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As of April 2018, CPA accredits 78 programmes in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Doctoral Programmes</th>
<th>Internship Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>39</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Total does not equal the sum of the number of programmes listed above as some programmes are cross-listed (e.g. school and clinical psychology).
Key Panel Activities in 2017-18

• Congratulations to our newly accredited doctoral and internship programmes:
  • McGill University Psychology Internship Consortium
  • Toronto Area Residency Consortium
  • York University Clinical-Developmental Neuropsychology Programme
  • University of British Columbia – Okanagan Campus, Clinical Psychology Programme
  • Memorial University of Newfoundland Clinical PsyD programme

• Panel Composition
  • Huge thank you to departing Panel members Dr. David Hodgins and Dr. Susan Farrell
Key Panel Activities in 2017-18

- CPA-APA First Street Accord Re-signed
- CCTC Fall 2017 Meeting
- AAAC Spring 2018 meeting
- ACPRO Spring 2018 Meeting
- Launch of the Public Consultation for 6th revision of the Standards
APPIC DPA Policy

An “Eligible Accrediting Organization” is one that accredits doctoral programs in Health Service Psychology and/or Professional Psychology and is (a) recognized by an Approved Government Agency or (b) the Canadian Psychological Association.

Definition of Approved Government Agency: An Approved Government Agency is a United States governmental department, agency, or body that (a) formally reviews and/or recognizes doctoral psychology accrediting organizations or (b) has explicitly recognized a doctoral psychology accrediting organization in its hiring qualifications; and (c) has been approved in APPIC’s sole discretion. Approved Government Agencies currently include the United States Department of Education and the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.
Key Panel Activities in 2017-18

- Submission deadlines
  - In place since 2014
  - Used to balance Panel and SV workload
  - Will be included in letters going forward

- Canada-US Visa issues
  - Working with APA on joint paper regarding cross-border training issues
Key Panel Activities in 2017-18

- UPDATE: Site visitor Database and Institutional Portals
- Additional Site visitor workshops
  - Recently offered in Calgary
  - French SV workshop offered as part of ICAP 2018
Standards Revision

The 6th Revision of the *Accreditation Standards and Procedures for Doctoral Programmes and Internships in Professional Psychology* is underway as of 2016-2017.
Standards Revision

- Some big changes anticipated
  - Policies and procedures to be separated from the Standards
  - Increased clarity on processes; operational definitions
  - Site visitor guide to be included in policies and procedures manual
Standards Revision

• Currently approximately 6 months behind anticipated schedule.
• Panel will be sending out notifications regarding interest in joining the Standards Review Committee
  – Looking for representation across training community
Standards Revision

• Next Steps
  – Establishment of working group for Standards Revision Process
  – Data analysis of public consultation survey
  – Working group begins initial draft of Standards revision based on:
    • Initial Consultation Survey results
    • Public Consultation Survey results
    • Feedback received from training community
    • Changes in procedure already implemented (e.g. site visit scheduling)
    • Review of other accreditation standards and procedures to provide insight to questions raised by survey results and training community feedback.
Public Consultation Survey

• Preliminary Data
  – Full responses N=53
  – Partial responses N=136
  – Total responses N=189
Public Consultation Survey

• Demographics
Public Consultation Survey

• Demographics
Public Consultation Survey

• Demographics
Public Consultation Survey

• Are you currently attending, or have you graduated from, a professional psychology training programme?
  – Yes (87%)
  – No (6%)
  – No answer (7%)

• Is that programme accredited by the CPA (or was it accredited at the time you graduated)?
  – Yes (64%)
  – No (29%)
  – No answer (7%)
Do you think the Standards should focus on ensuring that programmes meet minimum requirements (i.e. that the Standards should be prescriptive), or do you think that the Standards should be more outcome-focused (i.e. that the Standards should allow for some leniency in their interpretation provided training benchmarks are being met)?
Do you think that consortia and consortial issues are different enough from single-administration programmes that they should have their own Standards, or do you feel that the present organization of the Standards is sufficient in addressing and evaluating these internship settings?
Do you think the psychology training community would be better served by a single set of Standards for Doctoral programmes and a single set of Standards for Internship programmes?

![Bar chart showing responses to the survey question.]

- Yes (57)
- No (44)
- No answer (7)
In line with the above, do you think that the Standards should be modeled on the aggregate of competencies required for licensure in each of Canada’s regulatory jurisdictions?
Do you think that the Standards should include a requirement that accredited programmes agree to have some number or proportion of their staff serve as site visitors?
Controversial Issues - Doctoral

- Explicit guidelines for financial support (Standard I.A.2)
- Explicit requirements to address diversity across the curriculum (Standard III.B)
- Preparation for work across various service contexts (Standard III.B)
- Faculty complement (faculty:student ratio) (Standard IV)
- Direct observation in supervision (Standard VIII.A)
- APPIC Match (Standard VIII.B)
- Emerging Tech. Guidelines (Standard IX.B)
Other Issues Raised - Doctoral

- MA-level accreditation
- Clarity around practica (experiences, number of hours required, etc.)
- Psychopharmacology and neuro-anatomy courses
Controversial Issues - Internships

- Definition of adequate and stable funding (Standard I.A.1)
- Chief/DoT being same person (I.A.3)
- Operational definition of CPA-equivalent programme (I.B.1)
- Additional requirements for beginning internship (data collection, dissertation draft) (I.B.2)
- Preparation for work across various service contexts (Standard III.B)
Other Issues Raised - Internships

• Supervision
  – Training in supervision
  – Number of required supervision hours
  – Distance supervision

• Didactics
Reminder

Public Consultation Survey for the 6th revision of Accreditation Standards

Survey is still open, and we will be seeking members of the training community to be part of the review committee!
THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMITMENT TO HIGH QUALITY PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING!

This slide deck will be posted at: http://www.cpa.ca/accreditation/resources

Please feel free to contact the accreditation office at any time at: accreditation@cpa.ca