Dear U.S. Regulators,

I am writing on behalf of the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) in follow-up to our presentation at the April 2007 meeting of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB).

In February of 2007, with the full support of the CPA, the American Psychological Association (APA) voted to stop its accreditation activities in Canada. As of January 2008, the APA no longer accepts new applications for accreditation from Canadian programmes. Programmes in Canada that had been accredited by the APA prior to January 2008 may re-apply for accreditation after that date but all terms of APA accreditation in Canada will expire in September 2015.

As you may know, the CPA has had its own system of accreditation since 1984 through which it maintains rigorous standards for teaching and training of clinical psychology, counseling psychology, school psychology, and clinical neuropsychology in doctoral and internship programmes in Canada. As you may recall, the scope of our presentation to the ASPPB in April was to present and describe the nature and content of CPA’s Standards and Procedures on Accreditation.

The CPA Standards and Procedures for Accreditation of Doctoral and Internship Programmes in Psychology (2002) incorporate both prescriptive and outcome or competency based-models of accreditation. The prescriptive components are reflected in the criteria set for each Standard which define such things as the types of courses, number of practicum and internship hours, and amount of supervision that an accredited programme is required to provide to its students. While meeting the prescriptive criteria, the outcome components give programmes the opportunity to develop and define their models of training and then demonstrate their accountability to the outcomes of these models.

The reason that we took the opportunity to present at the April meeting of the ASPPB was to familiarize U.S. regulators with the nature of CPA’s Standards and Procedures. As you likely know, some American and Canadian students study and intern at Canadian institutions and then go to the U.S. for licensure and practice. As we go forward with each national association accrediting only those programmes in its own country, we thought it important that U.S. regulators have a good understanding of the quality and rigour of teaching and training provided by CPA-accredited doctoral and internship programmes.

Several North American and U.S. associations of psychology (e.g. the ASPPB, APPIC, the National Register) have statements of essential equivalency regarding accreditation. Anytime these associations refer to accreditation, both CPA and APA accreditation are specifically mentioned. Further, when fast-tracking credential reviews for applicants who have graduated from accredited programmes, many North American regulators do so for applicants from either APA or CPA accredited programmes.
It is my intent in writing this letter to ensure that graduates from CPA-accredited programmes be considered eligible for licensure in your jurisdiction. We appreciate, of course, that your state may have several eligibility requirements for licensure and that graduation from an accredited programme, be it APA or CPA accredited, may or may not be one of them.

However, if a faster-track credential review is afforded to applicants from accredited programmes, then CPA accreditation status should qualify. In the event that your legislation does not permit you to treat APA and CPA accreditation equivalently, then we would like to ensure that the applicant from a CPA-accredited programme is not precluded from licensure on the basis of the accreditation status of his or her training alone.

To this end, we asked the ASPPB, and they have since agreed, to publish (in its printed materials and on its website) the following statement. It can be found at https://www.asppb.org/licensure/license/general.aspx

It is the position of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) that in the event that a regulatory body holds the accreditation status of an applicant's training as a requirement for licensure or, in the event that the body permits a faster track credential review for applicants with accredited training, the definition of accredited training will include training accredited by the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA). In the event that legislation in a particular jurisdiction does not permit the equivalent treatment of CPA and U.S.-based accreditation, then it is the position of the ASPPB that no jurisdiction should preclude an applicant from applying for licensure solely because the program from which he or she graduated was accredited by the CPA and not a U.S.-based accreditor.

The CPA has been impressed by the collegiality and collaboration among North American regulators of professional psychology. As is so well demonstrated by the ASPPB, it is in the best interests of the public we serve to define transnational competencies for psychologists and to create the structures and mechanisms necessary to promoting these competencies. It is our view that accreditation, and in particular CPA accreditation, makes a significant contribution to this endeavour.

For your convenience, we have enclosed a copy of the CPA Standards and Procedures for Accreditation of Doctoral Programmes and Internship in Professional Psychology (2002). For further information, we invite you to visit the accreditation webpage of our website (www.cpa.ca) or contact us at any time:

Office of Accreditation
Canadian Psychological Association
141 Laurier Avenue West, suite 702
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5J3
613-237-2144 (t)
Ms. Ann Marie Plante: Accreditation Assistant, ext. 328, aplante@cpa.ca
Dr. Arcangelo Caputo: Registrar, Accreditation Panel, ext. 330, accreditation@cpa.ca
Dr. Karen Cohen: Acting Executive Director, CPA, ext. 344, kcohen@cpa.ca

With best wishes,

Executive Director (Acting)
Canadian Psychological Association

c.c. Dr. Stephen T. Demers, Executive Officer, ASPPB
Dr. Jeffrey Derevensky, Chair, CPA Accreditation Panel