

Report of Accreditation Summit Meeting Snowbird, UT, June 23-26, 2005

Introduction

The framers of the current *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology* (1995) recognized the need for periodic reviews of the structure and composition of the Committee on Accreditation. The Accreditation Summit held in June, 2005 was the culmination of several efforts to deal with this issue. The goal of Summit participants was to develop a flexible and forward-looking plan that would ensure equitable representation on psychology's accrediting body across the variegated education and training spectrum that has developed over the past half century. To accomplish this purpose an open invitation was extended to any interested group or organization to submit a statement outlining their views on the structure and composition of the Committee on Accreditation and to send a representative to the summit meeting (see Appendix A for a copy of the letter of invitation). Statements were submitted by 34 psychology organizations and groups, and 50 individuals participated in the meeting. A listing of participating organizations and individuals can be found in Appendix B, and a summary of the agenda for the four day meeting is contained in Appendix C. Eighteen of the 50 participants were designated in advance as summit "conveners" and were charged with planning the meeting and drafting the final report and recommendations. The conveners represented Domains I and II (Academic Leadership and Professional Education and Training Program Leadership) as currently described in the *Accreditation Guidelines and Principles* plus two individuals each from APA's Board of Educational Affairs and the Committee on Accreditation. The 18 conveners are identified by asterisks in Appendix B.

The primary goal of the Summit was to address issues and concerns about the structure and composition of the current Committee on Accreditation. Specific objectives included creating a plan that would (1) allow broad and equitable representation across the full spectrum of education and training programs, (2) maintain a unified accreditation system designed to protect the integrity and long-range interests of the field, and (3) ensure a flexible and adaptable approach to accreditation to facilitate the continued development and evolution of professional psychology.

A secondary goal in designing a new structure was to facilitate rather than impede the CoA's capacity to deal efficiently and realistically with its work load. The demands on committee members in recent years have become excessive to the point of encouraging early burn out and discouraging potential nominees from agreeing to serve if selected.

At the outset of the meeting the co-chairs requested that "egos and special interests be left at the door," and to a significant degree the highly diverse participants obliged, and a spirit of negotiation, compromise, and collaboration prevailed. Participants also honored a request from the co-chairs that the discussions be focused on the structure and

composition of the accrediting body and to leave for a later time the issue of affiliation and greater autonomy identified by the BEA Advisory Council on Accreditation (2004).

Brief Summary of Summit Recommendations

After reviewing the report from the BEA Advisory Council on Accreditation, reading the collection of statements submitted by the 34 psychology organizations and groups, hearing from representatives of the varied communities of interest, and focusing the discussion on the structure and composition of a unified accrediting body for professional psychology, summit conveners agreed to a number of major sets of modifications to the current system as follows:

- Renaming the CoA as a “Commission on Accreditation” in keeping with the majority of specialized professional accrediting bodies and the recommendation of the BEA Advisory Council.
- Convening an annual open Assembly on Accreditation to allow Commission members to receive regular input from interested parties and to provide opportunities for recruitment, training, and involvement of site visitors.
- Implementing an expanded panel review process to reinforce the principle of peer review of congruent programs and to ease the burden of program review, thus providing CoA members with increased time for reflection and attention to policy issues. Panels would be constituted to include a mix of individuals serving on the CoA *and* additional members nominated across the spectrum of organizations involved in psychology education and training with attention to the range and balance of expertise among professional peers.
 - *Near or proximal peers* includes those working at the same developmental level of training (doctoral programs, internships, or postdoctoral residencies) and who represent the same or similar approaches and/or models of training.
 - *Distal or different peers* means those working at different levels of the training continuum or from different approaches and/or models of training.
- Enlarging the accrediting body or Commission to 32 members to allow greater representation for internship and postdoctoral training, explicit representation of diverse perspectives, representation of those involved primarily in the core scientific activities of the discipline, representation of educational leadership, representation of those involved in advanced specialty training, commitment to diversity, and representation through “open” seats associated with significant changes in the discipline and profession. Constituency groups would normally nominate individuals for appointment to the CoA according to their own criteria and procedures.

- Implementing a 10-year cycle for reviewing in-depth the structure and composition of the CoA that includes elements such as:
 - Regular compilation and dissemination of relevant accreditation data to the field (e.g., number of programs, number of students/trainees, recent developments, etc.)
 - An open invitation once per decade to all organizations and groups associated with education and training to submit written perspectives on the structure and composition of the accrediting body
 - A subsequent accreditation summit meeting with representation from all groups submitting statements
 - A final report submitted to all participating organizations detailing requested modifications, necessary action steps, and associated timelines.

Structure and Appointment of The Commission on Accreditation (CoA)

A 32 person Commission on Accreditation is to be appointed from nominees identified by the constituent groups identified below. Thereafter, the CoA would assure replacement of appointees from nominations according to the strategies described in paragraphs that follow. Unless specified below, all appointments will be made for three-year terms, renewable one time. Initial appointments may be for shorter terms to assure continuity and allow for a balance of open and continuing seats with staggered replacement.

The CoA is committed, to the fullest extent possible, to support diversity in all aspects of the accreditation enterprise. The CoA offers strong encouragement for, and a continuing expectation that, all organizations and groups will nominate individuals representing cultural and individual differences and diversity. The CoA will continuously monitor the nomination and appointment process to ensure its ability to maintain diversity on the Commission and will report annually on the diversity of the CoA and its panels to its various publics.

Domains of Representation on the CoA

(See Table 1 at the conclusion of the narrative for a visual representation of the proposed Commission on Accreditation.)

Domain I – Breadth of the Scientific Discipline of Psychology (N=5)

I.A. Academic leadership for graduate education in the discipline of psychology at the departmental level of administration or higher

- Four seats nominated by the executive board of the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP)

I.B. Representative of the core scientific activities of the discipline of psychology

- One seat nominated jointly by the American Psychological Society and the Board of Scientific Affairs of the American Psychological Association (APS/BSA).

Domain II – Professional Education and Training in Psychology (N=16)

II.A. Training program leadership (N=5)

- One seat nominated by the board of the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC)
- One seat nominated by the board of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP)
- One seat nominated by the board of the Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs (CDSPP)
- One seat nominated by the board of the Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology (CUDCP)
- One seat nominated by the board of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP)

II.B. Leadership in professional education (N=1)

- One seat nominated jointly by the Board of Educational Affairs of the American Psychological Association and the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (BEA/NCSPP)

II.C. Professional peers nominated from program review panels (N=10)

- One seat nominated by the appropriate nominating authority from each group of program review panels for the varied areas and levels of training in professional psychology that are accredited.
 - Doctoral Panels (5)
 - One seat nominated by the Academy of Psychological Clinical Science (APCS)
 - One seat nominated by NCSPP
 - One seat nominated by CCPTP
 - One seat nominated by CDSPP
 - One seat nominated by CUDCP
 - Internship Panels (4)
 - Two seats nominated by APPIC
 - Two seats nominated by other organizations involved directly in internship training
 - Post-Doctoral Panel (1)
 - One seat to be determined through an open solicitation for nominations from organizations involved directly in postdoctoral training (e.g., CoS, APPIC)

Domain III - Practitioners of the Profession Representing Independent, Institutional, and Specialized Practice – (N=5)

III.A. Independent and institutional practice (4)

- Two seats representing institutional practice and two seats representing independent practice will be nominated jointly by APA’s Board of Professional Affairs and Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice (BPA/CAPPS).

III.B. Specialized practice (1)

- One seat nominated by the Council of Specialties (CoS).

Domain IV - Representatives of the Public Interest (N=3)

IV.A. General Public (N=2)

- Nominations for both seats to be solicited at large by the CoA from a broad range of education and public interest groups with nominees to be persons with breadth of community perspective and leadership experience who are not psychologists.

IV.B. Public Interest: Individual and Cultural Diversity (N=1)

- One seat to be determined from an open solicitation of nominations for a psychologist who brings scholarly expertise on issues of individual and cultural diversity in the context of advancing the science and practice of psychology in public service for appointment to a three-year, non-renewable term.

Domain V – Graduate Student Consumers of Education and Training (N=1)

- One seat nominated by the board of the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS) for appointment to a one-year term.

Open Seats (N=2)

Without regard to the Domains identified above, the CoA will solicit nominations from groups, organizations, and individuals to identify psychologist nominees for two open seats. Appointments will be made from the range of nominees for three-year, non-renewable terms to allow for greater flexibility and responsiveness to the development and evolution of the field and to provide opportunities to be informed by the annual Accreditation Assembly. Initially, on a three-year cycle, one nominee for an Open Seat will be appointed in each of the first two years, followed by an appointment of a nominee from Domain IV.B, Public Interest.

Construction of Review Panels by the CoA

The current *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation* authorize the committee “... to appoint consultants, program review panels, and task forces in the discharge of its duties...” (p. iv). The CoA has used a system of internal review panels comprised of members of the committee for several years, and two years ago was on the verge of implementing review panels that would include small numbers of external “associates” working with committee members. Implementation of the plan was suspended temporarily in anticipation of the report of the BEA Advisory Council on Accreditation

and this follow-up Accreditation Summit meeting. It is anticipated that the CoA will begin implementing a limited approach to extended review panels in the near future and will do so in a manner that is congruent with and preparatory to the recommendations that follow.

The proposed CoA will be charged with developing detailed policies regarding the size and composition of panels, guided by two principles: (1) substantial minority representation of peers from similar programs, and (2) balance of perspectives of peers from various types and levels of training programs and settings. An initial plan for organizing comprehensive review panels is described below with the caveats that (1) a comprehensive analysis will be required initially to confirm that adequate financial and logistical support is in place; (2) a phase-in period of some duration likely will be required; and (3) the CoA will of necessity need to be accorded some discretion in adjusting the plan based on the comprehensive analysis and any related but unanticipated conditions. See Table 2 at the conclusion of the narrative for a visual representation of the proposed panel structure of a fully implemented revised CoA.

Doctoral Panels (N=5)

- Group 1 panel or panels each include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by the Academy of Psychological Clinical Science (APCS), and 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.
- Group 2 panel or panels each include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by NCSPP, and 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.
- Group 3 panel or panels each include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by CUDCP, and 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.
- Group 4 panel or panels each include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by CCPTP, and 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.
- Group 5 panel or panels each include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by CDSPP and 1 member selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by the Consortium of Combined-Integrated Doctoral Programs in Psychology (CCIDPIP), and 3 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.

Internship Panels (N=4).

Each of the four internship panels will include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by APPIC (N=6) and from nominations submitted by other organizations and groups (N=6) that represent internship training identified by the CoA such as university counseling centers (Association of Counseling Center Training Agencies-ACCTA), VA medical centers (VA Central Office Psychology Leadership), academic health sciences centers (Association of Medical School Psychologists-AMSP), other hospitals and behavioral health settings, community mental health centers, internship consortia, “affiliated” internships, half-time internships, etc. Thus, a total of 6 members across the 4 panels will be selected from nominations submitted by APPIC, and a total of 6 members across the 4 panels will be selected from nominations from other internship-relevant groups as determined by the CoA. In addition, each of the four internship panels will include 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.

Post-doctoral Residency Panel (N=1).

The postdoctoral residency panel or panels will include 3 members selected by the CoA from nominations submitted by organizations and groups that represent postdoctoral residency training such as APPIC, CoS, VA Central Office Psychology Leadership, AMSP, Council of Postdoctoral Programs in Professional Psychology (COPPPP), Association of Postdoctoral Programs in Clinical Neuropsychology (APPCN), etc. as determined by the CoA. In addition, the postdoctoral residency panel(s) will include 4 CoA members who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.

Some Underlying Principles

The following “principles” of accreditation were evident in the discussions that occurred at the Summit meeting and in the deliberations of the conveners as they shaped this report.

1. *Principle of Accreditation Standards:* The education and training standards upon which the accreditation system is based have developed over several decades and represent broad consensus across the discipline and profession about knowledge and competence necessary for safe and effective professional practice.
2. *Principle of Voluntary Participation:* Accreditation is a voluntary process, separate and distinct from the legal regulatory system, in which programs choose to participate for the purpose of demonstrating their compliance with the accepted education and training standards.

3. *Principle of Public Interest:* A primary purpose of accreditation is to protect the public interest by insuring that accredited programs meet accepted standards that foster effective and non-harmful professional practice.
4. *Principle of Quality Enhancement:* A corollary purpose of accreditation is to stimulate the continuing development and implementation of high quality education and training programs at doctoral, internship, and postdoctoral residency levels
5. *Principle of Peer Review:* A necessary and crucial feature of all accreditation procedures is involvement in the review process of appropriately credentialed professional and scientific peers who are knowledgeable and skillful in the areas being assessed.
6. *Principle of Outcome Oriented Assessment:* The accreditation review process focuses primarily on the assessment of student learning outcomes both during and after completion of formal education and training.
7. *Principle of Valuing Diversity:* A primary commitment inherent in psychology's accreditation system is respect for individual and cultural diversity and further development of psychology's capacity to respond appropriately and effectively to an increasingly diverse society.
8. *Principle of Inter-organizational Scope:* A truly effective professional psychology accreditation system will involve all components of the education and training community including newly emerged as well as long-standing and traditional components.
9. *Principle of Unitary System:* A single, unitary psychology accrediting body that spans the education and training spectrum will be maximally effective in representing psychology to society and in stimulating the further development of the field.
10. *Principle of Transparent Policies and Procedures:* In so far as possible, the development and implementation of accreditation policies and procedures should be accessible and available to interested individuals and organizations, both within and outside the profession.

For a formal elaboration of principles that support the current accreditation system, the reader is referred to the *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology*, pp. 2-5.

Major Functions of the Commission on Accreditation

What follows is a brief listing of major functions to be carried out by the proposed Commission on Accreditation. The listing incorporates general functions outlined in the current *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation* (p. iv) as well as new tasks identified through the summit meeting process.

1. Formulate and promulgate accreditation policy that is informed by input from review panels, the annual Accreditation Assembly, and the field in general.
2. Make final program accreditation decisions, taking into account the recommendations received from review panels.
3. Manage, staff, and participate in the panel review process.
4. Organize and convene the annual Accreditation Assembly.
5. Maintain and assure quality of the site visitor function and panel review process.
6. Develop and maintain inter-organizational relationships across the full spectrum of psychology education and training entities.
7. Engage in timely and relevant self-studies and self-evaluations for the purpose of enhancing the quality and credibility of the accreditation review process.
8. Hear and adjudicate complaints from individuals and organizations.
9. Participate as prescribed in the accreditation decision appeal process.
10. Assure openness and periodic review of policies and procedures to ensure that innovation is supported.
11. Provide appropriate consultative guidance and general information about the accreditation process and its purposes through the Office of Accreditation.
12. Conduct evaluative and developmental research appropriate to accreditation.
13. Appoint program review panels, consultants, and task forces as needed, within policy and fiscal constraints.
14. Maintain the CoA's status as a recognized professional specialty accrediting body with the U.S. Department of Education and the Commission on Higher Education Accreditation.

Issues In Need of Further Attention from the New CoA

- Establishing a steering committee to set agendas and coordinate activities
- Developing specific procedures for constructing and maintaining the program review panels.
- Creating a format and venue for the annual Accreditation Assembly
- Generating specific policies and procedures for implementing 10 year cycles for reviewing the structure and composition of the CoA
- Enhancing selection procedures, education and training requirements, and related quality control activities for accreditation site visitors
- Emphasizing student learning outcomes in all accreditation decisions
- Ensuring more effective connections between doctoral and internship education and training programs
- Clarifying and strengthening inter-organizational relationships and collaboration
- Maintaining structures and processes that facilitate innovation, development and evolution of the field

Table 1, Domains of Representation for
Psychology's Commission on Accreditation

Domain	Representation For	Nominated By	Seats
I	<i>Scientific Discipline of Psychology (N = 5)</i>		
I.A	Academic Leadership for Graduate Education	COGDOP	4
I.B	Representative of Core Scientific Activities	APS/BSA	1
II	<i>Professional Education and Training (N = 16)</i>		
II.A	Training Program Leadership	APPIC CCPTP CDSPP CUDCP NCSP	1 1 1 1 1
II.B	Leadership in Professional Education	BEA/NCSP	1
II.C	Professional Peers from: <u>Doctoral Panels</u>	APCS NCSP CUDCP CCPTP CDSPP	1 1 1 1 1
	<u>Internship Panels</u>	APPIC	2
	<u>Post-doctoral Panel</u>	Other relevant groups Relevant groups	2 1
III	<i>Practitioners Representing Independent, Institutionalized, and Specialized Practice (N = 5)</i>		
III.A	Independent and Institutional Practice	BPA/CAPP	4
III.B	Specialized Practice	CoS	1
IV	<i>Representatives in the Public Interest (N = 3)</i>		
IV.A	General Public	Solicited at Large	2
IV.B	Individual and Cultural Diversity	Open nominations for individuals with expertise in diversity	1
V	<i>Graduate Students (N = 1)</i>	APAGS	1
Special	<i>Open Seats (N = 2)</i>	Nominations solicited for flexible responsiveness to evolving field	2

TOTAL

32

Table 2, Proposed Panel Structure for Commission on Accreditation

Doctoral Panels

<p><u>Panel 1:</u> 3 panelists nominated by APCS and selected by CoA 4 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>	<p><u>Panel 2:</u> 3 panelists nominated by NCSPP and selected by CoA 4 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>	<p><u>Panel 3:</u> 3 panelists nominated by CUDCP and selected by CoA 4 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>	<p><u>Panel 4:</u> 3 panelists nominated by CCPTP and selected by CoA 4 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>	<p><u>Panel 5:</u> 3 panelists nominated by CDSPP; 1 panelist nominated by CCIDPIP 3 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Internship & Postdoctoral Residency Panels

<p><u>Internship Panels 6-9:</u> Each panel will have 3 panelists selected by the CoA, some nominated by APPIC (N=6) and some nominated by other groups and organizations (N=6) that represent internship training as identified by the CoA such as university counseling centers (ACCTA), VA medical centers (VA Psychology Leadership), academic health sciences centers (AMSP), other hospitals and behavioral health settings, community mental health centers, internship consortia, “affiliated” internships, half-time internships, etc. Each panel will have 4 CoA panelists who represent various types and levels of training programs and settings.</p>				<p><u>Postdoctoral Residency Panel 10:</u> 3 panelists nominated by groups focused on postdoctoral training as determined by CoA (e.g., APPIC, CoS) 4 CoA panelists who represent various training levels and/or models</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Appendix A

Open Letter of Invitation to Participate in Accreditation Summit

March 14, 2005

Dear Colleague:

We write to you as a leader of one of the “communities of interest” in accreditation in professional psychology to invite participation by your group in an upcoming summit meeting. The Summit will be held from June 23-26 at Snowbird, Utah, 45 minutes east of the Salt Lake International Airport in the Wasatch Mountains.

A bit of history:

As you are undoubtedly aware, over the past few years there have been continuing conversations about change in the Committee on Accreditation. The Board of Educational Affairs of APA charged an Advisory Council “to think outside the box” on issues of accreditation. The Council issued an interim report about one year ago that evoked considerable controversy in the field.

Board members from COGDOP and CUDCP contacted members in leadership positions from the constituent groups represented in Domains I and II of the current Committee on Accreditation and solicited their involvement in a meeting to plan an inter-organizational summit around the issues surrounding a proposed reorganization of COA.

The Advisory Council appeared to listen carefully to comments from varied constituencies and issued a final report in November, 2005. The Advisory Council made three major recommendations: (1) A proposed composition, structure, and function of a 48-member commission, (2) change in the organizational context for accreditation governance, (3) convening by COA of a meeting of communities of interest.

The representatives of the leadership of APPIC, CCPTP, CDSPP, COGDOP, CUDCP, and NCSPP (names included among the Steering Committee listed on this document) met immediately after the release of the Advisory Committee’s Final Report. They found ready agreement with Recommendation 2 from the Advisory Council and, as a slight modification of Recommendation 3 from the Council, they developed a detailed proposal for an inter-organizational summit, not unlike the 1991 Kilbey meeting that resulted in agreements leading to the current COA structure. The intent of the summit would be to design a plan for composition of the Commission on Accreditation as an alternative to Recommendation 1 from the Advisory Council. The Summit will also result in a proposal to address ongoing reviews of composition of the Commission and a structure and process to use for future considerations of issues of representation.

Preparation for the Summit: Shaping an Agenda

This letter serves as an invitation to all “communities of interest” that might wish to participate in the summit. We ask that you submit a letter of intent to participate by April 15, 2005 to aid us in our planning.

By May 27, 2005, communities of interest will be asked to submit a written document of less than 1250 words making the case for representation, not for particular seats on the Committee (Commission) on Accreditation, or for particular groups or people, but for representation of interests, perspectives, and viewpoints. Current constituent groups will present the case for their representation as well.

Questions that each participating group will be asked to address in writing in advance of the meeting include:

- What is the nature of your community of interest-- formal organization, specific details about whom your group represents; (e.g., # of students; # of programs)?
- How do they fit into a conceptualization of doctoral, internship, and/ or postdoctoral education and training in professional psychology?
- How are these interests distinctive?
- What would be a good model or ways for your community of interest to have your interests represented while honoring the principles outlined above? We acknowledge that a “seat at the table” of accreditation might be the most satisfactory, but, what are some other models of collaboration or partnerships for your community of interest that might meet your needs for representation?
- What are the guiding principles for selection of representatives for a community of interest?

We ask for presentations to go beyond “asking for seats on the Co A,” rather, emphasizing the wisdom of representation, a broader view of the future of the field, and a progressive vision.

All written submissions from communities of interest will be made available to all Summit participants in advance of the meeting. These briefs will be used by the Steering Committee to designate break out sessions for discussion on the first day of the Summit.

Submissions may be made electronically (preferably .pdf format). They should be sent to: schillk@muohio.edu. Submissions must be received by May 27, 2005. Please use 2 inch margins and double spacing, 12 point font.

Conveners and Participants

Written materials will be submitted by all communities of interest prior to the Summit and distributed in advance to all registrants for the Summit. Participants will meet in small groups, as described in the attached Schedule, not to restate or rebut the ideas presented in the written statements, but, to consider the importance of the broad purview of the Committee on Accreditation as this enterprise moves into the future and the elements of distinctiveness and overlap among communities of interest that should inform decisions about representation on the Committee.

Participants and conveners will meet together in these discussions over the course of the Summit. Conveners will develop a model or models of representation based upon these discussions and develop a final proposal for representation that responds to feedback from the groups.

The number and representation of the conveners for the Summit mirror the current representation of Domains I and II on the CoA, plus two additional representatives from each of COA and BEA. Conveners for the Summit will include members of the Steering Committee as listed above and others selected by constituent groups to ensure the following representation in total:

- 2 members from BEA
- 2 members from COA
- 4 members from COGDOP
- 2 members from CUDCP
- 2 members from CCPTP
- 2 members from APPIC
- 2 members from CDSPP
- 2 members from NCSPP

Ted Packard and Karen Schilling will co-chair the Summit.

To facilitate planning, communities of interest should indicate in their letter of intent whether or not they will be sending a representative to the summit to express their views. All groups wishing to send a representative are asked to send only one representative in order to maintain a reasonable working group size. Participants will be representatives of the varied “communities of interest” that wish to make a case for their representation on COA.

The Context for the Summit: Principles Guiding Decisions about Representation in Accreditation Decision-making

We have identified a number of principles/assumptions regarding accreditation that are the context for the summit. Many of these also informed the work of the Advisory Council.

- Sustain and build an integrated, forward-looking, vital profession
- Encourage innovation and problem solving
- Autonomy of the accreditation body, with collaboration with other appropriate agencies (e.g., BEA, APA)
- Self-regulation of the parties subject to accreditation
- Respect for multiple needs, interests, perspectives
- Minimization of duplication of representation
- Representation based on distinctiveness, historical viability, and fit into conceptualization of professional psychology
- Retention of a manageable size for the working group
- Transparent process
- Equitable, principled representation
- Commitment to broad and general doctoral education with attention to the integration of science and practice and quality
- Commitment to inclusion of practice, student, and public representation

In conclusion, the history of the accreditation process is fraught with tension and conflict, in part because it must address core issues that are fundamental to education, training, reimbursement, and the future of the profession. The difficulty in resolving the key issues related to accreditation has become an impediment to the smooth operation of this important function. While it may well be a difficult and arduous task that lies ahead of us, it would be an abdication of responsibility to not attempt to resolve the present situation.

We believe that the final report of the Advisory Council on Accreditation provides impetus to addressing these difficult issues. We have proposed a structure and set of principles that we believe will foster an atmosphere of creative thinking and problem solving, and designed to allow the expression and consideration of various perspectives. We believe that the time is right for all communities of interest to come together, setting aside differences from the past, in a good faith effort to reach a viable outcome.

Logistics

The costs of the Summit will be borne by a conference fee for all participants, conveners, resource people, and observers, covering meeting rooms and most food costs. We anticipate a conference fee of \$300 per person. Not included in this fee are costs for lodging and dinners. In addition, the Committee on Accreditation will help to subsidize the meeting. We will provide you with a contact number at Snowbird so that you can arrange your lodging (approximately \$109 per night). We will also provide information on arranging shuttle service from the airport to Snowbird and on nearby restaurants so that you may make arrangements for dinner on your own each night. Detailed information concerning conference arrangements and lodging costs will be sent to you in the very near future.

Schedule for Summit

Working sessions are designed to build upon the written documents presented in advance of the meeting. There will be no opportunities to simply restate the case for a group's representation. Resource people or observers contribute to break out sessions only when their input is specifically invited by the group.

Thursday, June 23:

7:00 pm Opening night reception

Friday, June 24:

8:00 Plenary session: outline principles; identification of commonalities; charge to break out sessions

10:00 Break out sessions— potentially 4 groups of 8 constituted based on themes determined by the Steering Committee (e.g., internship, post doc, doctoral programs).

(Working lunch)

The charge to the break out groups will be: Identify three possible models of representation for your group, specifying strengths and limitations of each model.

3:00 Reconvene to have breakout groups report

4:00 Conveners meet to identify commonalities (working dinner)

Saturday, June 25:

8:00 Conveners meet to assemble draft model of representation.

10:00-11:00 Plenary session to report draft

11-1:00 Working Lunch: Participants and conveners will be randomly assigned to break out sessions to discuss draft documents specifically to identify concerns, risks, fears, and to develop feasible modifications and safeguards.

1-2:00 Plenary session to hear reports from break out session;

2:00 – 2:30 Break: Participants' obligations are fulfilled, participants are free to leave.

2:30 Conveners meet through evening to deliberate and develop final document

Sunday, June 26:

8:00am –2:00pm Conveners meet to finalize document

Appendix B

Organizations and Individuals Who Participated in the Summit

Baker, Nancy	APA-35 Society for Psychology of Women
Belar, Cynthia	APA-Education Directorate
Bieschke, Kathleen	APA-17 Society for Counseling Psychology
Boake, Corwin	Association of Postdoctoral Programs in Clinical Neuropsychology
* Brewer, Charles	APA-Board of Educational Affairs
Bricklin, Patricia	APA-29 Psychotherapy
Brucker, Bernard	American Board of Professional Psychology/Rehabilitation Psychology Synarchy
* Carlson, Cindy	APA-Board of Educational Affairs
Cellucci, Tony	Association of Directors of Psychology Training Clinics
Clark, Elaine	APA-16 School Psychology
* Collins, Frank	Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology
* Crossman, Raymond	National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology
Douce, Louise	Counseling Psychology Synarchy
Elman, Nancy	APA-43 Family Psychology
* Furlong, Michael	Council of Directors School Psychology Programs
* Goodyear, Rod	Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs
Hamsher, Kerry	Clinical Neuropsychology Synarchy
* Heesacker, Martin	Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology
Humphreys, Keith	APA-Board of Professional Affairs
Hurley, George	Council for the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology
* Kaslow, Nadine	Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers/APA-12
* Keilin, Greg	Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers
* Keys, Christopher	Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology
Klein, Nanci	APA-31 State, Provincial and Territorial Psychological Association Affairs
Levenson, Robert	American Psychological Society
Madson, Michael	American Psychological Association of Graduate Students
McFall, Richard	Alternate Accreditation Steering Committee
* Mitchell, M. Ellen	Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology
Morgan, Kris	KMJ Associates
Murphy, Michael	APA-42 Psychologists in Independent Practice
Nelson, Paul	APA-Education Directorate
Nordal, Katherine	Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice
* Packard, Ralph (Ted)	Committee on Accreditation
* Palmer, Laura	Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs
* Peterson, Roger	National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology
Pryzwansky, Walter	Council of Specialties in Professional Psychology
Rehm, Lynn	Comm. for the Recognition of Specialties & Proficiencies in Prof. Psychology
* Rey-Casserly, Celiane	Committee on Accreditation
* Roberts, Michael	Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology
Rodolfa, Emil	Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards
Ross, Thomas	Psychoanalysis Synarchy Group
Rozensky, Ronald	APA Board of Directors
* Schilling, Karen	Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology
Schreier, Barry	Association of Counseling Center Training Agencies
Shealy, Craig	Consortium of Combined-Integrated Doctoral Programs in Psychology
Shoham, Varda	Academy of Psychological Clinical Science

* Strein, William
Thorn, Beverly
Zeiss, Antoinette
Zlotlow, Susan

Council of Directors School Psychology Programs
APA-38 Health Psychology
Department of Veterans Affairs
APA-Office of Consultation and Accreditation

Appendix C

Accreditation Summit Agenda

Program Schedule:

Thursday, June 23, 2005

Building, Room

9:00 am – 5:00 pm	Convener Session <i>Continental Breakfast served at 8:30</i> <i>Snack Breaks at 10:30 am and 2:00 pm</i> <i>Buffet Lunch served at noon</i>	Cliff Lodge, Wasatch
7:00 – 9:00 pm	Welcome Reception and Registration	Cliff Lodge, Golden Cliff

Friday, June 24, 2005

7:30 – 8:00 am	Registration	Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer
<i>7:30 – 8:30 am</i>	<i>Breakfast Buffet</i>	<i>Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer</i>
8:00 – 10:00 am	Opening Plenary Session	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
<i>10:00 – 10:30 am</i>	<i>Snack Break</i>	<i>Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer</i>
10:30 am – 2:30 pm	Breakout Session A	Snowbird Center, Alpine A
	Breakout Session B	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
	Breakout Session C	Snowbird Center, Columbine
	Breakout Sessions D and E	Snowbird Center, Rendezvous A
<i>12:00 – 1:00 pm</i>	<i>Buffet Lunch</i>	<i>Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer</i>
<i>2:30 – 3:00 pm</i>	<i>Snack Break</i>	<i>Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer</i>
3:00 – 4:00 pm	Plenary Session: Breakout Groups Report	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
<i>4:00 – 5:30 pm</i>	<i>Free Time</i>	
5:30 – 9:00 pm	Convener Session <i>Working Dinner served at 6:00</i>	Cliff Lodge, Magpie B

Saturday, June 25, 2005

Building, Room

7:30 – 8:30 am	Breakfast Buffet	Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer
8:00 – 10:00 am	Convener Session: Draft Model	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
9:45 – 10:00 am	Snack Break	Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer
10:00 – 11:00 am	Plenary Session: Report on Draft	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
11:00 am – 1:00 pm	Breakout Session A	Snowbird Center, Alpine A
	Breakout Session B	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
	Breakout Session C	Snowbird Center, Columbine
	Breakout Sessions D and E	Snowbird Center, Rendezvous A
12:00 – 1:00 pm	Buffet Lunch	Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer
1:00 – 2:00 pm	Closing Plenary Session: Breakout Groups Report	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
2:00 – 2:30 pm	Snack Break	Snowbird Center, Alpine Foyer
2:30 – 5:00 pm	Convener Session: Develop Final Draft	Snowbird Center, Alpine B
3:45 – 4:00 pm	Break	
5:00 – 6:30 pm	Free Time	
6:30 – 9:00 pm	Convener Session: Develop Final Draft <i>Working Dinner served at 6:30</i>	Cliff Lodge, Magpie B

Sunday, June 26, 2005

8:00 am – 2:00 pm	Convener Session: Finalize Document <i>Plated Breakfast served at 8:00</i> <i>Snack Break 9:45 – 10:15 am</i> <i>Buffet Lunch served at noon</i>	Cliff Lodge, Wasatch
-------------------	--	-----------------------------

Thank you for attending the Accreditation Summit!