005). *Supervision Program: Guidelines for Provisional Psychologists and Supervisors*. Melbourne, Author.

Roe, R. A. (2002). What makes a competent psychologist? *The European Psychologist, 7(3)*, 192-203.

Shaw, C.D. (2004). *Toolkit for Accreditation Programs.* International Society for Quality in Health Care, East Melbourne, ISQA.

World Health Organisation (2005). *WHO/WFME Guidelines for Accreditation of Basic Medical Education*, Geneva/Copenhagen.

RECEIVED
MAR 0 1 2013
By

For consideration of the Education Committee of the Board of Psychology, State of Oregon

A greeting, my name is Donna Sperry. I have been a successfully practicing Master's level licensed Psychologist in the State of Michigan since 1992. When I moved to Oregon a few years ago, I discovered one additional requirement for licensure in Oregon, the EPPP exam. While this is a standard exam to demonstrate competence as a Psychologist its' material is primarily geared toward PHD level Psychologists.

In many states, including Michigan, the EPPP is not a requirement because Master level licensed Psychologists have not had the same training as PHD Psychologists, usually have to be supervised by a PHD Psychologist and typically are not allowed the reimbursement luxuries as PHD Psychologist, for example Medicare.

I am enclosing a copy of the EPPP passing score requirements by jurisdiction and license type. I have indicated by an orange mark the title of the license equivalent to the Psychologist Associate in Oregon and the EPPP passing score or where an N/A is indicated, the test is not required for licensure. I am also enclosing a downloaded copy of the ASCPPB's website informational section regarding recommended passing scores.

In reviewing this document with the exception of Canada there are only one other states, Indiana and Massachusetts also the Virgin Islands which require a passing score of 500. Other states range from 350 to 450 with the majority setting 450 as the passing score. In addition, ASPPB's own recommended passing score requirement (even for a PHD) is 500 if practicing independently and 450 if supervised, although each Psychology Board certainly has jurisdiction to determine what score, if any is appropriate. Therefore, I am respectfully requesting that you consider lowering the passing score on the EPPP for Psychologist Associates to a maximum of 450.

If you have any questions or comments, I would be glad to speak with you. I also thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I can be reached at (503) 798-3567 or georsp@yahoo.com.

Sincerely

Donna Sperry

EPPP Passing Score Requirements By Jurisdiction & License Type

Disclaimer: All information contained in this database was collected directly from our membership of psychology licensing boards and is provided to the Handbook user by ASPPB for reference purposes. The information provided in the Handbook is subject to change at any time. For the most up-to-date licensing requirements, please contact the licensing board directly. If you have specific questions or concerns regarding licensure and certification, please contact your board of psychology directly.

Last Modified: 8/21/2012 10:59:10 AM

Select a Jurisdiction

Alabama

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB recommended passing score for psychologists
Psychological Technician	scaled score of 400

Alaska

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500 or higher on the computerized version or 70% or higher on non-computerized version.
Licensed Psychological Associate	450 or higher on the computerized version or 60% or higher on the non-computerized version.

Alberta

License Title	Passing Score
Registered Psychologist	500
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	500
Temporary License	N/A

Arizona

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	70 percent on the written examination or a scaled score of 500 on the computer-based examination

Arkansas

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Psychological Examiner	450
Other	450

British Columbia

License Title	Passing Score
Registered Psychologist	140/200 or a scaled score 500/800
Other	140/200 or a scaled score 500/800

California

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Scaled score of 500.
Registered Psychologist	N/A
Registered Psychological Assistant	N/A

Colorado

License Title	Passing Score
Registered Psychologist	Pass/Fail
Psychologist Associate - Independent	
Psychologist Associate - Supervised Practice	

Connecticut

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500

Delaware

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB Passing Score (75% correct).
Registered Psychological Assistant	N/A

District of Columbia

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500

Florida

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Doctoral Limited License	N/A
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	N/A

Georgia

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB passing score.

Hawaii

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	A score of not less than the national average raw score (rounded up to the nearest whole integer if a fraction is reported) of all Ph.D. candidates sitting for the examination for the first time shall be passing for the EPPP written examination.

Idaho

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500

Illinois

License Title	Passing Score
Clinical Psychologist	ASPPB Pass Point

Indiana

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	Scaled score of 500.
Health Service Provider in Psychology	Scaled Score of 500.

Iowa

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Adopts the EPPP recommended scoring (scaled passing score of 500 currently).
Health Service Provider in Psychology	Adopts the EPPP recommended scoring (scaled passing score of 500 currently). (450 supervised)

Kansas

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	70%

Kentucky

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Scaled score of 500.
Licensed Psychological Practitioner	Scaled Score of 500.
Licensed Psychological Associate	Scaled score of 400.

Louisiana

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	minimum of 70% or 500 scaled

Maine

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	70%
Psychological Examiner	65% (45?)

Manitoba

License Title	Passing Score
Registered Psychologist	500
Psychologist Associate - Independent	500
Psychologist Associate - Supervised Practice	500

Maryland

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	Scaled score of 500.

Massachusetts

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500
Psychologist- Provider	500

Michigan

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Doctoral Limited License	N/A
Masters Limited License	N/A
Temporary Limited License	N/A

Minnesota

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Scaled score of 500 on computerized version 70% on pencil and paper version

Mississippi

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB-recommended passing score (National Scaled Score) of 500 which is approximately 70% correct.

Missouri

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	N/A

Montana

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	Scaled score of 500

Nebraska

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Have passed the national standardized examination with a minimum score at the national pass score for all doctoral candidates
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	N/A
Psychological Assistant	N/A
Psychologist Associate - Supervised	N/A
Temporary License	N/A

Nevada

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Scaled score of 500
Other	N/A

New Brunswick

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	N/A
Psychological Candidate	500

New Hampshire

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	70% on paper and pencil exam 500 on computerized exam

New Jersey

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	Established by ASPPB at the time of examination.

New Mexico

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	To qualify for licensure, an applicant must demonstrate professional competence by taking and passing a written examination called the EPPP, promulgated by ASPPB. The passing score on the EPPP taken before January 1,1993 is 140 (70%) or taken after January 1, 1993 is the score equal to or greater than the passing score recommended by ASPPB.

Psychologist Associate - Supervised	To qualify for licensure, an applicant must demonstrate professional competence by taking and passing a written examination called the EPPP, promulgated by ASPPB. The passing score on the EPPP taken before January 1,1993 is 140 (70%) or taken after January 1, 1993 is the score equal to or greater than the passing score recommended by ASPPB. (450)
Other	N/A
Other	N/A

New York

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	Converted score of at least 75 as determined by the State Board for Psychology.

Newfoundland and Labrador

License Title	Passing Score
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	500
Registered Psychologist	

North Carolina

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	500
Licensed Psychological Associate	440

North Dakota

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Other	500
Other	bacb exam required
Other	bacb exam or EPPP at 450

Nova Scotia

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	70% - 500
Other	70% - 500

Ohio

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	70% on written exam 500 scaled on computer-based exam

School Psychologist	N/A

Oklahoma

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB Pass point

Ontario

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist - Autonomous Practice	500
Psychologist - Interim Autonomous Practice	Left to the initial licensing jurisdiction
Psychologist - Supervised Practice	500
Psychologist Associate - Autonomous Practice	500
Psychologist Associate - Interim Autonomous Practice	Left to the initial licensing jurisdiction
Psychologist Associate - Supervised Practice	500

Oregon

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500
Psychologist Associate - Supervised	500
Psychologist Associate - Independent	500
Other	

Pennsylvania

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500

Prince Edward Island

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	
Psychologist - Supervised Practice	

Puerto Rico

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	N/A

Quebec

License Title	Passing Score
There is no information for this jurisdiction at this time. Please try again later.	

Rhode Island

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	ASPPB passing score.
Temporary Practice Permit	

Saskatchewan

License Title	Passing Score
Registered Psychologist	500 or higher
Other	500 or higher
Other	500 or higher

South Carolina

License Title	Passing Score
Licensed Psychologist	500 scaled score

South Dakota

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB passing score.

Tennessee

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	500
Other	400
Psychological Assistant	N/A

Texas

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist - Doctorate	500
Provisionally Licensed Psychologist	500
Licensed Psychological Associate	350
Licensed Specialist in School Psychology	N/A

Utah

License Title	Passing Score
Psychologist	ASPPB Recommended Passing Score
Resident	N/A

Vermont	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Psychologist - Doctorate	ASPPB passing score.
Psychologist- Master	ASPPB passing Score. (450) Supervised

Virgin Islands	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Psychologist	500
Psychologist Associate - Supervised	500

Virginia	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Clinical Psychologist	EPPP recomended pass. (452 supervised)
Applied Psychologist	EPPP recommended pass
School Psychologist	EPPP recomended pass

Washington	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Licensed Psychologist	The cutoff score which the Washington state board of examiners uses is 70% of the raw score, or the national mean of all first time doctorates, whichever is the lowest.

West Virginia	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Licensed Psychologist	500
School Psychologist	N/A
School Psychologist Independent Practice	N/A

Wisconsin	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Licensed Psychologist	500

Wyoming	
License Title	**Passing Score**
Psychologist	Every applicant for licensure must achieve a passing score of at least 70 percent or a scaled score of 500 on the examination.
Specialist in School Psychology	N/A
Psychological Practitioner	ASPPB recommended passing score for supervised practice (452)

> How soon will I get my score?
> Examination Feedback to Candidates
> Recommended Passing Score
> ASPPB EPPP Score Transfer Service

What is a scaled score and what is the passing score? The scaled scores utilized by ASPPB are an arithmetic conversion of raw scores (the number of questions a candidate answers correctly) to a scale that ranges from 200 to 800. One reason for converting raw scores to scaled scores is that forms (versions) of the examination may vary slightly in their level of difficulty: A score on one form of the examination may not be comparable to the same raw score on another form of the examination. To ensure that scores on different forms of the examination have the same meaning and that pass points represent the same level of difficulty, raw scores on different forms are equated and then converted to scaled scores that represent equivalent levels of achievement regardless of the test form taken. For example, while the ASPPB recommended passing scores of 500 for independent practice and 450 for supervised practice do not change, the number of questions that have to be answered correctly to achieve a passing score can change. If a form of the examination is easier than the form on which the passing score was set, more questions would have to be answered correctly to obtain a scaled score of 450 or 500. If the form of the examination is more difficult, fewer questions would have to be answered correctly to pass the examination. Thus, candidates are not unfairly rewarded because their test was easier nor unfairly penalized because it was more difficult.

After equating, the ASPPB recommended passing score of 500 is equivalent to the criterion-referenced passing score standard established in ASPPB's 2011 standard setting procedure. The level of knowledge represented by this score was adopted by the ASPPB as a recommended minimum standard for independent practice as a psychologist.

As noted above, the ASPPB recommended passing scores are set at 500 for independent practice and 450 for supervised practice. However, each board sets the standard for passing in its respective state, province or territory and reports the result to the candidates. At the present time, the majority of jurisdictions using the EPPP accept the ASPPB recommended passing score for independent practice. There is some variation among jurisdictions regarding the passing score for supervised practice. All procedures and decisions with regard to licensure are the responsibility of each jurisdiction. Any questions about these procedures should be directed to the appropriate state or provincial board.

How soon will I get my score? Generally speaking, examination scores will be available to licensing boards or their agents within 3 business days after the 15th and last days of each month. Once scores are received by the jurisdiction or its agent, there are various methods by which they may choose to provide examination results to their licensure applicants. The amount of time it takes for you to receive your score will depend on the process chosen by your licensing board. In some jurisdictions the board contracts with an agent to send scores to candidates on their behalf, some other jurisdictions send the examination results by postal service, and other jurisdictions may choose to release scores online through the PsyIMS system where you registered to take the EPPP.

Examination Feedback to Candidates To preserve the security of the examination, feedback to candidates regarding their EPPP performance must be presented in a way that provides assistance while avoiding any jeopardy to this security. The following rules have been developed for assistance to candidates regarding examination performance.

Requests for feedback or score verification may be initiated by completing a form available here, from PES or your licensing board office. Candidates should understand the difference between *score verification* and *examination*

** Current CE Rules. Changes shown are currently out for public comment and have not been finalized.*

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS

DIVISION 40

CONTINUING EDUCATION

858-040-0015

Basic Requirements

(1) Licensees must earn at least 50 continuing education credits during the period between license renewals. Continuing education credit must be reported as follows:

(a) Licensees must submit a Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit to the Board office with the fee postmarked on or before the due date printed on the notice.

(b) An unsigned or incomplete Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit shall be returned to the licensee.

(2) New Licensees. There is no continuing education reporting required for individuals licensed twelve months or less on their first renewal date.

(3) All active and semi-active licensees must complete four hours of professional ethics in each reporting period.

(4) All active and semi-active licensees must complete a minimum of seven hours of continuing education dedicated to the topic of pain management. This is a one time requirement.

(a) One hour must be a course provided by the Oregon Pain Management Commission.

(b) The pain management requirement must be reported within twenty-four months of the first Renewal Notice and Affidavit.

(5) No continuing education reporting is required for licensees requesting a change from active or semi-active to inactive status.

(6) No continuing education reporting is required for inactive licensees.

(7) The Board may grant exemptions in whole or in part from continuing education requirements, including extension of deadlines, in documented hardship cases.

858-040-0020

Failure to Comply

(1) A Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit shall be deemed timely if it is postmarked by the stated due date of the reporting year. Burden of proof of mailing is on the licensee.

(2) A licensee whose Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit is not postmarked by stated due date shall pay a delinquent fee.

(3) An individual whose license has lapsed for failure to submit a Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit and delinquent fee within 30 days after the due date must submit re-apply for licensure according to OAR 858-010-0010.

(4) An individual whose license has been revoked for noncompliance of continuing education requirements must re-apply for licensure.

858-040-0025

Continuing Education Reporting

(1) Before a license will be renewed under ORS 675.110 a licensee must a Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit.

(a) A copy of the Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavit is available on the Board's website at www.obpe.state.or.us.

(b) A paper copy of the form may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Board's office with a request for the form.

(2) Renewal Notice and Reporting Affidavits must be postmarked by the due date printed on the notice to be timely. Burden of proof of mailing is on the licensee.

858-040-0026

Continuing Education Random Audit

(1) The Board will conduct a random audit of continuing education compliance each year.

(2) Unless the licensee is contacted for an audit, certificates of attendance or other proof of continuing education activities should not be sent to the Board, but must be retained by the licensee for two years after the reporting period.

(3) To obtain credit during an audit, the following information must be typed or printed provided in legible form on the Board's Continuing Education Audit Report:

(a) Activity Title for multi-session or multi-day activities, titles of separate sessions attended;

(b) Dates attended, including month, day, and year;

(c) Organization sponsoring the program;

(d) Full name and degree of qualified instructor;

(e) Hours claimed according to OAR 858-040-0055.

(f) To obtain credit for writing published articles and books, the following information must be provided on the Continuing Education Audit Report as follows:

(A) Publisher;

(B) Title of publication;

(C) Dates of publication; and

(D) Hours claimed according to OAR 858-040-0055.

(4) Responsibility for documenting the acceptability of the program and the validity of credit rests with the licensee.

(5) The following shall constitute evidence of completion:

(a) For courses taken for academic credit from accredited universities and colleges: a copy of a transcript showing satisfactory completion of the course;

(b) For non-academic courses taken, a certificate of attendance;

(c) For formal individual home study programs, written evidence of completion from the sponsor;

(d) For formally organized study groups, a copy of the study group syllabus, and the recorder's study group meeting minutes;

(e) For consultation or supervision, copies of cancelled checks, or signed verification by the psychologist providing services; and

(f) For published material, a copy of pages of the material showing title, author, and date of publication.

(6) If a CE report or documentation is not approved, the licensee shall be so notified and shall be granted a period of time by the Board in which to correct the deficiencies noted.

858-040-0035

Programs ~~Which~~ That Qualify for Continuing Education Credit

Policy. Acceptable continuing education must be a learning activity which contributes directly to the professional competence of the licensee.

(1) Program Prerequisites. Continuing ~~E~~education programs shall qualify for credit if:

(a) The subject matter deals primarily with substantive psychological issues, skills or laws, rules and ethical standards related to one's role as a psychologist or psychologist associate.

(b) The program is conducted by a qualified instructor or discussion leader. A qualified instructor or discussion leader is a person whose background, training, education, or experience makes it appropriate for the person to make a presentation or lead a discussion on the subject matter; and

(c) A record of attendance, such as a certificate of completion, is obtained.

(2) Qualifying Programs. The following shall qualify for continuing education credit provided they comply with all other CE requirements:

(a) Substantive professional development programs of recognized mental health organizations;

(b) University or college courses. Each classroom hour shall equal one qualifying hour;

(c) Formally organized work place educational programs;

(d) Formally organized study groups that comply with the following;

(A) At least two other mental health professionals attend;

(B) The study group prepares and preserves a syllabus of meeting dates and study topics in advance;

(C) A record is kept of each study group meeting. The record must include the names of the participants present, the subject matter and references which relate to any written material utilized; and

(e) Supervision or ~~C~~consultation ~~R~~received for a fee from an Oregon licensed ~~P~~psychologist.

(A) Credit shall be given only to the licensee receiving supervision or consultation, not to the licensee providing supervision or consultation.

(B) No credit shall be given to licensees receiving supervision to fulfill licensure or discipline requirements.

(f) Home Study including non-interactive internet and tele-courses.

(g) Published articles and books on substantive psychological issues.

(h) Service as ~~L~~lecturer, ~~D~~discussion ~~L~~leader, or ~~S~~speaker on substantive psychological issues.

(A) Credit as a lecturer, discussion leader, or speaker may be claimed for work that is either paid or unpaid.

(B) Credit shall be allowed for the first time a course is taught. No credit shall be allowed for repeat presentations unless an instructor can demonstrate that the program content was substantially changed and such change required significant additional study or research.

(i) Ethics.

(j) ~~Oregon~~ Board ~~of Psychologist Examiners~~ committee volunteer.

(k) Ethics Committee meetings of professional associations.

(l) Pain Management.

(m) Office records organization; records maintenance and security procedures; office procedures; office staff training related to records maintenance and security procedures; billing software instruction.

858-040-0036

Programs ~~Which~~ That Do Not Qualify for Continuing Education Credit

(1) Marketing; investments; and practice building strategies.

(2) Yoga; therapeutic massage;

(3) Non-Clinical administrative staff meetings;

(4) Word processing computer skills;

(5) Therapies which are not widely recognized as within the scope of practice of psychology, through research or scientifically demonstrated clinical effectiveness.

858-040-0055

Credit Hours Granted

(1) Credit shall be given for actual hours attended.

(2) Credit shall be given for no more than 25 hours of continuing education for home study and study group hours combined.

(3) An instructor, discussion leader, or speaker shall be given two hours of credit for preparation for each hour of presentation time, and one hour of credit for each hour of presentation time.

(4) Credit shall be given for no more than 25 hours of continuing education credit in a reporting period for an instructor, discussion leader, or speaker and published material combined.

858-040-0065

Evidence of Completion

(1) Licensee must fill-out and retain a Continuing Education Tracking Tool.

(2) Responsibility for documenting the acceptability of the program and the validity of credit rests with the licensee.

(3) Licensee must retain documentation for a period of two years after the reporting period.

(4) The following shall constitute evidence of completion:

(a) For academic credit from accredited universities and colleges: a copy of a transcript showing satisfactory completion of the course;

(b) For non-academic courses: a certificate of attendance;

(c) For home study programs: written evidence of completion from the sponsor;

(d) For study groups: a copy of the study group meeting record study;

(e) For consultation or supervision received: copies of a cancelled check or a signed verification by the psychologist providing services; and

(f) For published material: a copy of pertinent pages of the material showing title, author, and date of publication.

ASPPB Guidelines for Continuing Professional Development

June 2012

ASPPB Task Force on Maintenance of Competence and Licensure (MOCAL)
Members of the task force:

Carol Webb, Ph.D., Chair	(GA)
Thomas J. Boll, Ph.D.	(AL)
Robert A. Brown, Ph.D.	(MD)
Jacqueline Horn, Ph.D.	(CA)
Catherine Yarrow, MBA, Ph.D.	(ON)
Janet Pippin Orwig, MBA	(ASPPB)

Task Force Charge and Process

In June 2001, ASPPB published its *Guidelines for Continuing Professional Education*. In 2009, in light of the competency movement and other recent developments in the field, the ASPPB Board of Directors determined that the guidelines should be updated. The Board appointed a task force on the Maintenance of Competence and Licensure (MOCAL) with the following charges:

1. Revise and update the *ASPPB Guidelines for Continuing Professional Education* (June 2001) with input from member boards and other interested stakeholders.
2. Study the role that regulatory bodies in psychology can have in assuring that licensed/registered psychologists maintain their competence.
3. Make recommendations to regulatory bodies on how to implement maintenance of competence/licensure procedures.

The MOCAL Task Force has been working since then through conference calls, in-person meetings, and a larger work group meeting. Draft *ASPPB Guidelines for Continuing Professional Development* were submitted to the ASPPB Board of Directors and to the ASPPB membership, and were posted for comments on the ASPPB website. The larger work group took into account all the comments that had been received and made further suggestions for the Task Force to consider. The document that follows is the result of those efforts.

Introduction

These *Guidelines* address the broad concept of Continuing Professional Development (CPD). Not only is it expected that psychologists will continue to update their knowledge throughout their careers, but also that they will maintain and enhance their existing knowledge, skills and professional competencies. Further, it is anticipated that psychologists will maintain their competencies based on published advances in theory, practice and empirical research. Participation in continuing education is one way that psychologists maintain and enhance their knowledge and skills; however, it is not the only way, nor is it necessarily the most effective way.

CPD, as described in these *Guidelines*, is intended to continue and update the training of psychologists in their current areas of practice. The development of specialist competencies, or competencies in new areas (e.g., from general clinical to neuropsychology), is expected to be undertaken through a much more comprehensive, structured process beyond what would ordinarily be required for licensure renewal. On the other hand, CPD is *not* "business as usual"; rather, it is intended to maintain and build on existing competencies throughout a psychologist's career, and to keep knowledge and practice up-to-date.

Assuring that psychologists maintain their competence serves the public protection mandate of psychology licensing boards and colleges. Consequently, appropriate CPD encompasses more than training in ethics and laws; it also addresses the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to maintain and enhance competent practice.

Adapting the definition of "competency" found in the Oxford Dictionary to the practice of psychology, Kaslow, Dunn & Smith (2008) described competency as "an individual's capability and demonstrated ability to comprehend and perform certain tasks appropriately and effectively and in a fashion that is consistent with the expectations for an individual qualified by education, training, and credentialing. It is not an absolute or static process, but rather a dynamic process that entails continual professional development"(p.19).

Epstein & Hundert (2002) described competence as including the ''habitual and judicious use of communication, knowledge, technical skills, clinical reasoning, emotions, values, and reflection in daily practice for the benefit of the individual and

community being served" (p. 226). Further they noted that competence involves "habits of mind that allow the practitioner to be attentive, curious, self-aware, and willing to recognize and correct errors" (p.228).

Consumers assume that professional regulatory organizations are ensuring that licensees maintain their competence to practice. However, one consumer advocacy group has recommended that regulatory organizations "go beyond imposing mandatory continuing education (CE) to require …periodic *assessment* of knowledge, skills, and clinical performance; development, execution, and documentation of an *improvement* plan based on the assessment; and periodic *demonstration* of current competence" (Swankin, LeBuhn & Morrison, 2006, p. iii).

For our purposes, at a minimum, competence is understood to comprise knowledge, skill, judgment and attitudes, which when integrated, result in appropriate and effective action being taken in a particular situation (Rodolfa, Bent, Eisman, Nelson, Rehm & Ritchie, 2005). Further there is an expectation that these components must be continuously refreshed and updated in order to maintain competence. These *Guidelines* are intended to assist psychology regulatory boards and colleges in meeting their mandate to assure consumers that licensees are competent to practice.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

CPD stands as a professional and ethical obligation of every psychologist. In psychology, the traditional way of defining this ongoing professional development has been in terms of Continuing Education (CE), which usually refers to formal learning activities conducted in classroom or workshop settings. CPD is a broader concept, referring to the continuing development of the multi-faceted competencies needed for quality professional performance in one's area of practice. For the professional practice and regulation of psychology, those areas of competency have been identified by a national sample of psychologists as Scientific Knowledge; Evidence-Based Decision Making/Critical Reasoning; Interpersonal and Multicultural Competence; Professionalism/Ethics; Assessment; and Intervention/Supervision/Consultation (ASPPB, 2010). An emerging area of competence that has been identified as important is Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (e.g., Spring, 2011).

CPD activities have as their foundation a continuing learning process, starting during graduate training and continuing as long as the practitioner is engaged in professional activities. The shaping, reshaping and development of a psychologist involves responding to changing societal and individual needs, in the context of evolving science, technologies, and professional activities (World Federation of Medical Education, 2003). CPD is essential to maintain professional competencies, to remedy gaps in knowledge and skills, and to enable professionals to respond to the challenges of rapidly growing knowledge and technology as well as changing practice requirements and structures in which that practice occurs.

In psychology the content of CPD should be based on evidence-based practice where possible. Evidence-based practice refers to the importance of integrating scientific knowledge, professional experience, and client characteristics into professional practice. The American Psychological Association (APA, 2005) provides a broad definition of evidence-based practice:

> *Evidence-based practice in psychology (EBPP) is the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences. This definition of EBPP closely parallels the definition of evidence-based practice adopted by the Institute of Medicine (2001, p. 147) as adapted from Sackett and colleagues (2000): "Evidence-based practice is the integration of best research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values." The purpose of EBPP is to promote effective psychological practice and enhance public health by applying empirically supported principles of psychological assessment, case formulation, therapeutic relationship, and intervention (p.1).*

An examination and understanding of two other issues in the field of professional psychology is critical to the development of CPD guidelines that jurisdictions can use to help ensure the ongoing competence of their licensees. They are: self-assessment, and outcome assessment of CPD. These two issues are briefly presented here and are discussed in detail in Appendix E.

Self-Assessment

A key assumption in much of adult education and continuing professional education is that the professional accurately determines what knowledge and skills he or she needs

to acquire or enhance, and then plans and selects appropriate methods to acquire or to enhance the needed knowledge and skills (Wise, 2010).

Research suggests that there are weaknesses to relying on self-assessment to determine professional development needs (Kruger & Dunning, 1999; Eva & Regehr, 2005). Those who are objectively more competent in their professional activities, especially those in the top quartile, tend to underestimate their competence relative to their peers. However, they were more accurate in assessing their absolute score on a performance test. Of greater concern, those who are objectively less competent overestimate their competence, especially those individuals whose competence falls in the bottom quartile. In addition, these less competent individuals may not benefit from observing a competent model (Kruger & Dunning, 1999); it seems that they do not recognize competence when they see it. They may not have the knowledge and expertise necessary to evaluate their competence adequately (Dunning, Heath & Suls, 2004).

It may be possible to increase the accuracy of self-assessment. Providing additional training in the knowledge and skills required for one's work increases the accuracy of self-assessment of competency (Kruger & Dunning, 1999). Providing objective feedback through tests and measures or feedback from peers may also improve the accuracy of an individual's self-assessment of competency (Dunning et al., 2004). Self-assessment may itself be a competency or even a meta-competency (Hatcher, 2011).

Outcomes

There are related but somewhat different meanings of the term "outcome" with respect to this report: (1) measuring and enhancing outcomes of CPD activities and (2) enhancing client/patient outcomes through monitoring progress. Both are important in developing and administering CPD programs and in attempting to ensure that the eventual outcome of CPD is competent professional practice.

Measuring and Enhancing CPD Outcomes

There are many ways that the effectiveness of CPD activities can be measured. One widely cited model for evaluating training outcomes is that of Kirkpatrick (1967); this model is discussed in Appendix E. More specifically for this report, one of the more

useful schemes for evaluating the effectiveness of CPD activities was developed by Milne, James, & Sheikh (2006). Their proposed system is as follows:

1. What is the right thing to do? This is the judgment about what needs to be learned and is guided by sources such as theories of psychopathology and mechanisms of change, clinical guidelines, treatment manuals, and professional consensus. However, there is limited consensus in the practice or academic communities as to what practitioners need to know to maintain or enhance their clinical or applied skills.

2. Has the right thing been done? Basically, this refers to whether there is a good match between knowing what the right thing is to do and what has actually been presented.

3. Has it been done right? This addresses whether the activity has been presented skillfully using an effective method. There is considerable research and theory in clinical, cognitive, and industrial/organizational psychology; medicine; educational settings; human resources; and adult learning that should inform the development and administration of CPD activities.

4. Did it result in the right outcomes? Outcomes can be roughly broken down into affective outcomes (satisfaction), acquisition of knowledge (subjective opinions or objective measures), transfer of knowledge and skills into the workplace (Sitzmann, Ely, Brown, & Bauer, 2010), and in the practice arena, the impact of the activity on client/patient care and on outcomes. In psychology, there is little empirical research on CPD outcomes, with the exception of surveys of participants' views regarding the value of the activities (Neimeyer, Taylor & Wear, 2009).

5. Was the CPD context right? This refers to whether the professional environment can serve as a booster or a barrier to introducing new learning into direct client care, e.g., peer and administrative support, practice opportunity (Brown & Sitzmann, 2011).

It is clear that more research aimed at systematically evaluating the utility of different methods of CPD delivery on transfer of new learning into practice, and the effects of this new learning on outcomes, is needed.

Enhancing practice outcomes through monitoring client/patient progress

There is one model of evaluating outcomes that bypasses many of the complexities detailed above. Michael Lambert and colleagues note in a series of publications that, while there has been an increased emphasis on quality assurance by policy makers and insurance carriers, less than one-third of practitioners systematically assess their own treatment outcomes to evaluate the quality of their work. A number of studies have shown that direct monitoring of clients'/patients' progress can dramatically improve outcomes, particularly in those clients/patients who are at risk for intervention failure (e.g., Lambert, 2010; Duncan, 2011).

In summary, in spite of the fact that there is little direct research on effective methods of CPD, much can be extrapolated from research in non-clinical settings, indicating that assessment in applied settings on ongoing client or patient progress offers a promising tool to enhance the effectiveness of service delivery. Research on effective methods of CPD is necessary to provide knowledge of what CPD methods actually can change psychologists' behavior. The Task Force therefore is recommending that CPD credit be given for monitoring client/patient progress. (A more detailed review of the professional literature on outcomes is available in Appendix E.)

Rationale for the *Guidelines*

CPD is part of a pattern of lifelong learning that begins with graduate training in psychology. It is **not** a substitute for the basic academic education and training needed for entry to the field of psychology, nor can it be the primary vehicle for career changes from one recognized specialty area (e.g. clinical, counseling, or school psychology) to another whose practice requires different training and different skill sets (e.g., neuropsychology, forensic, or consulting psychology).

Currently 52 jurisdictions of ASPPB's 64 member jurisdictions (See Appendices A & B) recognize the need for continuing professional development by requiring that continuing education be taken as one component of licensure renewal. These *Guidelines* are being written in part to provide a strong rationale for mandating CPD across jurisdictions.

The public believes and expects that licensed professionals remain current and competent in their areas of practice (Finlayson & Dewar, 2001). The public also believes professionals are required to demonstrate evidence of continued competency in order to maintain licensure (Neuberger, 2000). Competence is a cornerstone of ethics codes for psychologists, and psychologists are expected to practice only in their areas of competence and in a "competent" manner (APA, 2002; CPA, 2000). Research suggests that one-time continuing education workshops or classes do very little to ensure continued competence, and continuing education classes seem to have very little impact on how people practice (O'Brien, Freemantle, Oxman, Wolf, Davis, & Herrin, 2007). Research also has demonstrated that professionals are inaccurate when assessing what they need in the way of education and training to help them continue to practice competently (e.g., Krueger & Mueller, 2002; O'Brien et al., 2007). In other words, the systems for continuing education that jurisdictions have put in place to help ensure public protection and continued competence of their psychologists, may be inadequate, or at least have not been demonstrated to ensure continuing competence.

An important function of regulatory bodies is to investigate complaints and implement educative and disciplinary measures as appropriate. The association between continuing education and the prevention of disciplinary actions has not been established, and indeed, has been questioned (Rodolfa, Schaffer & Webb, 2010). Further, there does not seem to be an association between the presence of formal, public disciplinary actions or malpractice claims and professional competence (Reid, Adams, McGlynn & Mehrotra, 2010).

What ***has*** been demonstrated to contribute to ongoing maintenance of competence, enhanced orientation to lifelong learning, CPD, and ultimately public protection, is variety in the kinds of learning activities in which professionals engage (Hojat, Veloski, Nasca, Erdmann, & Gonnella, 2006; Hojat, Valoski, & Gonella, 2009), especially if the variety of activities focuses on one content area (Institute of Medicine, 2010); activities that continue over time (Jameson, Stadter, & Poulton, 2007); and activities that include ongoing feedback and formal follow-up (Grant, Chambers & Jackson, 1999, as cited in WFME, 2003). Further, it has been suggested that professional isolation can be a barrier to maintaining one's competence (Courtney & Farnworth, 2003), and that individuals who practice in isolation from others run the risk of becoming less aware of current practice standards (Lewkonia, 2001). Systematically monitoring one's own practice has also been demonstrated to improve client/patient outcomes (Babins-

Wagner, 2011; Lambert, 2010). (A more detailed discussion of these factors can be found in Appendix E.)

Purposes for the *Guidelines*

These *ASPPB Guidelines for Continuing Professional Development* are meant to assist jurisdictions by providing recommendations for implementation of a program of mandatory CPD that uses the research about continuing professional development to create a mechanism for licensees to maintain their competencies and continue a process of lifelong learning. They are meant to assist jurisdictions to identify their licensees' areas of practice at initial licensure and at each renewal period thereafter, thus providing a framework for each licensee's continued professional development. These *Guidelines* are based on a model of competencies identified by the ASPPB Practice Analysis (2010) that have been deemed necessary for professional practice in psychology, and they encourage evidence-based activities, a continuing professional development plan, and assessment of outcomes. While these *Guidelines* themselves are not evidence-based (the evidence for what actually works in CPD is not robust), they are informed by the evidence that is available.

Implementing a program of mandatory CPD will help create consistency in professional standards across jurisdictions. Mandated CPD also contributes to public protection by setting standards for continuing professional competence, and mandated CPD identifies and makes transparent a jurisdictional commitment to ensuring the highest ethical responsibilities for its licensees. The delivery of high quality psychological services and the commitment to the highest professional ethical standards must be the driving force for each psychologist's participation in CPD activities; but jurisdictions can help provide a structure that facilitates this very important commitment.

ASPPB Guidelines for Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

The following *Guidelines* are intended to assist jurisdictions in developing CPD requirements for their licensees/registrants. ASPPB supports the effort to achieve mobility in licensure and believes that greater standardization of CPD requirements will contribute to that effort. A sample of these *Guidelines* written in regulatory language is available in Appendix G.

Continuing Professional Development Plan

To optimize the value of CPD activities, psychologists should proceed in a thoughtful and self-reflective manner. To that end, it is recommended that each psychologist create a professional development plan at every license renewal cycle. The plan should be informed by a combination of self-reflection on the psychologist's own practice experience, input from peers and mentorship groups, and developments reported in the professional and research literature. The plan should be developed at the beginning of the licensure renewal cycle and should include areas of focus identified by the self reflection, proposed CPD activities, timelines for completion of those activities, and means to evaluate the impact of the CPD activities on the psychologist's practice. The psychologist should attest to its completion on the licensure renewal form. The professional development plan would serve as a tool for the psychologist's own use and could be modified during the licensure renewal cycle. The plan should be available for audit by the regulatory body. (A sample professional development plan is included in Appendix F.)

In light of the current debate regarding the value of self-assessment in the maintenance of competence, these *Guidelines* do not include a formal recommendation for self-assessment. Research has found that those who are less competent overestimate their competence as compared to evaluations by peers or by objective measures, but the accuracy of self-assessment may be improved with further training (Sitzmann,et al., 2010). It is hoped that future research will provide a self administered, structured, objective tool that can assist in informing a licensee's approach to appropriate continuing professional development.

Areas of Practice

It is recommended that at initial licensure and at each renewal period, jurisdictions require their licensees/registrants to identify their areas of practice. (Appendix C includes a recommended structure for identifying area of practice.)

Credits

The Task Force recognizes that most practitioners currently acquire more than the credits required by their licensing boards and colleges for license renewal, and these *Guidelines* in no way are meant to discourage this practice. These *Guidelines* present the number of suggested CPD credits required for licensure renewal, but they do not propose that practitioners limit their CPD activities overall.

It is recommended that jurisdictions require 40 *credits* of CPD every two years. The concept of *credits* replaces the concept of *hours*, since many of the recommended activities do not have an hourly component. Forty (40) credits are recommended because that is the modal number of hours of CE jurisdictions currently required, and we see no justification to change that number. Licensure renewal periods differ among jurisdictions; however, every two years is also the modal figure. If jurisdictions have a different licensure renewal period, it is recommended that the number of credits be adjusted accordingly, e.g. that there be 20 credits every year, or 60 credits every three years.

Mandated Credit Areas

The Task Force considered what, if any, credit areas should be *mandated* for licensure renewal. After considering a number of suggested areas, our aim was to be able to give some direction about what we considered important, not only at entry to practice, but throughout one's professional career. Additionally, the Task Force thought it important to allow flexibility to jurisdictions in deciding on appropriate areas for required CPD and to psychologists in their overall plans for obtaining CPD. Even though we did not find any reliable evidence to support the relationship of specific CPD credits in ethics and enhanced competence, the task force feels it is important for psychologist to remain updated in this area. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that 3 credits in Ethics, Risk Assessment, and/or Jurisdictional Rules and Regulations be required for each renewal period. These credits may be obtained through various activities, e.g., ongoing peer consultation, sponsor approved CE workshops; but it is recommended that there

be an evaluation component to the CPD in order to obtain these credits.

Mode of Delivery

One aim of these *Guidelines* has been, as much as possible to utilize the evidence there is about how adults learn, what ensures knowledge retention, and what contributes to ongoing competency. Although the research is limited, we know that people have different learning styles, that reducing isolation contributes to the likelihood of changes in practice and to keeping current, and that content conveyed by various methods is more likely to be retained.

Further, task force members determined that flexibility was key in terms of helping ensure that psychologists are able to take advantage of the variety of ways that people learn and thus how CPD credits can be earned. The Task Force did not find any evidence that a particular amount of in-person CPD is beneficial or that a particular amount of electronically mediated CPD is problematic. Given advancements in technology and issues of accessibility, the task force decided not to put any limit on the number of credits that can be earned by electronically mediated CPD.

CPD Activities

It is recommended that the following 10 activities, with associated credits, constitute the range of CPD activities. A psychologist can meet the CPD requirements with any combination of these activities as long as they add up to at least the recommended 40 credits. Most of the activities have caps or maximums (and one, Peer Consultation, has a minimum) on the credit values allowed, thus it will generally be necessary to be involved in more than one of the activities to reach 40 credits. Table 1 identifies each activity with its associated number of credits (based on 40 credits every two years). A more thorough description of each activity follows Table 1. Appendix H contains a table of the activities, rationale for each activity and the activity's relationship to the competencies identified in the Practice Analysis (ASPPB, 2010).

CPD Activities and Credit Values
TABLE 1

CPD Activity	Maximum # of Credits Allowed each Renewal Period	Value of Credits by Activity
Professional		
1. Ongoing Peer Consultation (including but not limited to case consultation, journal clubs, research groups; mentoring)	Minimum 10*/ Maximum 20 (*If this activity is chosen, a minimum of 10 credits is required)	1 hour = 1 credit
2. Practice Outcome Monitoring (assessing client/patient/patient outcomes via protocol)	20	1 client/patient = 1 credit
3. Professional Activities (including but not limited to serving on psychological association boards or committees, editorial boards of peer reviewed journals related to psychology, scientific grant review teams or board member of regulatory body)	10	1 year = 10 credits
4.Conferences/Conventions (attendance time as distinguished from CE credits)	5	1 conference day = 1 credit
Academic		
5.Academic Courses (taking courses from a regionally accredited institution, a graduate-level course for credit that is related to psychology)	20	1 credit course = 7 credits 2 credit course = 14 credits 3 credit course = 20 credits

6. Instruction (teaching a course related to psychology in a regionally accredited institution, full day sponsor-approved or half-day sponsor-approved workshop presentation; only counts first time teaching or presenting)	20	1 course = 20 credits 1 full day workshop = 10 credits ½ day workshop = 5 credits
7. Publications (peer-reviewed articles, book chapters or editor or coeditor of peer reviewed journal)	10	1 publication = 10 credits
Continuing Education		
8.Approved Sponsor Continuing Education (any activity provided by approved sponsor organizations defined in CPD guidelines)	30	1 hour = 1 credit
9. Self-directed learning related to one's professional activities (readings, videos, electronically mediated presentations, unsponsored activities)	5	1 hour = 1 credit
Board Certification		
10. Board Certification (can count for 100% of required CPD in the year that certification is awarded)	40	Certification awarded = 40 credits

Documentation requirements for each activity are defined in Table 2.

Professional

1. *Peer Consultation*: "Peer Consultation" refers to a structured and organized system of interaction with colleague(s) designed to help broaden professional knowledge and expertise and reduce professional isolation. Meeting with colleague(s) in research groups, journal clubs, and case consultations, with a structured, organized format, in person or electronically mediated, that focuses on professional practice would count for up to 20 credits, with a minimum of 10 credits (if this activity is chosen then a minimum of 10 hours of peer consultation is required to meet the CPD requirements) per renewal cycle, one hour of peer consultation being equal to one credit.

2. *Practice Outcome Monitoring*: "Practice Outcome Monitoring (POM)" refers to the periodic application of outcome assessment protocols with clients/patients, in order to monitor one's own practice process and outcomes. POM of ongoing therapy clients/patients should include repeated measures. POM can help assess whether or not one's approach to practice is effective and whether that effectiveness can be enhanced. Participation in an organization's (e.g., business, hospital, healthcare, etc.) quality assurance program that focuses on monitoring client outcomes is another means of evaluating one's practice that could be included in this category. POM involves the use of a standardized assessment tool. Practice Outcome Monitoring counts for up to 20 credits every two years, with one client/patient outcome assessment (or series of assessments as appropriate to the practice endeavor) being equal to one credit.

3. *Professional Activities*: "Professional Activities" refers to ongoing participation in professional associations and other professional organizations. This helps to ensure that the public service work of the profession is supported and helps to reduce professional isolation. Service on regulatory boards, within professional psychological associations (boards, and committees - with the exception of professional lobbying activities for psychology), and scientific grant review teams for one full year would count for up to 10 credits for the two-year renewal cycle.

4. *Conference/Convention*: "Conference/Convention" refers to attending, in person, professional conferences/conventions related to psychology in order to interact with colleagues and participate in the social, interpersonal, professional, and scientific activities which are part of the milieu of conferences and conventions. These credits are in addition to attaining continuing education credits at conferences and conventions from Approved Sponsor Continuing Education addressed below. These credits are for activities for which the attendee does not earn approved sponsor continuing education. Attendance at conferences/conventions would count for up to 5 credits every two years, with one conference day being equal to one credit.

Academic

5. *Academic Courses*: "Academic Courses" refers to taking, for credit, a graduate-level course related to psychology from a regionally accredited institution, either in person or electronically mediated. Coursework could be in a variety of areas, but must be demonstrated to relate to psychology and to help manage the professional, scientific, business or administrative aspects of one's profession more effectively. Taking the equivalent of one semester-long one credit course would count for 7 credits; taking the equivalent of one semester-long two credit course would count for 14 credits; and taking the equivalent of one semester-long three credit course would count for 20 CPD credits every two years. The maximum number of credits allowed for this category is 20 credits every two years.

6. *Instruction*: "Instruction" refers to teaching, for the first time, in a regionally accredited institution, a semester-long graduate or undergraduate course related to psychology. It also refers to presenting, for the first time, a day long (6 hours) approved sponsor workshop or a half-day (3 hours) approved sponsor workshop that relates to the practice of psychology. This kind of activity is seen as a means to advance one's own competencies as well as to educate others. Either of these activities may be taught in person or may be electronically mediated. Teaching a semester-long (or equivalent) course for the first time counts for 20 CPD credits every two years. Presenting a day-long workshop for the first time counts for 10 CPD credits, and presenting a half-day workshop for the first time counts as 5 CPD credits every two years. The maximum number of credits allowed for this category is 20 credits every two years.

7. *Publications: "*Publications" refers to authoring book chapters, editing or co-editing a book, authoring peer-reviewed articles, or editing or co-editing a peer-reviewed journal. This activity would benefit both the psychologist who does the writing and the intended audience. "Publications" must be related to the profession of psychology and counts for up to 10 credits every two years.

Continuing Education

8. *Approved Sponsor Continuing Education*: "Approved Sponsor Continuing Education" refers to attendance at any activities provided by approved sponsor organizations described in the Compliance and Enforcement section below. "Approved Sponsor Continuing Education" would count for up to 30 credits every two years, with one hour of workshop being equal to one credit.

9. *Self- Directed Learning*: "Self-Directed Learning" refers to reading books, or scientific journals, listening to tapes or reviewing electronically mediated presentations or other professional learning activities on one's own. "Self-Directed Learning" would count for up to 5 credits every two years, with one hour spent on this activity being equal to one credit.

Board Certification

10. *Board Certification:* "Board Certification" refers to earning certification from the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). ABPP certification requires psychologists to demonstrate to the satisfaction of experienced peers, through a structured and well-formulated process, that they are competent in intervention, assessment, and consultation in their area of practice. Additionally, psychologists are examined on ethical and legal issues, scientific bases for their services, supervision/teaching/management, interpersonal interactions, individual and cultural diversity, and professional identification. This level of examination and scrutiny is considered the "gold standard" and serves as the best indicator our profession currently has of assuring that licensed psychologists are maintaining their professional competence. A single, voluntary board encompassing all of the recognized specialties is considered to be the appropriate designator for board certification. Currently, the only organization recognized by the Council of Specialties, an independently incorporated non-profit organization representing and

supporting the development of specialties in psychology, is the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). Being awarded an ABPP counts for all 40 credits required for the two-year renewal period.

Assignment of Number of Credits

The Task Force used several methods in determining the number of credits to be assigned (maximums, and minimums where applicable) to each activity. The total allocation of 40 credits was based on the modal number of hours required by licensing boards for CE during each two-year renewal cycle. The initial allocations of activity credits were developed through a consensus approach among the Task Force members. However, allocations were adjusted after consideration of input received from surveys of ASPPB's member jurisdictions and from the APA Continuing Education Committee. The steps taken to arrive at the current number of credits for each activity are described more thoroughly in Appendix I.

Sponsorship and Verification

If the CPD activity requires sponsorship, it must be provided by an approved sponsor. Qualifying programs include those offered by the American Psychological Association or any of its sponsors approved through the American Psychological Association Sponsor Approval System (APA, 2005), the Canadian Psychological Association Approval of Sponsors of Continuing Education for Canadian Psychologists (CPA, 2005), the Academies of the Specialty Boards of the American Board of Professional Psychology, the Association for Psychological Science, the National Association of School Psychologists, Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, regionally accredited educational institutions that offer graduate training in psychology or related fields, accredited medical schools, Category I Continuing Medical Education (CME) of the American Medical Association, the Canadian Medical Association, the American Bar Association, and the Canadian Bar Association. Courses offered by non-psychology organizations must be relevant to the practice of psychology.

An organization, association, person, or entity must assume full responsibility for the program(s) offered and provide qualifications acceptable to the licensing board or college or its designee if so requested. Providers/sponsors are responsible for assuring the educational quality of the material presented, and are responsible for measuring achievement of the stated educational goals and objectives of the CE program. The

educational programs must be specifically applicable and pertinent to the practice of psychology and offer content that is post-graduate in nature, accurate, objective, timely, and where available, evidence-based. Finally, providers/sponsors should be held accountable for meeting all applicable local, state, provincial, and federal standards, and for the payment of any applicable provincial, state, or federal taxes or fees.

Approved sponsors must provide demonstration of acquisition of the knowledge, skills or attitudes consistent with the program's objectives. Surveys of participants' satisfaction are not sufficient to meet this requirement. The delivery method of the CPD may be in person or electronically mediated as long as provided by an approved sponsor.

Table 2 contains the recommended types of documentation and verification jurisdictions can use for each type of CPD activity. For more details of each activity see descriptions above.

CPD Sponsorship and Verification
Table 2

Continuing Professional Development Activity	**Maximum # of Credits Allowed each Renewal Period (2 years)**	**Value of Credits by Activity**
1. Ongoing Peer Consultation **<u>Documentation/Verification</u>** - Required documentation would be a completed Ongoing Peer Consultation Form with indication of structured program of consultation, regularly scheduled meetings, with attester's signature. Attester must be the designated recorder and attestation should include dates, nature of consultation, number of hours, recorded on the verification form. Minimum of 10 credits per renewal cycle is required if this activity is chosen to satisfy renewal requirements. *Completed Verification Form (Appendix D) (must provide evidence that it is a structured program of consultation with regularly scheduled meetings and nature of consultation).*	Minimum of 10 credits Maximum of 20	1hour=1 credit

2. Practice Outcome Monitoring **<u>Documentation/Verification</u>** -. Documentation includes completed verification form identifying type of assessment protocol, frequency of use with each client/patient and a copy of the protocol(s). *Completed Verification Form (Appendix D) (must include number of times protocol(s) was administered to each client/patient a copy of protocol(s) used).*	20	1 client/patient = 1 credit
3. Professional Activities **<u>Documentation/Verification</u>** – External verification of participation in activity (e.g. editorial page of journal, letter from organization verifying appointment and participation) *Completed Verification Form (Appendix D) (along with documentation from professional organization)*	10	1 year=10 credits
4. Conferences ***<u>Documentation /Verification-</u>*** *Conferences/Conventions-Copy of registration materials.*	5	1 conference day= 1 credit

5. Academic courses **Documentation/Verification** –*Course transcript*	20	1 credit course = 7 credits 2 credit course = 14 credits 3 credit course = 20 credits
6. Instruction **Documentation/Verification** - Instruction-documentation from university or workshop. *Documentation of first-time presentation from workshop or institution* (e.g., announcement, course catalog, registration materials); attestation from psychologist stating first time presenting	20	1 course= 20 credits 1 full day workshop = 10 credits ½ day workshop = 5 credits
7. Publications **Documentation/Verification** -Publications must be peer-reviewed only. *Publications-copy of first page of article or book chapter*	10	1 publication= 10 credits

8.Approved sponsored Continuing Education ***Documentation/Verification*** *-Appropriate documentation from sponsor.*	30	1 hour=1 credit
9. Self-directed learning **Documentation/Verification:** Self-directed learning (reading, videos-involves an unsponsored activity). *Self-Directed Learning- Verification Form completed. Completed Verification Form (Appendix D)*	5	1 hour=1 credit
10. ABPP Certification. **Documentation/*Verification*-***Verification from ABPP stating date certification was awarded.*	40	Certification awarded= 40 credits

Compliance and Enforcement

Record Keeping

Licensees should retain copies of accepted documentation of CPD, including proofs of attendance (e.g., certificate of attendance, university course transcript), course outlines, verification forms, and published CE content and presenters for at least two (2) licensing cycles.

Each jurisdiction has the authority to accept CPD documentation from the ASPPB Credentials Bank and to consider this documentation as primary source documentation. Licensees should refer to the specific category to ascertain what documentation is

required. Some of the categories will require using a customized verification form (Appendix D-1). Licensees may use the CPD log (Appendix D) to maintain records of completed CPD. Some jurisdictions may wish to have all licensees send in a completed CPD log with each renewal.

Attestation

As part of the renewal process, the licensee should be required to sign an attestation of completion of the mandated CPD. The attestation and/or penalty of perjury statement should be part of the license renewal form. Licensees should be informed of the disciplinary implications of falsely signing the renewal statement.

Audit

All psychologists are subject to audit to ensure compliance with CPD requirements. It is recommended that at least 5 to 10% of licensees be audited each renewal cycle. Auditing of all licensed psychologist board/college members and any licensees/registrants who have been subjected to a board or college action is advised for every renewal cycle during their tenure or disciplinary period.

Exceptions

Psychologists who are licensed during the first year of the biennial renewal period must obtain 20 credits of CPD. Any psychologist licensed during the second year of the biennial renewal period will **NOT** be required to obtain any CPD credits to renew his/her license for the first time.

Situations may arise in which it is appropriate to modify the CPD requirements for certain licensees. These modifications should be developed at the individual jurisdictional level. The board or college has the authority to issue a waiver of required CPD or to be more flexible regarding what content areas are required for CPD. If a license/registration has been in inactive status for more than one year, the psychologist should be required to complete 20 CPD credits prior to reactivating the license.

Sanctions

Further disciplinary action should be considered when licensees continue to practice psychology while failing to comply with mandated CPD.

Failure of CPD Audit: While many times CPD audits will occur during licensure renewal periods, the Task Force is focused on sanctions for failing a CPD audit rather than consequences for failing to renew one's license. Failing a CPD audit occurs when the board/college deems that the licensee has not completed the required credits in the required time frame. In these cases, a disciplinary action (letters of concern or reprimand, fines…) should be pursued. Additionally the licensee should have no more than 3 months to complete the required CPD and the CPD completed for this purpose should not count towards the next reporting cycle. Further, the licensee should be audited in the next reporting period. However, depending on the severity of the infraction, a formal and public disciplinary action may be deemed necessary that could include more stringent consequences.

Appeal: The licensee shall have 30 days to appeal the decision made as a result of the CPD audit. After 30 days, discipline should be pursued per Board/College authority.

Multiple Licenses

Psychologists must meet the specific CPD requirements for each jurisdiction in which he/she is licensed. CPD credits earned in one jurisdiction should transfer to other jurisdictions.

APPENDIX A

Current Jurisdictional Mandated CE

For more information regarding individual jurisdictional requirements for Continuing Professional Development (Continuing Education), please visit the ASPPB website at http://www.asppb.org/HandbookPublic/Reports/default.aspx?ReportType=ContinuingEducation

APPENDIX B

Board Contact Information

For information on how to contact a psychology licensing board in the U.S. and/or Canada, visit the ASPPB website at http://www.asppb.net/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3395

APPENDIX C

Declaration of Psychological Practice Form

Declaration of Psychological Practice

All licensee applicants are asked to state their areas of practice in psychology. The declaration will be considered in the context of the competences identified in the educational preparation and experience of the applicant.

A. Check the appropriate area(s) of psychological practice* below:

1. Clinical Psychology		8.Family Psychology	
2. Counseling Psychology		9. Industrial-Organizational Psychology	
3. School Psychology		10. Clinical Neuropsychology	
4. Forensic Psychology		11. Professional Geropsychology	
5. Behavioral & Cognitive Psychology		12.Psychoanalytic Psychology	
6. Clinical Health Psychology		13. Other (specify)	
7. Clinical Child Psychology			

*Commission for the Recognition of Specialties and Proficiencies in Professional Psychology (CRSPPP) recognized areas of practice

B. Once you have indicated your area(s) of practice, use the corresponding numbers above to identify the activities and services you intend to provide and the clients to whom you will provide these services.

Clients	Administration	Consultation	Assessment/ Evaluation**	Intervention/ Treatment***	Research	Other (specify)
Infants						
Children						
Adolescents						
Adults						
Elderly						
Families						

Groups						
Organizations						
Other (specify)						

C. You declare you are competent to provide services in:

English	
French	
Spanish	
Other languages (list)	

Applicant's Signature Date

APPENDIX D

OVERALL CPD LOG

CPD Category	Description of Activity Completed	Date Completed	# of Credits Awarded	Total Allowed Credits Earned for Category
1. Peer Consultation (up to 20 credits allowed)				
1. Peer Consultation (up to 20 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
2. Practice Outcome Monitoring (up to 20 credits allowed)				
2. Practice Outcome Monitoring (up to 20 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
3. Professional Activities (up to 10 credits allowed)				
3. Professional Activities (up to 10 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
4. Conferences/Conventions (up to 4 credits allowed)				

4.Conferences/Conventions (up to 4 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
5.Academic Courses (up to 20 credits allowed)				
5.Academic Courses (up to 20 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
6. Instruction (up to 20 credits allowed)				
6. Instruction (up to 20 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
7. Publications (up to 10 credits allowed)				
7. Publications (up to 10 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
8.Approved Sponsor CE (up to 30 credits allowed)				
8.Approved Sponsor CE (up to 30 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				

9. Self-directed learning (up to 4 credits allowed)				
9. Self-directed learning (up to 4 credits allowed)				
Total Credits				
10. ABPP Certification (can count for all required CPD in the renewal period in which that certification is awarded)				
Total Credits				
Total Renewal Credits				

APPENDIX D-1

CPD Verification Form

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD) VERIFICATION FORM

Name:	
Address:	
Telephone Number:	
Email:	Date:
Identify below the type(s) of CPD completed. Attach any available documentation regarding each type as verification (see Sponsorship & Verification Table for details).	
CPD Activity Completed	**Peer Consultation**
Dates of meetings	
Nature of Consultation	
Number of hours	
Person Attesting to meetings (attached a signed attendance log attesting to your presence)	
CPD Activity Completed	**Continuous Practice Outcome Measure**
Dates of meeting(s)	
Client/Patient ID	
Number of Protocol administrations with each client/patient	

Attach protocol used for each client/patient	
CPD Activity Completed	**Professional Activities**
Name of association/regulatory body	
Date of appointment	
Duties	
Attach verification documentation from organization	
CPD Activity Completed	**Self-Directed Learning**
Name of Activity (name of video/article)	
Mode of Delivery (online; reading; video)	
Applicability to Practice	

APPENDIX E

Further Information about Self-Assessment & Outcomes

Self-Assessment

Approaches to CE and CPD often assume that a psychologist is able to accurately assess his or her own abilities and deficits in order to select appropriate CE or professional development activities (Wise, 2010). Some jurisdictions with mandatory CE requirements or "quality assurance" programs have explicitly included self-assessment as a key component of these programs (College of Psychologists of Ontario, 2010).

Despite the reliance on self-assessment, there has been conflicting evidence regarding its value. Kruger & Dunning (1999) found that people overestimated their abilities in many social and intellectual domains and that this was particularly so for people who scored in the lower quartiles on objective measures of performance. They found, however, that improving the skills of research participants helped them recognize the limitations of their abilities and improved the accuracy of their self-appraisals.

Their research also indicated that incompetent individuals are less able to recognize competence in others and so may not benefit from an opportunity to observe the performance of a competent individual. In contrast, the authors found that those whose performance fell in the top quartile underestimated their performance relative to their peers. However, they were more accurate in assessing their absolute score on a performance test (Kruger & Dunning, 1999).

Based on their comprehensive review of the self-assessment literature, Dunning et al. (2004) cited several concerns. One such concern was that people might not have the knowledge and expertise necessary to assess their competence adequately.

Another concern was that the common educational practice of massed training (a one day workshop, or two or three successive days), while appearing to promote the rapid acquisition of skill and self-confidence, does not necessarily promote the retention of skill. This finding is similar to the learning literature of the 1960's that demonstrated the differential outcomes of massed versus distributed practice and concluded that the latter resulted in longer term retention of learning. Dunning et al. recommended providing

long-term evaluations of retention and transfer to assess the actual benefits of an educational or training program. To improve the accuracy of self-assessment of competence, they recommended watching tapes of one's performance in the company of a faculty member, undergoing peer assessment with clear standards, being provided with more frequent feedback and taking standardized testing.

Eva & Regehr (2005) also considered why a number of studies have found poor correspondence between self-assessment ratings and objective or external ratings of competence. They concluded that people are least accurate in making summary judgments (summative evaluations) of their own abilities. In order for individuals to identify and redress gaps in their knowledge or skill they would need to obtain and act upon reliable and valid external evaluations of their performance rather than self-assessment.

In a wide-ranging review, they noted that only the health professions emphasize self-directed learning. This is in contrast to models of the development of expertise that suggest that learners do better when there are expert tutors available to provide assistance and direction, when a broad overview of the material to be learned is provided, and when there is an opportunity to actively work on a problem before receiving a solution.

Eva & Regehr (2005) argued that the type of self-assessment that may be more valuable to self-regulation is "reflection-in-action," an ongoing self-monitoring process during performance of a task. They described this as effortful, guided problem solving which involves repeatedly assessing one's self-efficacy in a situation, addressing emergent problems and continuously monitoring one's ability to effectively solve the current problem.

Based on these studies, it seems that a capacity for accurate self-assessment of competence should not be presumed, but may be developed as a result of appropriate training to develop the particular competence. Attempting to solve a problem on one's own, with the availability of an instructor for guidance, may improve the self-assessment of competence. Additionally, frequent feedback, peer evaluation and objective testing may also improve the accuracy of self-assessment of competence. These elements should all be considered in any program intended to foster continuing professional development.

In the meantime, it is recommended that licensees routinely seek out peer feedback and opportunities to receive feedback through external evaluation. The current evidence indicates that both of these approaches foster the development of competence and also improve the accuracy of self-assessment.

Outcomes

There are related but somewhat different meanings of the term "outcome" with respect to this report: (1) measuring and enhancing outcomes of CPD activities and (2) enhancing client/patient outcomes through monitoring the individual's progress. Both are important in developing and administering CPD programs and attempting to ensure that the eventual outcome of CPD is competent professional practice. This appendix will address each of these questions.

Measuring and Enhancing CPD Outcomes

There are many ways that the effectiveness of CPD activities can be measured. However, there is limited consensus on information that practitioners need to know to maintain or enhance their skills, whether CPD activities are in fact integrated into their practices, or if integrated, whether the new learning is effective in positively affecting client/patient improvement. This section will address each of these questions.

One of the more comprehensive schemes for evaluating effectiveness of CPD activities was developed by Milne et al. (2006). This appendix will follow their framework, beginning with examining the basis for deciding what type of CPD is needed, and then proceeding through several steps to finally examining the context in which new learning is to be implemented.

<u>What Is The Right Thing To Do?</u>

Milne et al. (2006) say that this is the judgment about what needs to be learned based on such sources as individuals' assessments of their own needs and interests, theory, clinical guidelines, treatment manuals, and professional consensus. Once out of graduate school, for most psychologists no one guides them as to coursework and professional development, and rarely is there close supervision. The current structure

for psychologists consists in most jurisdictions of a mandated number of CE hours without specifying the particular content (with the exception of ethics and a few other topics in some jurisdictions), and it is presumed that the psychologist's selection of CPD activities is largely based on the self-assessment of needed knowledge and skills, availability of CPD activities, and the necessity to meet licensing board mandates. Recently, Neimeyer, Taylor, and Wear (2010) found that there were significant differences in psychologists' CPD activities based on their workplace settings. This indirectly supports the idea that psychologists chose CE experiences on the basis of their professional needs even though there was no direct measure of what specific education or training was needed. These authors also found that program convenience and cost was important, so self-assessed need was clearly not the sole determinant of psychologists' choices.

While it is certainly important that psychologists pursue CPD activities they feel are important to their own development, there are several drawbacks to CPD being based solely on psychologists' choices. As discussed in other sections of this report, there is a great deal of evidence that self-assessment as a determinant of CPD needs is quite fallible. Green (2006) indicates that self-appraisal in medical students tends to get less accurate over time, that as nurses have more experience there is more discrepancy between competence and confidence, and that often the least capable professionals have the most positively distorted assessment of their own abilities. Graesser (2010) notes that in selecting CPD activities, practitioners tend to avoid areas that are difficult for them and choose to focus on what they already know. Also, Lambert (2010) has found that most clinicians do not systematically monitor treatment outcomes, and without such monitoring they underestimate negative outcomes. A logical extension of his findings suggests that without systematic feedback, psychologists will find it difficult to objectively appraise their own knowledge, skills, and educational needs, meaning that they will have difficulty choosing CPD activities that could most benefit them and their clients/patients.

Also, psychologists generally do not follow prescribed assessment or treatment protocols, so without firm benchmarks as to "correct" intervention, it is difficult, if not impossible, to know what the "right" thing is. Aspirational treatment guidelines developed by various APA work groups have attempted to provide guidance, and the APA initiative on treatment guideline development, still in the beginning stage as of this writing, is one step toward establishing guidelines that individual psychologists can use

to inform their work. The most recent work in this area is documented at APA Access (Access/pubs/newsletters/access/2012/01-04/index.aspx).

In summary, there is a great deal of information, but no current consensus, on guidelines for the treatment of various disorders or the determinants of effective treatment. Lacking that, practitioners use their own judgment as to what paths to choose for their own continued development. While practitioners' self-assessed needs probably are quite useful in determining their choices, there is little objective evidence that they are making the choices that would most enhance their competencies. More problematically, at least using evidence from other professions, the practitioners most in need of guidance seem to be the ones least likely to believe they need it.

Has The Right Thing Been Done?

Milne et al. (2006) ask whether there is a good match between knowing what the right thing is to do and the material that has been presented. There are some studies that evaluate the fidelity of the CPD activity to theory or empirical evidence, as shown by the delivery of services that are true to the content of the training program. One promising project is the Resiliency and Disease Management Initiative in Texas, which has established evidence-based treatment guidelines for children, offered training in those treatments, and monitored their implementation (Jensen-Doss, Hawley, Lopez, & Osterberg, 2009). Additionally, Steinfield and colleagues have implemented an evidence-based anxiety and depression treatment program and tracked its implementation (Steinfield, Coffman, & Keyes, 2009). One can make a reasonable assumption that if these trainings were developed from a model, and the model intervention was implemented, then the training accurately reflected the model and was successful in translating the approach into practice. Sponsors of continuing education programs would do well to demand that providers explicate the theoretical, empirical, and/or professional consensual bases of their offerings, and demonstrate that, in fact, the provider has accurately and effectively translated these bases into the program content. This is largely an issue of quality control by providers. At this time, we know of no research that has directly examined this question across a wide range of CPD activities.

Has It Been Done Right?

Milne et al. (2006) ask whether the activity has been presented skillfully using an effective method of delivery. By effective method one can refer to research on what works and what does not work in CPD activities, ranging across self-directed learning, supervision, peer or professional consultation, or more formal courses or workshops. There is considerable research in clinical, cognitive, and industrial/organizational psychology; educational settings; human resources; and adult learning that should inform the development and administration of CPD activities. Unfortunately, as noted by Neimeyer et al. (2009), while psychology has been at the forefront of developing theory and practice in training, learning and methods of skill acquisition, very little of this theory or its practical applications has found its way into the design of CPD programs.

There is a wide variety of research on whether current methods of CPD delivery are effective in producing the various outcomes mentioned above in fields other than those directly involving clinical practice; very little of this research has been used to shape approved CPD activities in psychology.

A brief overview of some of this research is presented below that should illustrate the kinds of empirical findings that could, and should, guide CPD program development and implementation. For convenience, this report will list selective findings and conclusions gleaned from one or more of these sources; the ones selected seem to us to be the ones most relevant to CPD for practitioners. Moreover, there is considerable overlap between these authors from different fields, which would seem to emphasize the importance of some of the conclusions. However, we did not attempt to integrate the findings, but opted to simply list them. Finally, all of the following are taken from multidimensional, complex articles or books, so any listing, while we hope it will be useful, will necessarily be oversimplified (but, we hope, not distorted).

Conclusions and recommendations from Brown & Sitzmann (2011) regarding training and employee development:

- Formal vs. informal settings. Formal instruction seems superior to informal if the information is complex.

- Transfer of training into the workplace. The relationship between learning outcomes and application in the workplace is not necessarily strong, so steps need to be taken to enhance the transfer.

- Transfer of learning outcomes into the workplace is particularly strong if there is high similarity between the training and the jobs to be performed.

- Transfer of learning into the workplace is facilitated if:
  a. The work environment is supportive.
  b. There is opportunity to put the new knowledge and skills into practice.
  c. There is post-training evaluation of transfer.
  d. There are interactive activities during training.

- Training should not be an isolated event. Its effectiveness is enhanced if there are pre-training and post-training activities as well.

- Training is enhanced if the learning is multidimensional, including cognitive, affective, and skill components.

- For older trainees, it may be useful for the experience to be slower paced and to show work examples.

- Lectures are useful in order to transmit knowledge. They are particularly helpful when combined with discussion, problem-solving tasks, case studies, modeling, simulation, and games. It is also helpful if learners have the opportunity to explore resources, probably because this fosters independent inquiry.

- Feedback alone may not be enough to alter behavior (also see Graesser and "practice outcome monitoring" below).

Conclusions and Recommendations from Graesser (2010) regarding the seven principles of adult learning:

- Learning experiences should be spaced over time.

- It is useful to interweave worked examples with problem solving exercises.

- Combining graphics with verbal descriptions enhances learning.
- It is important to connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts.
- Use quizzes to promote learning.
- Help students allocate time effectively.
- Ask deep, explanatory questions.

Information from Graesser, Halpern, & Hakel (2008) regarding principles of learning (selected items):

- Ground concepts in perceptual motor performance.
- Present material in verbal, visual, and multimedia forms.
- Use testing to enhance learning.
- Space studying and testing to produce long-term better retention.
- There are benefits for repeated testing when students expect a final exam.
- Producing answers is more effective than simply recognizing answers.
- Outlining, integrating, and synthesizing information works better than more passive strategies.
- Stories and examples tend to be remembered better than facts and abstract principles.
- Multiple and varied examples are helpful.
- Students benefit from feedback, particularly immediate feedback.

- Challenges make learning and retrieval effortful and enhance long-term retention.
- Information presented should not overload working memory.
- Complex lessons should be broken down into manageable parts.
- There are more benefits in constructing mental models than memorizing isolated facts.
- Deep reasoning and learning is stimulated by problems that present obstacles to goals, conflict, and contradictions.
- Cognitive flexibility improves with multiple viewpoints that link fact, skills, procedures, and conceptual principles.
- Material should be pitched at the right level for learner's skill or knowledge (Goldilocks Principle).
- Most students need training in self-regulated learning.
- Learning and motivation are enhanced when content is anchored in real world problems that matter to the learner.

Conclusions from Bloom (2005)

- Interactive techniques were most effective in changing physician behavior and enhancing patient outcomes, including audit, feedback, academic detailing/outreach, and reminders.
- Clinical practice guidelines and recommendations of opinion leaders were less effective.
- Didactic presentations and distributing printed information was reported to have minimal beneficial effect.

Hojat et al. (2009) support the idea of experiencing a range of learning activities, including continuing medical education, attending conferences, reading, home study, etc.

Sitzmann et al. (2010) provides information regarding training for accurate self-assessment of knowledge:

- Give feedback on performance.

- Self-assessment is particularly useful if students get feedback on the accuracy of their self-assessments during the learning process so they can calibrate their assessments. This helps them learn their strengths and weaknesses.

- Have students compare their level of knowledge and performance with their peers in order to enhance their motivation to learn.

- Have students practice using relevant knowledge and skills.

- Learning to evaluate one's own knowledge and skills is helpful in developing lifelong learning habits.

Information gleaned from Cochran Collaboration reviews (e.g., Davis, 2001; Davis et al., 2006; Jamtvedt, Young, Kristoffersen, O'Brien, & Oxman, 2010; Oxman, Thomson, Davis & Haynes, 1995):

- Feedback on performance is valuable if the feedback is proximal in time to decision making. There are a variety of methods of feedback (e.g., 360-degree feedback, peer comparison), and the empirical support for these methods varies from study to study.
- Reminders given before a decision is to be made are significantly but minimally useful. For example, some type of reminder of the various assessment instruments helpful in a custody evaluation report could be useful if given soon before the assessment is to take place.
- Educational meetings combined with feedback are helpful; meetings help to increase the value of feedback.

- Educational meetings can be helpful when attendance is higher, there are mixed didactic and interactive elements, when at least some of the learning requires active participation on the part of the recipient, and when outcomes are more serious.

- Educational meetings alone do not seem to be effective in changing professionals' complex behaviors.

- At times, intense feedback combined with practice audit is useful, but the effect on quality of care is small.

- Audits and feedback are more useful when the feedback is intensive and adherence to recommended practice (e.g., treatment guidelines) is low.

- Multifaceted programs generally produce better practice outcomes, but there are many interactions among various factors.

- It has been shown in medicine that if a practice audit turns up deficiencies in performance, targeted interventions can improve performance.

Conclusions and Recommendations from the Committee on Planning a Continuing Health Care Professional Education Institute (2010):

- CPD activities should bring together diverse health care disciplines to enhance team-based health care.

- It is important to have learners identify problems and apply solutions.

- Best learning comes from interactive experiences that involved feedback.

- It is most useful to have multiple learning experiences over time on the same topic.

- Simulations may be helpful.

- Learning is enhanced if it is in the context of client/patient care and deals with clinical or applied questions.

- It is important to teach students the nature of biases and to learn self-reflection.
- Experiential learning using such methods as needs assessment and role-play may be helpful.
- Ongoing feedback is useful.
- Simulate the clinical setting.

In summary, this is a survey of some of the literature applicable to CPD and adult learning. However, it should be apparent that the majority of CPD experiences, particularly as mandated by licensing boards in psychology, have not integrated what is known about effective CE into their programs.

Did It Result In The Right Outcomes?

Outcomes can be roughly broken down into affective outcomes (satisfaction), acquisition of knowledge (subjective opinions or objective measures), transfer of knowledge and skills into the workplace, and the impact of the activity on patient or client care and ultimately on outcomes (Brown & Sitzmann, 2011). There is a long history of evaluating treatment outcomes (e.g., Lambert & Hawkin, 2004), most of which has been designed for research or developed to provide agency feedback on overall effectiveness (Battle, Imber, Hoehn-Saric, Stone, Nash & Frank, 1966; Kiresuk & Sherman, 1960), and most of which only indirectly applies to CPD outcomes. There is a much briefer history on developing measures that may be useful to the individual practitioner (e.g., Cone, 2000; Lambert, 2010), and few formal CPD programs that specifically address the use of these measures. As noted by Neimeyer et al, (2009), there is a paucity of CPD outcome research in psychology, so we are left with extrapolating results of research from other professions or fields to attempt to enhance CPD programs for psychologists.

There are a variety of ways to categorize outcomes. One useful model is the taxonomy proposed by Kirkpatrick (1967). The four-outcome levels framework includes:

1. “Reactions” to CPD, (e.g., satisfaction with the program, opinions about the acceptability of the material). Such reactions, however, may have a minimal or even non-existent relationship with the next three levels. For example, Warr, Allan, and Birdi (1999) found that in an organizational setting, positive reactions

to a training program were unrelated to later job behavior. Unfortunately, many purveyors of CPD programs rely heavily on such reactions to judge a program's effectiveness. This would be akin to asking undergraduate students how much they learned in a course, assigning grades on the basis of their opinions, and then expecting them to apply the knowledge gained. Such positive reactions may be effective in promoting business and must reflect some learning; however, this has not been objectively documented to be helpful in professionals' skill development or improving client outcomes.

2. The second level of outcome is defined as the acquisition of declarative or procedural knowledge, behavioral change such as increased competency, or change in attitude. As discussed above, relying on self-assessment at this level is hazardous, suggesting that objective measures of change are desirable.

3. Even if there is objectively documented learning at level two, it is critical that the enhanced competence gained from CPD transfer to the workplace. Kirkpatrick labels this as "results". Again, the assumption is that if the new learning transfers into the workplace, this will enhance client outcomes. In the practice monitoring adherence to treatment guidelines, generally carried out in research settings, but currently difficult if not impossible to implement in general practice settings, is probably the "gold standard" for monitoring this level of CPD results. Other measures could include practice audits. Of course, if one can demonstrate new learning has been put into practice in the workplace, decades of outcome research into methods of assessment and treatment would suggest a positive impact on treatment outcomes. The work of Jensen-Doss et al. (2009) and Steinfield et al. (2009) serve as good examples of this outcome level.

4. Kirkpatrick's fourth outcome level, system change, seems more possible in organizational settings, e.g., higher morale, less staff turnover, than in independent practice settings. In mental health organizations, this could include fewer complaints, fewer errors, higher compliance with administrative and clinical regulations, etc.

As previously stated, unfortunately, in psychology, there is little empirical research on CPD outcomes with the exception of surveys of participants' views of the value of such activities (Neimeyer et al., 2009). A survey of APA Practice Organization members indicated that generally psychologists were satisfied with their CE experiences, felt the

quality of offerings was good, felt they had learned a considerable amount, and felt that what was learned translated into their practices. The authors were clear that there was no direct assessment of outcomes and further note the discrepancy in the literature between perceived and measured outcomes in psychology. They also stated that the lack of theoretically informed work on studying and offering CE is puzzling. In the practice arena most of the evidence on levels of new learning, translation of learning into practice, and effects on clients/patients is based on self-report rather than on objective assessment (Neimeyer et al., 2009).

Neimeyer et al. (2009) suggest that studies of CE outcomes can be broken down into four categories: (1) overall satisfaction, (2) levels of new learning, (3) translation of learning into practice, and (4) impact of learning on service effectiveness. This is quite similar to Kirkpatrick (1967). They go on to note that there is little research in psychology on the latter two; however, it might be more usefully stated that most of the sound research on CPD in psychology is in the first category, since most of the evidence on levels of new learning, translation of learning into practice, and effects on clients/patients is based on self-report. We have evidence from training in I/O psych that self-assessment of knowledge gained appears to be more strongly related to satisfaction with the experience than with actual cognitive learning. Findings in medicine (Davis et al., 2006) summarized in a review of 725 articles, showed "weak or no associations between physicians' self-rated assessments and external assessments" (p.1100). Also, people who have lower rated external assessments are the least accurate in self-assessment (Tracey, Arrol, Barham & Richmond, 1997). Tracey and colleagues found correlations between physicians' self-assessed level of knowledge of three major disorders with formal knowledge assessment to be about .20, suggesting that physicians have great difficulty assessing their level of knowledge accurately. Finally, it is discouraging to see that people who need the most help and who know the least are the least aware of needing it (Gruppen, 2010). Gruppen referred to a general finding of professionals, in his example college professors, where 94% rated themselves above average. He and others have referred to this as the "Lake Woebegon" effect, where there is no one below average.

Laying aside the assumption that enhanced competencies will enhance client outcomes, it is also possible to think of another outcome level, that of specific client outcomes. Kirkpatrick (1967) may have included this level under "results" but this is not clear. There is no reason to expect, however, that acquired cognitive or behavioral

competencies will necessarily translate directly into improved client outcomes, even if they do translate into enhanced client care. There are many variables affecting client outcomes, including, for example, the nature and level of a client's illness/distress, motivation or willingness of the client to comply with recommendations, efficacy of the treatment model, aspects of family or other environmental factors that either support or undermine treatment, client financial resources, client/psychologist match, etc. Therefore, while improved outcomes is clearly the ultimate goal of CPD, direct measurement of this goal is complicated and contaminated by many factors other than psychologist competence and transfer of knowledge into the workplace.

In spite of the complications of using patient or client outcomes as a measure of CPD effectiveness, there are an increasing number of innovations in outcome measurement that show great promise in improving results of treatment. First, it is important to present a bit of background on the impetus for these developments. This discussion will involve CPD only insofar as practitioners can be motivated and taught to systematically monitor client/patient progress; it does not gauge the effectiveness of the various methods of offering CPD on the outcome categories outlined by Kirkpatrick (1967) or Niemeyer et al., (2009).

Golding & Gray (2006) note that after graduate school, psychologists face a lack of supervision, some larger degree of professional isolation, and some loss of peer support. They suggest that learning to evaluate one's own outcomes should be part of the graduate program curriculum to help ensure that competent provision of services will continue in spite of reduced oversight. Similarly, Epstein, Siegal, & Silberman (2008) note that in medicine, practitioners get little objective, external feedback, so they fall back on "internal data" to judge their knowledge and competence. These authors discussed how subcortical regions of the brain, particularly those involved in emotions and reactions to threat, are involved in processing of information beneath conscious awareness even though such processes directly affect reasoning and decision-making. This internal data is, of course, subject to a variety of sources of bias such as noticing only external information that is consistent with one's self image. Riso (2011) notes that we may ignore important cues from our patients, selecting out information that confirms our preconceived belief that psychotherapy is effective (confirmation bias).

Daniel Kahneman, in *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (2011), reviews findings in cognitive psychology and related fields in straightforward, everyday language, brilliantly

summarizing the effects of "fast thinking" (automatic, non-reflective, reflexive thinking and reactions) on our thinking and decision-making, introducing biases of which we are unaware. There is no evidence that practitioners are more immune to these biases than anyone else. In a review in *The Atlantic,* Maria Popova (2011) suggests that Kahneman's book will forever change the way one thinks about thinking. Even more problematic, a number of authors (Kruger & Dunning, 1999; Dunning et al., 2004; Gruppen, 2010) have shown that practitioners who are least competent are the ones most likely to inflate their image of themselves as competent. And those who are incompetent may not be able to use more competent individuals as role models since they may not have the knowledge to assess competence in others.

One attempt to help practitioner's remedy this lack of feedback and avoid the types of biases noted above may be called "practice outcome monitoring". In her APA Presidential Address, Carol Goodheart (2011) outlined an attempt to help practitioners remedy this lack of feedback and avoid the type of biases noted above called "practice outcome monitoring" or "practice based evidence." The popularity of outcome monitoring has gathered considerable momentum in the last few years. Katherine Nordal, Executive Director for Professional Practice of the American Psychological Association, strongly endorsed individual practitioner's use of outcome measures in that it benefits patients, practitioners, third party health insurance carriers, and policy makers (Nordal, 2012). Practitioner newsletters have endorsed this practice (e.g., Riso, 2011) and there have been several workshops that have focused on monitoring, including a series of online presentations by the Psychotherapy Networker (2011) and the APA (Doucette, 2011).

The impetus for outcome assessments reflects not only the importance of demonstrating the effectiveness of psychological interventions, but, more importantly for this report, enhancement of the individual practitioner's effectiveness. It is the impact on individual practitioners that led us to recommend awarding CPD credit for conducting outcome assessments.

Lambert and colleagues note in a series of publications that, while there has been an increased emphasis on quality assurance by policy makers and insurance carriers, less than one-third of practitioners systematically assess their own treatment outcomes (e.g., Lambert, 2010, Lambert & Hawkin, 2004; Shimowka, Lambert & Smart, 2010.) However, Whipple and Lambert (2011) indicate that a minimum of 5-10% of patients in

psychotherapy get worse during therapy, and 30-50% of others may fail to improve. The situation seems even worse for children and adolescents. They have also found that it is rare for psychologists to predict or even note deterioration. For example, in one study involving 550 patients, therapists predicted one percent would have a negative outcome, while, in fact, seven percent of them did (Hannan, Lambert, Harmon, Nielsen, Smart, Shimokawa, & Sutton, 2005). In light of these findings, the issue of biases discussed above, and the ambiguity of assessing psychotherapy outcomes, the lack of systematic assessment on one's own outcomes would seem to represent a serious deficiency in our practice

A number of studies have shown that direct monitoring of patients' progress can dramatically improve outcomes, particularly in those patients who are at risk for treatment failure. A wide array of measures have been developed specifically for therapists to administer to patients to track progress session by session, allowing for recognition of problems and need for changes in the treatment on an on-going basis. As noted above, the APA has reviewed many of these measures and has put a searchable database of researched measures on the APA website (under My APA, for members only). Some of these are aimed at specific problem areas, e.g., depression (Beck, Steer & Brown, 1996), others at a range of symptoms (Derogatis & Fitzpatrick, 2004), some at more general levels of functioning (Lambert, 2010; Whipple & Lambert, 2011), and others at more global estimates of functioning and the quality of the therapeutic alliance (Anker, Duncan & Sparks, 2009; Anker, Owen, Duncan & Sparks, 2010; Anker, Sparks, Duncan, Owen & Stapnes, 2011; Duncan, 2011). Below we will give an overview of several of these instruments.

Lambert (2010) has developed a questionnaire called the Outcome Questionaire-45 (OQ-45). It is a 45-item patient survey, administered at each session that covers the status of symptoms, interpersonal functioning, social role functioning, and changes in quality of life. It has been well standardized and been shown to be exceedingly effective in identifying therapy that is "off-track," and is effective in predicting and averting treatment failure. Duncan and colleagues have developed the Partners for Change Outcome Management System (Anker et al., 2009; Anker et al., 2010; Anker et al., 2011; Duncan, 2011). They developed two four-item scales, one focused on the same areas as noted above in the OQ-45 and the other focused on the therapeutic alliance (quality of the therapeutic relationship and agreement with the therapist on the goals and methods of treatment). They have shown dramatic improvement in treatment

effectiveness when the measure is used collaboratively with the client or patient. In this collaboration, the patient becomes the "educator" or at least provides motivation for the therapist's new learning and approaches. Finally, Pinsof (2011) authored the Systemic Therapy Inventory of Change (STIC), a measure designed to track what he terms client systems from "multi-systemic, multi-dimensional perspectives", suitable for individuals, couples, and families. His is also a collaborative model, using the STIC at each session for assessment, planning, and monitoring change. Babins-Wagner (2011) has further demonstrated that such measures not only enhance overall treatment outcomes in a clinical setting, but also can be integrated seamlessly into ongoing agency procedures.

It appears that while some authors believe that feedback alone can be helpful (Lambert, 2010; Duncan, 2011), to be maximally useful it should be combined with collaboration between the practitioner and the patient on the ongoing assessment of the therapy and the patient's functioning. Several authors (e.g., Lambert, 2010; Pinsof, 2011) have taken a second step in not only identifying patients in danger of deterioration but also developing a "decision tree" of recommended interventions depending on the major dimensions involved in impending failure, e.g., symptoms, interpersonal relationships, ruptures in the alliance. This can help guide the practitioner to a variety of interventions that could be helpful in averting failure or enhancing outcomes.

Based on the findings discussed above, Epstein et al. (2008) suggest that learning to evaluate one's own outcomes should be part of the graduate program curriculum to help ensure that competent provision of services will continue in spite of reduced oversight. In support of the feasibility of this suggestion, Brown & Sitzmann (2011) have shown that there is research that suggests that under certain conditions, students can learn to be more accurate in their self-assessments.

In summary, in spite of the fact that there is little direct research on effective methods of CPD, much can be extrapolated from research in non-clinical settings, and assessment in clinical settings on ongoing patient progress offers an exciting tool to enhance the effectiveness of service delivery. The first may provide knowledge of what CPD methods change therapists' behavior. The second does not necessarily lead practitioners to be better therapists, but it does help them provide better therapy (Lambert, 2011). The Task Force therefore is suggesting that CPD credit be given not only for seminars or workshops on integrating these methods into practice, but also to practitioners who demonstrate that these methods have been integrated into their practice.

APPENDIX F

Professional Development Plan

EVALUATION OF CURRENT AREAS OF PRACTICE AND/OR SERVICES PROVIDED

List your current areas of practice or the services you provide.

Identify any differences between your current and desired levels of knowledge or skill. Please consider both areas requiring improvement and areas where enhancement is desired. Having identified these differences, you should begin to think about how these might be addressed through continuing professional development. Please describe these differences and carry them forward to be addressed in your *Professional Development Plan*.

Areas of Practice/Services Provided	**Differences Between Current and Desired Levels of Knowledge and Skill**
Example:	Example:
Consultation with School Teams regarding children with learning disabilities	None
Rehabilitation therapy with elderly	Not familiar with newest versions of intelligence measures with national norms
Assessment of children with LD	Confusion regarding consent to treatment, capacity, etc. How does capacity to consent to treatment differ from capacity to handle own financial affairs
Counseling for families of elderly stroke victims	None
Bereavement Counseling	Continue to update knowledge
Chronic pain work with individuals	Consider expanding to group work – need more experience

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A *Professional Development Plan* is created to address any differences between the current and desired levels of knowledge, skill or experience identified through the above exercise.

Differences Identified Above	Developmental Plan to Address Differences	Time Line	Course, Workshop, Activity
Example:	Example:	Example:	
Become familiar with newest versions of intelligence assessment measures, including national norms	Discuss with peers Review journal articles	June 2012	
Improve understanding of 'capacity' and ability to consent to treatment	Get copy of relevant legislation Discuss areas of confusion with colleague	Immediate	
Obtain experience with chronic pain groups	Review recent literature in psychoeducation and support groups Arrange to co-facilitate two series of groups with colleague	December 2012	
Continue to update knowledge for bereavement counseling	Look for workshop, conference or new journal articles	Ongoing	

APPENDIX G

Regulatory Language Sample

Continuing Professional Development Requirements.

During each two year period commencing on _____, of each even numbered year:
A licensed psychologist shall be required to complete not less than 40 credits of continuing professional development related to the licensee's professional practice;
The required number of hours of continuing professional development for a psychologist who first becomes licensed during the two year period shall be decreased to 20 for one year and less than a year, no CPD will be required. All licensed psychologists are required to have at least 3 credits in the areas of Ethics, Risk Assessment and/or Jurisdictional Rules and Regulations every two years.

Each licensee shall be required to complete a Continuing Professional Development Plan available at (jurisdictional website) at the beginning of each renewal period. The plan shall serve as a guide for the psychologist regarding continuing professional development and should be available to the licensing board in the event the psychologist's continuing professional development is audited;

Each licensee shall be required to provide the Board with a document available at (jurisdictional website) stating his/her intended areas of practice;

Credit for Continuing Professional Development shall be recognized in accordance with the following:

Peer Consultation

A maximum of 20 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for regular and ongoing peer consultation. Peer consultation includes research groups, journal clubs, and case consultation groups that have a structured, organized format, meet regularly, and focus on psychological activities related to one's practice. This activity requires a minimum of 10 hours participation, in order to be creditable, with one hour or peer consultation equal to one hour of credit. Required documentation is a contemporaneous

log with a list of dates attended, topics discussed, location, identification of participants, and number of hours. The log must be attested to by the individual who is designated as the recorder of the peer consultation group.

Practice Outcome Monitoring (POM)

A maximum of 20 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for Practice Outcome Monitoring (POM) with one patient/client series of assessments being equal to one credit, if properly documented. This activity includes the regular application of outcome assessment protocols with clients/patients in order to monitor one's own practice process and outcomes. POM of ongoing services should include repeated measures and involve the use of a standardized assessment tools. Participation in a hospital or health care system's formal quality assurance program (QA) that focuses on monitoring client/patient outcomes would also be included in this category. Required documentation includes a contemporaneous log with client ID #, date of assessment, assessment protocol, and outcome of assessment.

Professional Activities

A maximum of 10 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for Professional Activities such as serving on psychological association boards or committees, editorial boards of peer reviewed journals, scientific grant writing teams or a board member on a regulatory body. One continuous year of such service equals 10 credits. Required documentation is written verification from board or committee chair.

Conferences/Conventions

A maximum of 5 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for attendance at professional Conference/ Conventions related to psychology, which are not part of formal Approved Sponsored Continuing Professional Development. One day equals one credit. Required documentation is a copy of the registration materials.

Courses

A maximum of 20 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for completing and passing a graduate-level course related to one's area of psychological practice from a

regionally accredited educational institution. Passing the equivalent of one semester-long one credit course would count for 7 credits; passing the equivalent of one semester-long two credit course would count for 14 credits; and passing the equivalent of one semester-long three credit course would count for 20 CPD credits. Required documentation is a transcript showing the course taken and the passing grade.

Instruction

A maximum of 20 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for teaching a graduate or undergraduate course related to psychology in a regionally accredited institution. A maximum of 10 credits per two year period shall be recognized for teaching a 6 hour long approved sponsor continuing professional development workshop and a maximum of 5 credits every two years shall be recognized for teaching a 3 hour long approved sponsor continuing professional development workshop. These credits (for courses and workshops) apply only for the first time teaching or presenting. Required documentation is a copy of the presentation announcement or course catalog noting the course taught and instructor, or registration materials indicating the presentation; and an attestation from the psychologist stating that the course or workshop is being presented for the first time.

Publications

A maximum of 10 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for publications related to psychology as long as the publications are contained in a peer-reviewed article or a book chapter. Required documentation is a copy of the first page of the journal article, or book chapter.

Approved Sponsor Continuing Education

A maximum of 30 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for Approved Sponsored Continuing Education. This refers to participation in any activity provided by approved sponsor organizations described below. Required documentation is an official certificate of attendance/participation issued by the CE presenter/sponsoring organization and includes date, title, location, and number of hours.

Self-directed Learning

A maximum of 5 credits per two-year period shall be recognized for self-directed learning directly related to the practice of the psychologist. Acceptable activities include use of audiotapes, videotapes, books, and journals and activities from non-approved sponsors. Each hour of self-instructional activity qualifies for one (1) CPD credit. Required documentation is an attestation that contains a description of the activity, the subject material covered, the dates, and number of hours involved.

Board Certification

A maximum of 40 credits in a two-year period shall be recognized for the successful completion of the board examination of the American Board of Professional Psychology. Documentation from ABPP must be submitted to the Board.

Approved sponsors of continuing education include the American Psychological Association or any of its sponsors approved through the American Psychological Association Sponsor Approval System (APA, 2005), the Canadian Psychological Association Approval of Sponsors of Continuing Education for Canadian Psychologists (CPA, 2005), the Academies of the Specialty Boards of the American Board of Professional Psychology, the Association for Psychological Science, the National Association of School Psychologists, Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, regionally accredited educational institutions that offer graduate training in psychology or related fields, accredited medical schools, Category I Continuing Medical Education (CME) of the American Medical Association, the Canadian Medical Association, the American Bar Association, and the Canadian Bar Association. Courses offered by non-psychology organizations must be relevant to the practice of psychology.

The delivery method of the continuing education may be in person or electronically mediated as long as provided by an approved sponsor

Each licensee shall be responsible for maintaining records of completed qualified professional education for a period of four years after the close of the two-year period to which the records pertain.

Each licensee shall attest, on his/her biennial license renewal application, that he/she has satisfied the continuing professional development requirements. Documentation of these activities should be retained by the licensee and not sent to the Board unless so requested. False attestation of satisfaction of the continuing professional development requirements on a renewal application may subject the licensee to disciplinary action, including revocation.

The Board will audit a ____ percent sample of the renewal applications. Licensees whose applications are audited will be required to document the completion of their Continuing Professional Development activities.

If an audited licensee attests to completion of the required CPD in the appropriate timeframe but does not present acceptable documentation of the attested CPD, a disciplinary action will be pursued. The licensee will have no more than three months from the time of the failed audit to present acceptable documentation of the required CPD. These CPD credits shall not be used by the licensee for documentation of CPD requirements for subsequent reporting cycles and the licensee will be audited in the next reporting cycle. Should the licensee fail to present documentation of the required CPD within that 3 months, the license will be considered lapsed.

Appeal: The licensee shall have 30 days to appeal the decision made as a result of the CPD audit. After 30 days, discipline should be pursued per Board/College authority.

Further disciplinary action should be considered when licensees continue to practice psychology while failing to comply with mandated CPD.

APPENDIX H

Rationale for the Activities

CPD Activity	Primary Rationale	Competencies Addressed
Peer Consultation: Interaction with colleagues can be extremely valuable and should be encouraged. Professional isolation can be a danger and is more likely to occur when a psychologist is practicing solo.	Reduction in professional isolation	• Scientific Knowledge • Evidence-Based Decision-making/Critical Reasoning • Interpersonal & Multicultural Competence • Professional Ethics • Assessment • Intervention/ Supervision/ Consultation
Practice Outcome Monitoring: Periodic filling out evaluation forms, having specific goals mapped out and then checked by the client/patient and practitioner when they have been attained, and other more formal mechanisms of evaluation are available for internally monitoring one's own practice.	Systematically monitoring one's own practice	• Evidence-Based Decision-making/Critical Reasoning • Intervention/ Supervision/ Consultation
Professional Activities: In order to overcome isolation and to ensure that the public service work of the profession is supported, professionals are encouraged to participate in their professional associations at all	Reduction in professional isolation	• Scientific Knowledge • Professional Ethics

levels.		
Conferences/Conventions: Interacting with colleagues and participating in the variety of social, interpersonal, professional and scientific activities that are part of the milieu of conferences and conventions can be enhancing to professional development.	Variety in the kinds of learning activities	• Scientific Knowledge
Academic Courses: There are many areas that benefit psychologists with regard to obtaining additional information that relates to their profession and the practice of psychology. These areas could range from refresher courses in areas of established practice to business training to help with management of the business-related aspects of practice.	Activities that occur over time	• Scientific Knowledge • Evidence-Based Decision-making/Critical Reasoning • Interpersonal & Multicultural Competence • Professional Ethics • Assessment • Intervention/ Supervision/ Consultation
Instruction: The effort of preparing for a course or workshop and teaching it for the first time is substantial. The updated knowledge gained from these endeavors can significantly add to one's professional development.	Activities that occur over time	• Scientific Knowledge • Evidence-Based Decision-making/Critical Reasoning • Interpersonal & Multicultural Competence • Professional Ethics • Assessment

		• Intervention/ Supervision/ Consultation
Publications: Publications are an example of an area with benefits for both the psychologist who does the writing and for the intended audience. When one produces a publication, a great deal of knowledge is obtained from the literature review, from the science that has been included in the publication itself, and the feedback given by the publishers. The Identification of new ideas is critical to the continuing freshness, growth and development of the field and that is also true for the growth and development of professionals within the field.	Activities that include formal feedback	• Scientific Knowledge
Approved Sponsor CE: The opportunity for psychologists to take various approved sponsor CE, not only from other psychologists, but also from individuals in professions related to the psychologists' fields of endeavor, will continue to be an important and mainstream aspect of Continuing Professional Development.	Variety in the kinds of learning activities	• Scientific Knowledge • Professional Ethics • Assessment • Intervention/Supervisio n/ Consultation

Self-directed learning: It is valuable to read books and scientific journals, listen to tapes, or in other ways gain knowledge on one's own	Variety in the kinds of learning activities	• Scientific Knowledge • Professional Ethics • Assessment • Intervention/Supervision/ Consultation
Board Certification: Board Certification requires much time, effort, work and demonstrated competence in a specialty area that is scrutinized and evaluated by other expert psychologists within the same area. Psychologists are required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of experienced peers, through a structured and well-formulated process, that they are competent in intervention, assessment, and consultation in their area of practice. Additionally, psychologists are examined on ethical and legal issues, scientific bases for their services, supervision/teaching/management, interpersonal interactions, individual and cultural diversity, and professional identification. This level of examination and scrutiny is considered the "gold standard" and serves as the best indicator our profession currently has of assuring that licensed psychologists are maintaining their professional competence. As with medicine, a single, voluntary bard encompassing all	Activities that include formal feedback	• Scientific Knowledge • Evidence-Based Decision-making/Critical Reasoning • Interpersonal & Multicultural Competence • Professional Ethics • Assessment • Intervention/ Supervision/ Consultation

of the recognized specialties is considered to be the appropriate designator for board certification.		

APPENDIX I

Assignments of Credits

The decision to assign a certain value to each activity was initially determined on a rational, rather than on an empirical, basis. The process utilized to obtain the current credit recommendations involved seven steps.

1. Each member of the Task Force individually assigned a percentage value to each of the activities listed, reflecting the maximum value that activity should contribute to a two-year quotient of CPD activities;
2. The committee determined that 40 credits every two years would be recommended, in keeping with the modal number of CE hours required by jurisdictions
3. Each individual assigned a maximum number of credits for each activity, based on the requirements of 40 credits every two years.
4. A consensus conference was used to arrive at the initial allocations, using both a credit and percentage basis considered appropriate for each of the several categories of CPD activity.
5. The psychology regulatory Boards and Colleges in the United States and Canada were surveyed for their views on the proposed credit allocations and on the appropriate maximum allocations for each activity.
6. In addition, input was received from a survey jointly conducted by the American Psychological Association's Continuing Education Committee, and the American Board of Professional Psychology asking practicing psychologists about their current CPD activities, and their estimates of future CPD activities.
7. The MOCAL committee reviewed the number of credits for the various activities in light of the results of both surveys as well as from other input received. In addition, the committee assessed various combinations of activities to ensure that practitioners and academicians could readily obtain the required number of credits. Caps were maintained for the total number of credits for each type of activity to require psychologists to utilize more than one activity for professional development and to reduce the potential for professional isolation.

References

American Psychological Association (2002). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct.* APA: Washington, DC.

American Psychological Association (2005). Policy statement of evidence-based practice in psychology. Retrieved from http://www.apapracticecentral.org/ce/courses/ebpstatement.pdf

American Psychological Association Access (2012). Retrieved from Access/pubs/newsletters/access/2012/01-04/index.aspx

Anker, M.G., Duncan, B.L., & Sparks, J.A. (2009). Using client feedback to improve couple therapy outcomes: A randomized clinical trial in a naturalistic setting. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(4), 693-704.

Anker, M.G., Owen, J., Duncan, B.L., & Sparks, J.A. (2010). The alliance in couple therapy: Partner influence, early change, and alliance patterns in a naturalistic setting. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 78(5), 635-645.

Anker, M.G., Sparks, J.A., Duncan, B.L., Owen, J., & Stapnes, A.K. Footprints of couple therapy: Client reflections at follow-up. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy,* 22(1), 22-45.

ASPPB Study of the Practice of Licensed Psychologists in the United States and Canada. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.asppb.net/files/PA_Executive_Summary_2010.pdf

Babins-Wagner (2011). Building a culture of excellence. Webinar Bringing Science into Clinical Practice, *The Psychotherapy Networker*, Washington, D.C.

Battle, C.C., Imber, S., Hoehn-Saric, R., Stone, A.R., Nash, C., & Frank, J.D. (1966). Target complaints as a criterion of improvement. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 20, 184-192.

Beck A.T., Steer R.A., & and Brown,G.K . (1996). Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory-II". San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Bloom, B.S. (2005). Effects of continuing medical education on improving physician clinical care and patient health: a review of systematic reviews. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*, 231, 380-385.

Brown, K. G. & Sitzmann, T. (2011). Training and employee development for improved performance. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 469-503). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Canadian Psychological Association (2000). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists (3rd edition)*. CPA: Ottawa, ON.

College of Psychologists of Ontario (2010). Self assessment guide and professional development plan. Retrieved from http://www.cpo.on.ca/WorkArea/showcontent.aspx?id=2596

Committee on Planning a Continuing Health Care Professional Education Institute. (2010). *Redesigning Continuing Education in the Health Professions.* The Institute of Medicine. National Academies Press: Washington, D.C.

Cone, J. (2000). Evaluating outcomes: Empirical tools for clinical practice. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Courtney, M. & Farnworth, L. (2003). Professional competence for private practitioners in occupational therapy. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. *50,* 234-243.

Davis, N. (2001). Enhancing the effectivness of meetings and workshops through research. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, *21(3),* 188-90.

Davis, D.A., Mazmanian, P.E., Fordis, M., Van Harrison, R., Thorpe, K.E. & Perrier, L., 2006). Accuracy of physicians' self-assessment compared with observed measures of competence. *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 296(9), 1094-1102.

Derogatis, L.R. & Fitzpatrick, M. (2004). The SCL-90-R and theBSI-18. In Maurish, M.D., (pg 1-42). *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcome assessment* (3rd Ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Doucette, A.M. (2011). Integrating outcome measurement in psychotherapy practice. APA Online academy (http://www.com/secure/registrationpage.

Duncan, B. (2011). How do we get better? Webinar: Bringing Science into Clinical Practice, *The Psychotherapy Networker*, Washington, D.C.

Dunning, D., Heath, C. & Suls, J.M. (2004). Flawed self-assessment: Implications for health, education and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *5(3),* 69-106.

Epstein, R. M., & Hundert, E. M. (2002). Defining and assessing professional competence. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 287, 226-235.*

Epstein, R.M., Seigal, D.J., & Siblerman, J. (2008). Self-monitoring in clinical practice: A challenge for medical educators. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 28(1),* 5-13.

Eva, K. W. & Regehr, G. (2005). Self-assessment and the health professions: A reformulation and research agenda. *Academic Medicine*, *80(10)*, October 2005 Supplement.

Finlayson, B. and Dewar, S. (2001). Reforming complaint systems: UK and New Zealand. *The Lancet*, *358*, 1290.

Forsetlund, L., Bjorndal, F., Rashidian, A., O'Brien, M.A., Wolf, F., Davis, D., & Oxman, A.D. (2008). Continuing education meetings and workshops for health professionals. www2.chchrane.org/reviews/en/ab003030.html.

Golding, L, & Gray, I. (2006). *Continuing professional development for clinical psychologists: A practical handbook*. Malding, MA: Blackwell.

Goodheart, C.D. (2011). Psychology practice: designed for tomorrow. *American Psychologist, 66(5),* 339-347.

Graesser, A. (2010). Scientific basis of adult learning. Presented at American Psychological Association Educational Leadership Conference, Psychology and Lifelong Learning. Washington, D.C.

Graesser, A.C., Halpern, D.F., & Hakel, M. (2008). 25 Principles of Learning. Washington, DC: Taskforce on Lifelong Learning at Work and at Home. Retrieved from www.psyc.memphis.edu/learning

Grant, J., Chambers, E., & Jackson, G. (1999). *The good CPD guide.* Reed Healthcare Publishing: Sutton. (WFME, 2003, p. 8.)

Green, D. (2006). CPD: Why bother? In Golding, L, and Gray, I. *Continuing professional development for clinical psychologists: A practical handbook*. Malding, MA: Blackwell. pp, 7-22.

Gruppen, L.D., (2010). Self-assessment in self-directed learning: Can we trust it? Do we have a choice? Paper presented at the APA Educational Leadership Conference, Washington, DC

Hannon, C., Lambert, M., Harmon, C., Nielsen, S., Smart, D., Shimokawa, K. & Sutton, S. (2005). A lab test and algorithms for identifying clients at risk for treatment failure. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61(2), 155-163.

Hatcher, R. (2011). The Future of the EPPP and Competency Assessment: Implications for Member Jurisdictions. Panel discussion, Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Hojat, M., Veloski, J., Nasca, T., Erdman, J., & Gonnella, J. (2006). Assessing physicians orientation to lifelong learning. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *21*, 931-936.

Hojat, M., Valoski, J., & Gonella, J. (2009). Measurement and correlates of physicians' lifelong learning. *Academic Medicine*, 84(8), 1066-1974.

Institute of Medicine (2010). Redesigning Continuing Education in the Health Professions. Washington, DC The National Academies Press.

Jameson, P., Stadter, M., & Poulton, J. (2007). Sustained and sustaining continuing education for therapists. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 44*, 110-114.

Jamtvedt, G., Young, J.M., Kristoffersen, D.T., O'Brien M.A., & Oxman, A.D (2010). Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Review.*

Jensen-Doss, A., Hawley, K.M., Lopez, M., & Osterberg, L.D. (2009). Using evidence-based treatments: The experiences of youth providers working under a mandate. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 41(4)*, 417-424.

Kahneman, Daniel (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kaslow, N. J., Dunn, S. E. & Smith, C.O. (2008). Competencies for psychologists in academic health centers (AHCs). *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, *15,* 18-27.

Kiresuk, T.J., & Sherman, R.E. (1960). Goal Attainment Scaling: A general method for evaluating comprehensive community mental health programs. *Community Mental Health Journal*, *4*, 443-453.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1967). Evaluation of training. Quoted in Golding, L, and Gray, I. *Continuing professional development for clinical psychologists: A practical handbook*. Malding, MA: Blackwell.

Kruger, J. & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77(6),* 1121-34.

Krueger, J. & Mueller, R. (2002). Unskilled, unaware, or both? The better-than-average heuristic and statistical regression predict errors in estimates of own performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(2), 180-188.

Lambert, M.J. (2010). *Prevention of treatment failure: The use of measuring, monitoring, and feedback in clinical practice.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Lambert, M. J. (2010). Yes, it is time for clinicians to routinely monitor treatment outcome. In Duncan, B.L., Miller, S.D., Wampold, B.E., & Hubble, M. (Eds). *The*

heart and soul of change: Delivering what works in therapy (2nd ed). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. (pp. 239-266.).

Lambert, M.J. (2011). From evidence-based practice to practice-based evidence. Webinar Bringing Science into Clinical Practice, the Psychotherapy Networker, Washington, DC

Lambert, M., & Hawkin, J. (2004). Measuring outcome in professional practice: Considerations in selecting and using brief outcome instruments. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, *35*, 492-499

Lewkonia, R. (2001). Educational implications of practice isolation. *Medical Education 35*(6), 528-529.

Milne, D., James, I., & Sheikh, A. (2006). Evaluating CPD: A practical framework, illustrated with clinical supervision. In Golding, L, and Gray, I. (2006). *Continuing professional development for clinical psychologists: A practical handbook.* Malding, MA: Blackwell. (pp. 149-174).

Neimeyer, G.J., Taylor, J.M., and Wear, D.M. (2009). Continuing education in psychology: Outcomes, evaluations, and mandates. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40(6),* 617-624.

Neimeyer, G.J., Taylor, J.M., & Wear, D. (2010). Continuing education in psychology: Patterns of participation and aspects of selection. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 41(4), 281-287.*

Neuberger, J. (2000). The educated patient: New challenges for the medical profession. *Journal of Internal Medicine, 247*, 6-10.

Nordal, K.C. (2012). Outcome measurement benefits psychology. *APA Monitor,* January, p. 51.

O'Brien, M.A., Freemantle, N., Oxman, A.D., Wolf, F., Davis, D.A. & Herrin, J. (2007). Continuing education meetings and workshops: Effects on professional practice and health care outcomes (review). The Cochran Collaboration, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Oxman, A.D., Thomson, M.A., Davis, A.D., & Haynes, R.B. (1995). No magic bullets: a systematic review of 102 trials of interventions to improve professional practice. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, *153(10*), 1423–1431.

Pinsof, W.M. (2011). The clinical use of the STIC (Systemic Therapy Inventory of Change). Webinar: Bringing Science into Clinical Practice, The Psychotherapy Networker, Washington, DC

Popova, M. (2011). The anti-Gladwell: Kahneman's new way to think about thinking. The Atlantic, November 1, Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/11/the-anti-gladwell-kahnemans-new-way-to-think-about-thinking/247407/

Psychotherapy Networker (2011). The road to clinical excellence. Washington, D.C. Integrating outcome measurements in psychotherapy practice. APA Online Academy: Washington, D.C.

Reid, R., Friedberg, M., Adams, J., McGlynn, E. & Mehrotra, A. (2010). Associations between physician characteristics and quality of care. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. *170(16),* 1442-1449.

Riso, L.P. (2011). Do you know how your clients are doing? Outcome measurement in clinical practice. *Independent Practitioner*, *314*, 155-156.

Rodolfa, E., Bent, R., Eisman, E., Nelson, P., Rehm, L., & Ritchie, P. (2005). A cube model for competency development: Implications for psychology educators and regulators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 36*, 347–354

Rodolfa, E., Schaffer, J. & Webb, C. (2010). Continuing education: The path to life-long competence? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 41(4),* 295-297.

Shimowka, K., Lambert, M.J., & Smart, D.W. (2010). Enhancing treatment outcome of patients at risk of treatment failure: Meta-analytic and mega-analytic review of a psychotherapy quality assurance system. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *78(3),* 298-311.)

Sitzmann, T., Ely, K., Brown, K.G. & Bauer, K.N. (2010). Self-assessment of knowledge: A cognitive learning or affective measure. *Academy of Management Learning and Education.*

Spring, B. (2011). Update on the science of team science. Paper presented at the APA Education Leadership Conference, Interdisciplinary and Interprofessional Practice, Washington, DC

Steinfield, B.I, Coffman, S.J., & Keyes, J.A. (2009). Implementation of an evidence-based practice in a clinical setting: What happens when you get there? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *40(4),* 410-416.

Swankin, D., LeBuhn, R.A., & Morrison, R. (2006). Implementing continuing competency requirements for healthcare practitioners. AARP, Washington, D.C. http://www.cacenter.org/files/ImplementingContinuingCompetencyRequirements.pdf Retrieved September 7, 2010.

Tracey, J., Arrol, B., Barham, P., & Richmond, D. (1997). The validity of general practitioners' self-assessment of knowledge: Cross sectional study. *British Medical Journal, 315,* 1426.

Warr, P., Allan, C.; & Birdi, K. (1999). Predicting three levels of training outcome. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72,* 351-75.

Whipple, J.L., & Lambert, M.J. (2011). Outcomes measures for practice. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *7.* 87-111

Wise, E. (2010). Maintaining and enhancing competency in professional psychology: Obsolescence, life-long learning, and continuing education. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 41(4),* 289-292.

World Federation of Medical Education (2003). Continuing professional development (CPD) of medical doctors. WFME: Global Standards for Quality Improvement. WFME Office: University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

OREGON HEALTH & SCIENCE UNIVERSITY

School of Medicine

Anesthesiology & Peri-Operative Medicine

Mail code UHS-2
3181 S.W. Sam Jackson Park Road
Portland, OR 97239-3098
tel 503 494-4908
fax 503 494-3092
www.ohsu.edu/anesth

Research Division

December 11, 2012

Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners
3218 Pringle Road SE, Suite 130
Salem OR 97302-6309

Dear Board Members,

I am licensed psychologist #1809 in Oregon, and employed as an Assistant Professor in the Departments of Anesthesiology and Peri-Operative Medicine, and Psychiatry, at Oregon Health & Science University in Portland. I am writing to ask for clarification regarding whether some types of yoga-related trainings might qualify as exceptions to Rule 858-040-0036 of ORS 675.110, "Programs Which Do Not Qualify for Continuing Education Credit". "Yoga" is stipulated therein as not qualifying for CE credit.

This rule appears to be based on a widely disseminated understanding of "yoga" as largely synonymous with the physical poses that have become popularized worldwide in recent decades. In actuality, the fuller discipline of yoga comprises a wide variety of psychologically relevant practices, such as meditation, breathing exercises, introspective self-inquiry, application of yoga philosophy principles to optimal coping, and practitioner meetings and discussions (Carson et al., 2010). However, yoga styles do vary greatly in the methods they emphasize, with some focusing almost exclusively on the physical exercises, and others emphasizing meditation and mindfulness in daily life.

As you may be aware, research into the effects of various types of yoga programs has been growing rapidly, providing substantial support for the psychological as well as physical benefits of yoga practices (Banerjee et al., 2007; Berger & Owen, 1992; Galantino, Galbavy, & Quinn, 2008; Haaz & Bartlett, 2011; Narendran, Nagarathna, Narendran, Gunasheela, & Nagendra, 2005; Wood, 1993; Wren, Wright, Carson, & Keefe, 2011; Yang, 2007). My own research has concentrated on the effects of an 8-week intervention, "Yoga of Awareness", that emphasizes meditation, mindfulness strategies, and other coping tools drawn from the yoga tradition, in addition to gentle physical exercises. It should be noted that "mindfulness", which has now become widely integrated into clinical psychology practice (Baer, 2003; Carson, Carson, Gil, & Baucom, 2004; Carson, Carson, Gil, Baucom, & Baer, 2006; Hayes, Follett, & Linehan, 2004; Walsh & Shapiro, 2006), has roots not only in Buddhism but also the yoga tradition (Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Krishnamurti, 1992). Our results thus far have demonstrated significant improvements in emotional distress, pain, fatigue, and sleep in breast cancer as well as fibromyalgia patients (Carson et al., 2010; Carson, Carson, Jones, Mist, & Bennett, 2012; Carson, Carson, Porter, Keefe, & Seewaldt, 2009; Carson et al., 2007). Moreover, the yoga intervention appears to lead to a beneficial shift in how patients cope, including greater use of adaptive coping strategies (e.g., activity engagement, acceptance, relaxation) and less use of maladaptive strategies (e.g., catastrophizing, self-isolation, confrontation).

I have presented this research at major symposiums, such as annual meetings of the Society of Behavioral Medicine in 2007 and 2008, and the American Pain Society in 2010, 2011, and 2012. More recently, as it has

become apparent that many types of health professionals - including psychologists - are interested in learning how to integrate a range of yoga-based skills into their work with patients, I have been working on plans to provide a educational training to fulfill this purpose. Attached please find a draft of a flyer announcing a program entitled “Yoga-Based Skills for Oncology Professionals: A Supportive Care Training” that will be a collaboration with the OHSU Knight Cancer Institute. Although we have put off the dates till Fall 2013, we do anticipate this being offered. Note that most of the yoga-based therapeutic skills in this training fit within the scope of practice of psychologists, such as breathing practices to facilitate relaxation and manage fatigue and pain, mindfulness strategies, and other coping tools to work with emotional distress.

If at all possible, we want psychologists licensed in Oregon to be eligible to obtain CE credits for this course. One way this might be accomplished would be for OBPE to modify the language of the relevant rule. The rule might be more precisely stated, to clarify that yoga trainings that focus primarily on physical exercises do not qualify for CE credit, rather than broadly indicating that any yoga-based program is excluded.

Please consider the attached print-out on “Yoga & Mindfulness: Clinical Applications for Anxiety and Depression”, another example of a CE program that draws on scientific evidence supporting yoga-based strategies. This particular program provides continuing education credit with approval from the American Psychological Association. I am also attaching a recent relevant article, “Yoga as a practice tool”, from the APA’s Monitor on Psychology publication.

Lastly, I wish to call the Board’s attention to the unusual nature of this broadly worded restriction on “yoga” as disqualified for CE credit. I have searched the continuing education guidelines, statues, and related information posted on the websites of the psychology licensing boards of all 50 states. It appears that Oregon is the only state that has such a restriction. Likewise, related professional boards in Oregon (i.e., Oregon Board of Licensed Professional Counselors and Therapists, and Oregon Board of Licensed Social Workers) do not list any list any such restriction.

Please give this request serious consideration.

Sincerely,

James W. Carson, PhD
carsonja@ohsu.edu
4308 SW Chesapeake Ave
Portland, OR 97239

References

Baer, R. A. (2003). Mindfulness training as a clinical intervention: A conceptual and empirical review. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 10*, 125-143.

Banerjee, B., Vadiraj, H. S., Ram, A., Rao, R., Jayapal, M., Gopinath, K. S. (2007). Effects of an integrated yoga program in modulating psychological stress and radiation-induced genotoxic stress in breast cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. *Integrative Cancer Therapies, 6*, 242-250.

Berger, B. G., & Owen, D. R. (1992). Mood alteration with yoga and swimming: aerobic exercise may not be necessary. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 75*, 1331-1343.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Gil, K. M., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Mindfulness-based relationship enhancement. *Behavior Therapy, 35*, 471-494.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Gil, K. M., Baucom, D. H., & Baer, R. (2006). Mindfulness-based relationship enhancement in couples. In *Mindfulness-based treatment approaches: Clinician's guide to evidence base and applications* (pp. 309-331). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Jones, K. D., Bennett, R. M., Wright, C. L., & Mist, S. D. (2010). A pilot randomized controlled trial of the Yoga of Awareness program in the management of fibromyalgia. *Pain, 151*, 530-539.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Jones, K. D., Mist, S. D., & Bennett, R. M. (2012). Follow-up of Yoga of Awareness for Fibromyalgia: Results at 3 Months and Replication in the Wait-list Group. *Clinical Journal of Pain, 28*, 804-813.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Porter, L. S., Keefe, F. J., & Seewaldt, V. L. (2009). Yoga of Awareness program for menopausal symptoms in breast cancer survivors: Results from a randomized trial. *Supportive Care in Cancer, 17*, 1301–1309.

Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Porter, L. S., Keefe, F. J., Shaw, H., & Miller, J. M. (2007). Yoga for women with metastatic breast cancer: results from a pilot study. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management, 33*, 331-341.

Galantino, M. L., Galbavy, R., & Quinn, L. (2008). Therapeutic effects of yoga for children: a systematic review of the literature. *Pediatric Physical Therapy, 20*, 66-80.

Haaz, S., & Bartlett, S. J. (2011). Yoga for arthritis: a scoping review. *Rheumatic Diseases Clinics of North America, 37*, 33-46.

Hayes, S. C., Follett, V. M., & Linehan, M. M. (2004). *Mindfulness and acceptance*. New York: Guilford.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind in everyday life*. New York: Delacorte.

Krishnamurti, J. (1992). *Choiceless awareness*. Ojai, Calif.: Krishnamurti Publications of America.

Narendran, S., Nagarathna, R., Narendran, V., Gunasheela, S., & Nagendra, H. R. (2005). Efficacy of yoga on pregnancy outcome. *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine, 11*, 237-244.

Walsh, R., & Shapiro, S. L. (2006). The meeting of meditative disciplines and Western psychology: a mutually enriching dialogue. *American Psychologist, 61*, 227-239.

Wood, C. (1993). Mood change and perceptions of vitality: a comparison of the effects of relaxation, visualization and yoga. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 86*, 254-258.

Wren, A. A., Wright, M. A., Carson, J. W., & Keefe, F. J. (2011). Yoga for persistent pain: new findings and directions for an ancient practice. *Pain, 152*, 477-480.

Yang, K. (2007). A review of yoga programs for four leading risk factors of chronic diseases. *Evidence-Based Complementary & Alternative Medicine: eCAM, 4*, 487-491.

ONCOLOGY

OHSU KNIGHT CANCER INSTITUTE PRESENTS:

The Yoga of Awareness Program

Yoga-Based Skills for Oncology Professionals: A Supportive Care Training

Save the date:
March 16 – 18, 2013, 9:00 am – 4:30 pm
BICC Library, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, Ore.

Join OHSU clinical research team James Carson, Ph.D. and Kimberly Carson, M.P.H., R.Y.T., developers of the Yoga of Awareness Program, for an in-depth study of safe and effective ways to teach yoga-based skills to individuals undergoing cancer treatment and recovery.

Participants will learn:

- Overview and rationale for the clinical application of yoga-based skills
- How to introduce breath-based practices to facilitate relaxation and manage fatigue/pain
- How patients can stay connected to inner resources that support resilience
- The utility and efficacy of simple mindfulness strategies
- Yogic approaches to working with emotional distress

Who: Physicians, nurses, social workers, psychologists, health coaches and occupational therapists working with oncology patients.

For more information, please contact **Susan Hedlund**
at **503 346-0285** or **hedlunds@ohsu.edu**

CEU credits pending
Registration materials to follow

www.ohsuknightcancer.com/yogacme

KNIGHT CANCER INSTITUTE
Oregon Health & Science University

CMI PREMIER EDUCATION SOLUTIONS
MEDS PDN powered by PESI

Continuing Education Seminars, CDs, DVDs, Publications, and Online
Mental Health • Educators • Rehab

HAVE A BROCHURE? - QUICK REGISTRATION

LINKS

HOME LOGIN FAQ'S

Search...

home
education search
by: zip state/title
online
video webcasts
streaming content
downloadable content
on-site training
graduate credit
product store
cd products
dvd products
books

discounts
coordinators
students

associations
leading experts
accreditation
become a speaker
become an author
contact us
careers
about us
join our mailing list

confirm registration
need directions?
FAQs

GUARANTEE

Your satisfaction is our goal and our guarantee.

Yoga & Mindfulness: Clinical Applications For Anxiety And Depression

Length: 6 hours 20 minutes

Additional Participant CE: $19.99

Rent It Access: 14 days

DESCRIPTION

Purchase the DVD from our product store!

Understand the neuroscience behind these evidence-based therapies

Improve client outcomes in treating mood disorders

Discover specific tools for healing anxiety and depression

Explain specific yoga practices & sequences to treat anxiety and depression

Recovery from anxiety and depression presents a formidable challenge for both clients and clinicians. Yoga and mindfulness facilitate clients' movement through recovery and beyond - rewiring the brain to experience greater happiness. These tools encourage therapeutic presence and self-compassion, allowing for greater intimacy in the client/therapist relationship

Read more

BUY IT

Downloadable MP4 Video and MP3 Audio
Course ID: PPC043450
Credit Type: Self-Study
$169.99 Add to cart

RENT IT

Streaming Video
Course ID: POS043450
Credit Type: Self-Study
$99.99 Add to cart

CREDIT INFORMATION

Continuing Education Information: This activity qualifies for continuing education for the following professionals in every state: Psychologists, Counselors, Social Workers, Case Managers, Addiction Counselors, Marriage & Family Therapists, Nurses, and other Mental Health Professionals. For states that differ from national board approval see details below. For states not listed or do not accept national approvals please contact CMI or your licensing board.

CE Information is based on 100% attendance.

PSYCHOLOGISTS

PSYCHOLOGISTS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is approved by the American Psychological Association to sponsor continuing education for psychologists. CMI maintains responsibility for this program and its content. CMI is offering this activity for **6.0 live or 6.0 self-study** hours of continuing education credit. Full attendance is required; no partial credits will be offered for partial attendance.

SOCIAL WORKERS

SOCIAL WORKERS: CMI Education Institute, Provider #1062, is approved as a provider for continuing education by the Association of Social Work Boards, 400 South Ridge Parkway, Suite B, Culpeper, VA 22701. www.aswb.org. ASWB Approval Period: January 27, 2011-January 27, 2014. Social workers should contact their regulatory board to determine course approval. Social workers will receive **6.25 live or 6.25 self-study** (Clinical) continuing education clock hours in participating in this activity after successful completion of the post test/evaluation form. Course Level: All Levels.

FLORIDA SOCIAL WORKERS/MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS/MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELORS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider with the Florida Board of Clinical Social Work, Marriage and Family Therapy and Mental Health Counseling. Provider Number BAP #77. This course qualifies for **6.0** continuing education credits. **No self-study credit hours available.**

ILLINOIS SOCIAL WORKERS: CMI Education Institute is an approved provider with the State of Illinois, Department of Professional Regulation. License #: 159-000154. Full attendance at this activity qualifies for **6.0** contact hours. **No self-study credit hours available.**

MINNESOTA SOCIAL WORKERS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider with the State of Minnesota, Board of Social Work. Provider #: CEP-140. This course has been approved for **6.0** continuing education hours. **No self-study credit hours available.**

NEW JERSEY SOCIAL WORKERS: This activity qualifies for an approved continuing education offering for New Jersey Social Workers. The New Jersey State Board of Social Work Examiners has approved this activity for **6.0** (Clinical) credit hours. **No self-study credit hours available.**

COUNSELORS

COUNSELORS: CMI Education Institute, Inc, is an approved provider of the National Board of Certified Counselors, NBCC Provider #: 5637. We adhere to NBCC Continuing Education Guidelines. This activity qualifies for **6.25 live or 6.25 self-study** contact hours.

CALIFORNIA COUNSELORS/SOCIAL WORKERS/MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS/LICENSED EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider with the State of California, Board of Behavioral Sciences, Provider #: 2087. Full attendance at this course meets the qualifications for **6.0** hours of continuing education credit as required by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences. **No self-study credit hours available.**

OHIO COUNSELORS/SOCIAL WORKERS/MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS: CMI Education Institute is an approved provider with the State of Ohio Counselor, Social Worker and Marriage & Family Therapist Board. Provider approval #:RCST071001. Full attendance at this course meets the qualifications for **6.25** clock hours of continuing education credit. **No self-study credit hours available.**

ADDICTION COUNSELORS

ADDICTION COUNSELORS: CMI Education Institute is an approved provider of continuing education by the National Association of Alcoholism & Drug Abuse Counselors (NAADAC), provider #: 00131. Full attendance is required; no partial credit will be awarded for partial attendance. This activity qualifies for **7.5 live or 7.5 self-study** contact hours.

CALIFORNIA ALCOHOLISM & DRUG ABUSE COUNSELORS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider with the California Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors (CAADAC) Provider #: OS-03-036-1013. This course meets the qualifications for 6.0 hours of continuing education credit. No self-study credit hours available.

MICHIGAN ADDICTION PROFESSIONALS: This course has been reviewed and approved by the Michigan Certification Board for Addiction Professionals (MCBAP). This course will award **7.5** contact hours and has been identified as RELATED to substance abuse. **No self-study credit hours available.**

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS: This activity consists of **380 minutes live or 6.25 hours**

self-study of continuing education instruction. Credit requirements and approvals vary per state board regulations. Please save the activity advertisement, the certificate of completion you receive from the activity and contact your state board or organization to determine specific filing requirements.

ILLINOIS MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS: CMI Education Institute has been approved as a provider of continuing education by the State of Illinois, Department of Professional Regulation. Provider #: 168-000156. Full attendance at this activity qualifies for **6.0** credits. **No self-study credit hours available.**

TEXAS MARRIAGE & FAMILY THERAPISTS: CMI Education Institute has been approved as a continuing education sponsor through the Texas State Board of Examiners of Marriage and Family Therapists. Provider #: 503. This activity qualifies for **6.0** continuing education credits. **No self-study credit hours available.**

NURSES/NURSE PRACTITIONERS/CLINICAL NURSE SPECIALISTS

NURSES/NURSE PRACTITIONERS/CLINICAL NURSE SPECIALISTS: This activity meets the criteria for an American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC) Activity. CMI Education Institute, Inc, is an approved provider by the American Psychological Association, which is recognized by theANCC for behavioral health related activities. Full attendance is required. No partial credit will be offered for partial attendance.

This activity qualifies for **6.0 live or 6.0 self-study** contact hours.

CALIFORNIA NURSES: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is a provider approved by the California Board of Registered Nursing, Provider Number 13305 for **6.3** contact hours. Full attendance is required. No partial contact hours will be issued for partial attendance. **No self-study credit hours available.**

FLORIDA NURSES: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider with the Florida Board of Nursing, Provider # FBN2858. This course qualifies for **6.3** contact hours. **No self-study credit hours available.**

IOWA NURSES: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an approved provider by the Iowa Board of Nursing. Provider #: 346. Full attendance at this activity qualifies for **7.6** contact hours. Full attendance in the activity is required; no partial contact hours will be issued for partial attendance. These contact hours are used for your license renewal. **No self-study credit hours available.**

APPROVED PROVIDER of CONTINUING EDUCATION by The American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS & OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSISTANTS: CMI Education Institute, Inc. is an AOTA Approved Provider of continuing education. Provider #: 3322. This self-study course qualifies for **6.25 self-study** contact hours. The assignment of AOTA CEUs does not imply endorsement of specific course content, products, or clinical procedures by AOTA. Course Level: Intermediate. **No live credit hours available.**

OTHER PROFESSIONS: This activity qualifies for **6.3 live or 6.25 self-study** continuing education clock hours as required by many national, state and local licensing boards and professional organizations. Save your activity advertisement and certificate of completion, and contact your own board or organization for specific requirements.

Only credits listed are approved. For any other credit inquiries (i.e. state specific or others not listed), please contact cecmi@cmieducation.orgor 800-844-8260 BEFORE the event. Additional credit inquiries submitted after the date of the event will not be honored, per board regulations. For all other inquiries, please contact info@pesi.com.

FACULTY

Debra Premashakti Alvis, Ph.D., RYT

Debra Premashakti Alvis, Ph.D., RYT is a licensed psychologist and therapeutic yoga educator practicing in Athens, Georgia. She developed and currently leads the Mind Body Program at the University of Georgia. For many years, Debra trained psychotherapists with a focus on the integration of contemplative practice and has served as a clinical consultant on a research team investigating mindfulness. As a leader in the integration of yoga, mindfulness and psychotherapy, she has created a

clinician's training program in mindfulness. She also conducts a private practice of psychology providing counseling to individuals, couples and families and offers seminars in the United States and internationally. Debra has been engaged in contemplative practices for over 25 years studying yoga and mindfulness. She has worked extensively with the senior teachers of Integral Yoga earning over 500 hours of yogic studies and certification in numerous teacher training programs. Debra has also completed professional Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction training through the University of Massachusetts Medical School. Her wealth of clinical knowledge, research experience, and her deep understanding of yoga and mindfulness transform into effective, easily applicable skills for mental health professionals. You will leave this seminar feeling renewed and with powerful tools for helping clients.

COURSE MATERIALS

Buy It/Rent It Manual (33 pages)

PowerPoint (8 pages)

Additional_Participant_CE_Request_Form (4 pages)

FAQ's

A Non-Profit Organization Connecting Knowledge With Need Since 1979!

Trustwave Trusted Commerce Click to Validate

© 2012 Copyright CMI Education All Rights Reserved

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

FEATURE

Yoga as a practice tool

With a growing body of research supporting yoga's mental health benefits, psychologists are weaving the practice into their work with clients.

By Amy Novotney
November 2009, Vol 40, No. 10
Print version: page 38

What was once a practice for a centered few has now become mainstream American: According to a survey last year by Yoga Journal, today more than 15 million U.S. adults practice yoga, and not surprisingly, there is research supporting its physical benefits. Studies show the practice—which combines stretching and other exercises with deep breathing and meditation—can improve overall physical fitness, strength, flexibility and lung capacity, while reducing heart rate, blood pressure and back pain.

But what is perhaps unknown to those who consider yoga just another exercise form is that there is a growing body of research documenting yoga's psychological benefits. Several recent studies suggest that yoga may help strengthen social attachments, reduce stress and relieve anxiety, depression and insomnia. Researchers are also starting to claim some success in using yoga and yoga-based treatments to help active-duty military and veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder.

"The evidence is showing that yoga really helps change people at every level," says Stanford University health psychologist and yoga instructor Kelly McGonigal, PhD.

That's why more clinicians have embraced yoga as a complement to psychotherapy, McGonigal says. They're encouraging yoga as a tool clients can use outside the therapy office to cope with stress and anxieties, and even heal emotional wounds.

"Talk therapy can be helpful in finding problem-solving strategies and understanding your own strengths and what's happening to you, but there are times when you just need to kind of get moving and work through the body," says Melanie Greenberg, PhD, a psychology professor at Alliant International University, who has studied yoga's benefits to mental health.

The mind-body meld

According to a study by Sherry A. Glied, PhD, professor of health policy and management at Columbia University, and Richard G. Frank, PhD, professor of health-care policy at Harvard Medical School, published in the May/June *Health Affairs* (Vol. 28, No. 3), the rate of diagnosed cases of mental disorders increased dramatically between 1996 and 2006—doubling among adults age 65 and older, and rising by about 60 percent among adults 18 to 64. During that same time period, rates of psychotropic medication use rose by about the same percentages among these groups.

In light of these numbers, yoga remains a natural and readily available approach to maintaining wellness and treating mental health issues, says Sat Bir Khalsa, PhD, a neuroscientist and professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School at Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston who studies yoga's effects on depression and insomnia. Khalsa, who has practiced yoga for more than 35 years, says several studies in his 2004 comprehensive review of yoga's use as a therapeutic intervention, published in the Indian *Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology* (Vol. 48, No. 3), show that yoga targets unmanaged stress, a main component of chronic disorders such as anxiety, depression, obesity, diabetes and insomnia. It does this, he says, by reducing the stress response, which includes the activity of the sympathetic nervous system and the levels of the stress hormone cortisol. The practice enhances resilience and improves mind-body awareness, which can help people adjust their behaviors based on the feelings they're experiencing in their bodies, according to Khalsa.

While scientists don't have quite the full picture on how yoga does all that, new research is beginning to shed light on how the practice may influence the brain. In a 2007 study in the *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine* (Vol. 13, No. 4), researchers at Boston University School of Medicine and McLean Hospital used magnetic resonance imaging to compare levels of the neurotransmitter gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) before and after two types of activities: an hour of yoga and an hour of reading a book. The yoga group showed a 27 percent increase in GABA levels, which evidence suggests may counteract anxiety and other psychiatric disorders. GABA levels of the reading group remained unchanged.

"I believe if everyone practiced the techniques of yoga, we would have a preventive aid to a lot of our problems," Khalsa says.

"There would likely be less obesity and Type-II diabetes, and people would be less aggressive, more content and more integrated."

Khalsa's claims are backed by evidence supporting the social benefits of participating in a yoga class, says Stanford's McGonigal. A series of experiments conducted by organizational behavior researchers at Stanford University and published in January's *Psychological Science* (Vol. 20, No. 1) suggest that acting in synchrony with others—be it while walking, singing or dancing—can increase cooperation and collectivism among group members.

"In a yoga class, everyone is moving and breathing in at the same time and I think that's one of the undervalued mechanisms that yoga can really help with: giving people that sense of belonging, of being part of something bigger," McGonigal says.

Psychologists are also examining the use of yoga with survivors of trauma and finding it may even be more effective than some psychotherapy techniques. In a pilot study at the Trauma Center at the Justice Resource Institute in Brookline, Mass., women with PTSD who took part in eight sessions of a 75-minute Hatha yoga class experienced significantly reduced PTSD symptoms compared with those participating in a dialectical behavior therapy group. The center recently received a grant from the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine to conduct a randomized, single-blind, controlled study to further examine whether, as compared with a 10-week health class, yoga improves the frequency and severity of PTSD symptoms and other somatic complaints as well as social and occupational impairments among female trauma survivors.

"When people experience trauma, they may experience not only a sense of emotional disregulation, but also a feeling of being physically immobilized," says Ritu Sharma, PhD, project coordinator of the center's yoga program, who only began practicing yoga when she started leading the program. "Body-oriented techniques such as yoga help them increase awareness of sensations in the body, stay more focused on the present moment and hopefully empower them to take effective actions."

And in what is becoming one of the most widely applied yoga-based trauma treatments, clinical psychologist Richard Miller, PhD, has developed a nine-week, twice-weekly integrative restoration program based on the ancient practice of yoga Nidra. In 2006, the Department of Defense began testing iRest with active-duty soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who were experiencing PTSD. At the end of the program, participants reported a reduction in insomnia, depression, anxiety and fear, improved interpersonal relations and an increased sense of control over their lives. Since then, iRest classes have been established at VA facilities in Miami, Chicago and Washington, D.C. Miller has also helped develop similar programs for veterans, homeless people and those with chemical dependencies and chronic pain.

"The program teaches them skills they can integrate into their daily lives, so that in the midst of a difficult circumstance, they have the tools to be able to work in the moment," says Miller, president of the Integrative Restoration Institute in San Rafael, Calif.

New research is also supporting yoga's benefit for other mental illnesses. An as-yet-unpublished randomized control trial by Khalsa offers insight into how yoga may reduce insomnia. In this study, 20 participants who practiced a daily 45-minute series of Kundalini yoga techniques shortly before bedtime for eight weeks reported significant reductions in insomnia severity as compared with those told to follow six behavioral recommendations for sleep hygiene. And a 2007 study supports yoga's potential as a complementary treatment for depressed patients taking antidepressant medication but only in partial remission. University of California, Los Angeles, psychologist David Shapiro, PhD, found that participants who practiced Iyengar yoga three times a week for eight weeks reported significant reductions in depression, anxiety and neurotic symptoms, as well as mood improvements at the end of each class (*Evidence-based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, Vol. 4, No. 4). Many of the participants achieved remission and also showed physiological changes, such as heart rate variability, indicative of a greater capacity for emotional regulation, Shapiro says.

Putting yoga into practice

While she cautions against teaching yoga to clients without formal training, McGonigal and others say psychologists can use psychotherapy sessions to practice yoga's mind-body awareness and breathing techniques. Simple strategies—such as encouraging clients to get as comfortable as possible during their sessions or to pay attention to how their body feels when they inhale and exhale—teach clients to be in the here and now.

"These by themselves would be considered yoga interventions because they direct attention to the breath and help unhook people from thoughts, emotions and impulses that are negative or destructive," she says.

Alliant International University psychology professor Richard Gevirtz, PhD, agrees that alternatives to traditional psychotherapy may help clinicians make progress with difficult clients.

"Psychologists have painted themselves in the corner by only doing talk therapy," Gevirtz says. "There's much more that can be accomplished if you integrate it with other sorts of modalities, such as biofeedback, relaxation training or yoga."

In fact, some psychologists say yoga may not really be so special when it comes to improving one's mental state, and that several forms of exercise may provide mood-enhancing benefits.

In a 2007 study by researchers at Bowling Green State University, 36 participants kept mood diaries during the first and final four weeks of a 16-week weight-loss program. On the days participants engaged in planned exercise—typically walking for 30 to 60 minutes—they reported a better mood at night as compared to in the morning, before exercising (*Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, Vol. 29, No. 6).

"It seems that many types of exercise—particularly non-competitive exercise—are related to positive mood alteration," says Bonnie Berger, EdD, one of the study's co-authors and professor and director of Bowling Green's School of Human Movement, Sport and Leisure Studies.

Psychologists may also benefit from using yoga and other forms of exercise for their own care, Greenberg says. In a 2007 survey of licensed APA members by the APA Board of Professional Affairs Advisory Committee on Colleague Assistance, 48 percent reported that vicarious trauma and compassion fatigue are likely to affect their functioning.

"Practicing yoga personally and adopting a stance based on yoga principles such as non-judgment, compassion, spirituality and the connection of all living things can help relieve stress, enhance compassion and potentially make you a better therapist," she says. "If you can come to a level of peace with yourself, there may be more nurturing that you exude toward your patients."

Amy Novotney is a writer in Chicago.

Find this article at:
http://www.apa.org/monitor/2009/11/yoga.aspx

FELTON LaRee * BPE

From: renee@talkdcc.net
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 3:35 PM
To: laree.felton@state.or.us
Subject: CEU CarryOver

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Larée-

I am sending this email as a follow-up to our telephone conversation regarding the ability to carry forward some certain number of hours of accumulated CEUs. As I discussed, many other professions including LCSWs, MDs and nurses are allowed to carry forward a certain number of CEU's earned in excess of what is required for renewal periods.

This issue is important as many decisions about attendance at CEU courses and conferences involves a decision about time and financial investment. I have far more credits than I need for this period and I am having to decide whether or not to spend money and time away from the office on some VERY good training opportunities that will have no benefit to me in terms of CEUs. Yes, I do love learning and staying current in my field AND as a practioner in private practice supporting myself and my family, these decisions weigh heavily in terms of resource allotment.

I would like to see the Board make a ruling that would allow us to carry forward 5-8 CEU credits from one renewal period to the next. This would create more flexibility in choosing to attend conferences that we find out about after our CEUs are completed and before our renewal period ends.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.
Renee

Renee Pirkl, Psy.D., P.C.
503-223-2929 P
503-223-7070 F
reneepirkl.com

Please don't print this e-mail unless necessary.
This electronic mail could contain confidential or privileged information. Unauthorized use, copying or distribution is prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender.

Yvette Dawson Rybolt, Ph.D.
Psychology License No. 1256 (Inactive)
3144 Broadway, #4, PMB 134
Eureka, CA 95501-3838
541-281-0727
ydrybolt@hotmail.com

January 27, 2013

Oregon Board of Psychologist Examiners
Education Committee
3218 Pringle Road SE, Ste. 130
Salem, Oregon 97302-6309

Dear Education Committee Members:

As a psychologist living in rural areas for the last 17 years, I continue to struggle to attend conferences and seminars that are usually offered in larger communities. As you know, travel takes time and is expensive. Therefore, I take many courses online or by mail which I find to be a practical solution; in addition, I lecture at our local college whenever I have the opportunity to do so. Although my license is inactive at this time, I still complete my 50 credits of continuing education when I renew my license, as I plan to activate my license in the future.

I'm writing to you to request that you consider allowing psychologists living in rural areas to submit more than the allowed 25 CEUs of home study due to the extra added difficulties in reaching larger communities for education purposes. For example, in Humboldt County we have a small airport that has one airline. Due to fog and inclement weather, it is not uncommon for flights to be cancelled or delayed. Our closest large city that offers a variety of relevant seminars and conferences is San Francisco, which is approximately 5 ½ hours away by car. We seldom have the opportunity to attend conferences locally.

Your consideration of this request is appreciated and I look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Yvette Dawson Rybolt, Ph.D.