

---

**PSY.D. TASK FORCE**  
**Final Report to the Canadian Psychological Association Board of Directors**  
**November, 1998**

---

**Task Force members:**

**Bob Robinson, Ph.D., Chair**

**Harvey Brooker, Ph.D.**  
**Pierre Carpentier, M.A.**  
**Joseph DeKoninck, Ph.D.**  
**Keith Dobson, Ph.D.**  
**Anna Beth Doyle, Ph.D.**  
**David Dozois, M.Sc.**  
**Luc Granger, Ph.D.**  
**Jennifer McIvor, M.A.**  
**Juanita Mureika, M.A.**

**Janel Gauthier, Ph.D. (Ex-officio)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[I. TASK FORCE BACKGROUND AND MANDATE](#)

[II. HISTORICAL ISSUES IN PROFESSIONAL TRAINING](#)

- A. American Trends in Training Models
- B. Canadian Training Models

[III. REGULATORY ISSUES](#)

- A. Canada
- B. USA
- C. EEC
- D. Regulatory Implications

[IV. CURRENT CONTEXT TO CONSIDER A SECOND DOCTORAL TRAINING MODEL FOR PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY](#)

[V. A CANADIAN PSY.D. MODEL](#)

- A. Guiding Principles
- B. Entry Requirements
- C. Knowledge Domains
- D. Science Competencies

- E. Practice Competencies
- F. Practica/Externship
- G. Internship
- H. Socialization
- I. Evaluation

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

- A. Programme Characteristics
- B. Student Funding/Internships
- C. Mid-Career Practitioners
  
- D. Integration with Existing Programmes

## VII. STRATEGIC OPTIONS AND CONTINUING CONCERNS

## VIII. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## REFERENCES

### **I. TASK FORCE BACKGROUND AND MANDATE**

In 1997, the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) established a Task Force to consider the viability and appropriateness of the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) model of professional training in Canada. CPA took on this task in its capacity as the organization most representative of the whole of the discipline in Canada, as an organization that views education and training as fundamental to both the science and practice of psychology, and as the steward of the national Accreditation Programme in Professional Psychology.

The Terms of Reference approved by the Board of Directors of CPA in Spring 1997 charged the Task Force *with a review of education and training models in professional psychology that are appropriate and realistic. Its ultimate task is to put before the CPA Board of Directors a comprehensive report with proposals and recommendations for consideration and implementation.* ○

The Task Force was comprised of a professionally, geographically and linguistically diverse group of individuals from both academic and applied settings, including student representatives. It convened four times during 1997 and 1998 for one-day working sessions and an extensive final teleconference meeting. In between, Task Force members researched topics, drafted sections, received and discussed feedback. An interim Consultation Document was widely circulated to the psychological community in February, 1998, and a summary of issues raised and feedback received, the Issues Paper, was circulated in May, 1998. Both documents were the subject of conversation sessions at the CPA convention in June, 1998, and written feedback has been since received.

Several other representative organizations, e.g. the Canadian Council of Professional Psychology Programs (CCPPP), the Canadian Council of Departments of Psychology (CCDP), and the Council of Provincial Associations of Psychology (CPAP), discussed

the question and took positions at their annual meetings at the CPA Convention in June, 1998. Issues surrounding the establishment of the Psy.D. degree in Canada are multiple, complex, and controversial, arousing strong and diverse opinions. The Task Force members themselves hold diverse opinions on the advisability, feasibility and viability of Psy.D. training in Canada. This Final Report summarizes their consensus as to the issues, their recommendations, and concerns remaining to be resolved.

The Task Force undertook to exercise its mandate in the context of : 1) the history, philosophies and models of training both within and outside North America; 2) accreditation issues and the concurrent CPA Accreditation Review; 3) regulatory issues from provincial, territorial, national and international perspectives; 4) market-place issues including supply and demand; 5) the university context; and 6) desired training programme outcomes for the practice of psychology.

## **II. HISTORICAL ISSUES IN PROFESSIONAL TRAINING**

Although the variety of training models that has evolved in the United States has been extensively discussed, relatively little has been written about models in Canadian psychology (Craig, 1993; Hunsley & Lefebvre, 1990). In this section, we discuss the development of the three dominant US approaches to professional training, followed in turn by the Canadian context.

### **A. American trends in training models**

As has been well documented (Routh, 1994; Sechrest, 1992), the history of professional psychology in the United States is that it grew primarily out of a demonstrable societal need, coupled with an infusion of federal monies and an agreement on training, in the era immediately following the Second World War. The 1949 conference on training held in Boulder, Colorado, established the "scientist-practitioner" model of training as the dominant one for the next twenty years. This model states that clinical psychology (and later, other applied areas of psychology) is a specialty within the broad domain of the discipline. As such, this model has been largely interpreted as meaning that a clinical or other applied psychologist should be trained both in the broad methods (e.g. research methods; statistics) and knowledge base of psychology, and in the specific skill sets needed for psychological practice. It should also be noted that in the US, building upon the tradition of a liberal arts general undergraduate education, professional training in psychology was exclusively at the graduate, post-bachelor, level.

The Boulder model was widely accepted, and was reaffirmed in conferences in 1955, 1958, 1962, 1965 and 1973. Further, in the 1950s and 1960s there was a great expansion of doctoral programmes based upon this model. Notwithstanding these developments, it became increasingly clear that the practice of the majority of psychologists did not match the scientific training that they had obtained, as the majority of practitioners did not continue to conduct research after graduation, though they applied critical and scientific thinking. In an early survey it was found that 7% of the time of Ph.D. clinicians was devoted to research. As well Ph.D. clinicians indicated somewhat less satisfaction with

their graduate training (77%) than their Psy.D. counterparts (97%) (Garfield and Kurtz, 1976). This factor, coupled with the extra time taken to attain these skills, averaging at least 1 ½ years longer (Gaddy, et.al., 1995), led some to question the appropriateness of the scientist-practitioner model. " competing " scholar-practitioner" model of training emerged with a decreased emphasis on the training and practice of traditional logical-empiricist research skills, and an expanded definition of doctoral training (Peterson, McHolland, Bent, Davis-Russell, Edwall, Polite, Singer & Stricker, 1991). Donald Peterson, who is quoted extensively in this document, was a formative player in the Psy.D. movement.

As time went on, the notion emerged that a professional psychologist could appropriately be an educated "consumer" of research as a legitimate option to being a "producer" of research (Peterson, et al, 1991; Routh, 1994), and that both types of training legitimately produced "practitioners" of psychology. The Professional model, as reflected in the Psy.D. degree, began to unfold, first with the accreditation of Adelphi's practice-orientated programme in 1957, then at the University of Illinois in 1968, followed by the California School of Professional Psychology (with 4 campuses) in 1969, and others in the 1970s. By 1980 there were 21 Psy.D. programmes in operation (Peterson, et.al., 1982). It is important to note that professional schools offer both Ph.D. and Psy.D. degrees, as do some university based academic and professional programmes.

By the 1974 Vail conference, members declared that American psychology had expanded sufficiently to warrant the creation of programmes for scientists, professionals, and scientist-professionals. They formally endorsed the professional training model and stated that "where primary emphasis in training and function is upon direct delivery of professional service and the evaluation and improvement of those services, the Doctor of Psychology degree is appropriate. Where primary emphasis is upon the development of new knowledge in psychology, the Ph.D. is appropriate" (Korman, 1974, p443).

By the 1990's the number of graduates in clinical psychology from professional schools equalled those from universities, and 25% of all clinical psychology graduates in 1993 received Psy.D. degrees (Belar, 1998). Although there has been some reduction in the number of Psy.D. graduates in the U.S. recently due to the financial failure of some schools, the practice of psychology in the United States is now significantly influenced by professional schools, and a sizeable cohort of Psy.D.'s is produced by professional schools and universities. A published report from one Psy.D. programme (Baylor University) indicated very few difficulties in obtaining employment of its graduates and 44% reported advantages. The authors further state "The Psy.D. is not viewed, nor has it been experienced, as a second-rate credential by those who received it . . ." (Hershey, Koppler and Cornell, 1991). The National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology (NCSPP) reports virtually no unemployment (3/286) in a follow-up of graduates from seven programmes (1993-1996) (Edwards, no date).

In recent years there has been some question about whether or not the supply of psychology graduates in the US is too great. It has been argued that some states are "saturated" (see Robiner, 1991, but also see Vandenbos, DeLeon, and Belar, 1991, for a contrary perspective). It is also the case that the demand for pre-doctoral internships has surpassed the availability of these training opportunities, albeit by only about 5%

according to results of the 1998 survey by the Council of University Directors of Clinical Programs (Thorn, E-mail to CUDCP, July, 1998). The Association of Psychology Post-doctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) reports an under supply of internship positions in the hundreds in the last several years. Although it remains to be seen whether the shortage of internships may be due to factors such as reductions in the number of internships, or the transfer of some pre-doctoral positions to post-doctoral internships, one dominant concern is that there may be an over-supply of new psychologists that simply cannot be accommodated by these positions.

It is important to note that there has been considerable tension, and in some cases open antagonism, between psychologists who endorse one or the other of the Ph.D. or Psy.D. training model (Snepp and Peterson, 1988). While the Ph.D. has been asserted to be the model for the scientific practitioner, and the Psy.D. has been equally asserted to be the most appropriate format for the polished professional, both models have been criticized as deficient in important ways. Recent documents such as McFall's (1991) "Manifesto for a Science of Clinical Psychology", and other recent developments such as the Academy of Clinical Scientist Programs, further contribute to the tension seen in the United States. Interestingly, data cited by Snepp and Peterson (1988) indicate no significant differences in core clinical skills and general dimensions of professional competence between Ph.D. and Psy.D. students as rated by their internship supervisors. There were slight differences in favour of sensitivity for Psy.D. students and scientific attitude for Ph.D. students.

It is clearly the case that both the Ph.D. and Psy.D. are not monolithic models, are expressed in a variety of ways, and can and do meet accreditation standards. In part, this is a reflection of trainers in both types of programmes ensuring that the standards have been set, but it is also undoubtedly the result of modifications of the standards themselves. The 1996 APA revision of Accreditation Guidelines and Principles allows programmes to self-declare their domain and model of training, as long as they can document the delivery of such a programme. It remains to be seen to what extent this change in accreditation will lead to one or another model being favoured, or whether there will be an elaboration of new models of training.

Although doctoral training is the dominant model in most areas of professional training in the United States, masters degree programmes endure. There remain some states where it is possible to practice psychology or related functions with a masters degree. In some states such practice is limited to specific areas such as school psychology, while in other states the practice of masters level providers is that of an "Associate" or "Assistant", who must work under the aegis of a doctoral level supervisor. There continue to be large and effective organizations such as the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the American Association of Marital and Family Therapists (AAMFT) that argue that masters-level training is sufficient for an entry into certain areas of psychological practice.

## **B. Canadian training models**

Unlike the United States, there was no conference equivalent to the Boulder Conference in Canada; nor was there any large infusion of funding for psychological programmes

after the Second World War. Rather, there was a slow evolution of training programmes in Canada that in some respects, although not exactly, mirrored American trends. As an example, the idea of accreditation of doctoral programmes was accepted by some Canadian programmes shortly after it was enacted in the United States, and indeed, some Canadian programmes attained APA accreditation before there was an accreditation process in Canada (Conway, 1984). The Ontario Psychological Association developed a unique accreditation programme with its own criteria, and in 1984 CPA established an accreditation system (as an adaptation of the APA criteria and procedures). Without new funds to mount accreditable doctoral training programmes, however, the number of such programmes only grew slowly to its current number of 17. Some provinces and territories of Canada still do not have accredited doctoral training programmes. There are 25 CPA accredited internship training programmes as well.

A critical difference between the Canadian and American training scene is that of the exclusive dominance of publicly funded universities in Canada in all areas of post-graduate education. Whereas the United States has had a long tradition of private universities with excellent academic traditions (e.g. Harvard, Yale), the manner in which public universities are funded and administered in Canada makes significant shifts in the nature of their programmes a rare phenomenon indeed. For example, to have any new graduate programme approved in Ontario not only must the programme be accepted by the specific university that initiates it, it must also be approved by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS), which consists of graduate deans from across the province, and which makes a recommendation to the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. The OCGS can, and has, effectively blocked the development of Psy.D. programmes in Ontario, on the basis of the argument that the conduct of original research is an integral and irremovable part of the training of any "doctoral degree". This position held despite the fact that doctoral degrees in musicology are being granted without original composition, and that in social work both Ph.D. and D.S.W. degrees coexist. Similar governmental systems in other provinces also make the broad acceptability of Psy.D. programmes an open question, even if professional psychology advocates such a development.

An interesting historical note is that Adrien Pinard in his 1964 CPA Presidential Address brought official mention of the Psy.D. concept for the first time in Canada (Pinard, 1964). In Quebec, in the 1970s and 80s the University of Montreal offered a popular D.Ps., Psy.D.-type programme, but ceased to do so because the dissertation product was judged to be indistinguishable from that required of those in the Ph.D. program. Currently, a practice-oriented doctoral programme (D.Ps.) exists at UQAM as an option, along with research and research-intervention options. Few students enrol, however, perhaps because in Quebec registration for independent practice is at the masters level. To date, despite serious efforts including programme proposals in some universities, no indigenous doctoral training programmes based on the Psy.D. model exist, nor have any Canadian doctoral programmes based on the Psy.D. model applied for approval from bodies accrediting in Canada. Thus, although this model of professional training exists in Canada (for example, the Hawaii School of Professional Psychology conducts classes in Vancouver, as does the Adler Institute in Toronto), the degrees are not based in Canada.

In some respects the development of Canadian scholar-practitioner programmes has been anticipated. The current CPA Accreditation Criteria (CPA, 1991, p.67) are permissive of such training models, stating:

"Clinical psychology or counselling psychology training in Canada currently appears to rely on the scientist-practitioner model resulting in the Ph.D. degree, although we may anticipate the development of training in practitioner models that may choose to offer Psy.D. degrees. In any event, programmes should demonstrate a commitment to the intellectual and scientific enterprise of psychology."

The CPA/CPAP Task Force on Mid-Career Training for Psychologists (Whitsett & Handy, 1991) strongly recommended a consideration of alternative models including university- and non-university-based professional programmes (see also Handy & Whitsett, 1993). Further, the more recent Mississauga Conference on Professional Psychology (Dobson & King, 1994) passed several resolutions on this matter:

- "Training models which vary in the relative emphasis on practice and research can meet the doctoral standard [of training]."
- There should be the "Creation of examples of doctoral programmes in professional psychology with the potential for accreditation that vary in emphasis on practice and training, including three generic models:
  1. Greater emphasis on research;
  2. Balance between research and practice;
  3. Strongest emphasis on practice (e.g., Psy.D.)" (Dobson & King, 1994, p. 38)

Nevertheless, despite the emphasis on doctoral models of training in clinical psychology, counselling psychology and clinical neuropsychology in Canada, it remains a fact that, in contrast to the US, only one province (BC) exclusively requires doctoral level training for entry into the profession of psychology, and that the majority of the 12,000 practising Canadian psychologists are not trained at the doctoral level. This situation exists despite the fact that, in almost all Canadian universities, like in the US, professional training in psychology is exclusively at the graduate, post-BA level. Further, organizations such as the AAMFT and the Canadian Association of School Psychologists (CASP) have argued that masters level entry is appropriate for entry into some practice areas.

### **III. REGULATORY ISSUES**

The Task Force looked at the licensing and training requirements for psychologists in three regions of the Western World: Canada, The United States of America (USA), and the European Economic Community (EEC). These areas have endorsed a growing tendency to facilitate trade and commercial activities among the countries. A corollary of this tendency is that there is a movement to harmonize the rules and regulations that govern trade and the provision of services.

#### **A. Canada**

In Canada and the USA, in contrast to Europe, licensing is a matter of province/territorial/state jurisdiction. In five provinces (Alberta, Québec, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick) the minimal entry requirement for independent practice is the masters degree, with a post-masters requirement of supervised professional practice ranging from 0 (e.g. Quebec) to 5 (e.g., Nova Scotia) years. Additionally, legislation has been passed declaring the masters standard in Saskatchewan, effective 1999. In Prince Edward Island a person with a masters degree can be registered for independent practice only in an institutional agency. Two provinces (Manitoba and Ontario) register psychologists at the doctoral level, and people with masters degrees as psychological associates. Only one province ( British Columbia) retains the legislative framework to register psychologists exclusively at the doctoral level. It should be noted that in many provinces there are exemptions for university faculty (8 provinces), school ( 2) or government (3) employees (Breault, 1998). The Northwest Territories do not have such exemptions. According to a recent article in Psynopsis (Gauthier, 1996) about two-thirds of the psychologists in Canada are registered at the masters level. Thus, to be able to be registered as a psychologist in Canada, the required length of university and post-university education/ training ranges between 5 and 9 years . (See following chart)

PROVINCIAL / TERRITORIAL LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS								
	NWT	BC	ALTA	SASK	MAN	ONT	QUE	NFLD
Academic Entry Requirements	*Masters or equivalent (Indep)	*Doc. or equivalent (Indep)	*Masters (Indep)	*Doc (Indep) Masters (Indep) in 1999	*Doc (Indep) *Masters P.Assoc. Supervised	*Doc. (Indep) *Masters (P.Assoc. Indep)	Masters (Indep)	Masters (Indep) (until 2001)
Supervised Experience	1 year of practical experience (1600 hrs)	1 year pre-Doc	1 year (1600 hrs) post-Masters	1 year pre-Doc	*Doc (1 pre- & 1 post-year) *Masters (2 yrs post)	*Doc (1 pre- & 1 post-yr) *Masters (4 yrs post plus 1 year on supervision register)	none	*Doc (1 pre- & 1 post-yr) *Masters (2 yrs post)

Examinations	may be required	*EPPP 65% *Oral	*EPPP 70% *Oral	*EPPP 70% *Oral	*EPPP Doc: 70% Mas: 65% *Oral	*EPPP 70% *Oral *juris-prudence	*no EPPP *no oral *Ethics	*EPPP 70% *no oral
Exemptions	none	University GovernSt Schools	University	University GovernSt Health-Board Schools	University GovernSt Schools Hospitals	University	none	University

Yukon: Registers psychologists who are registered in other jurisdictions (or eligible for registration) and requires no additional exams.

NOTE: No Canadian jurisdiction has adopted a specialty certificate or license.

Breault, L. Provincial/Territorial Licensing Requirements for Psychologists, Psynopsis, Winter, 1998.

## **B. USA**

In the majority of the states the doctorate is the minimal requirement to be licensed as a psychologist. Vermont and West Virginia are the only states that license people with a masters degree in psychology to practice independently. Twenty-three states license masters-level practitioners under a variety of supervised roles, such as psychological associate or counsellor. Some states allow masters-level practitioners who work in public facilities, such as prisons, to deliver services unsupervised. Also, every state credentials masters-level school psychologists to practice independently in educational settings. It thus appears that in the majority of the USA the minimum number of total university years to be able to be licensed as a psychologist is between 5-9.

## **C. EEC**

In the spirit of developing a common market, the EEC is trying to facilitate the movement of professionals among its member countries. In the EEC the profession (when it is regulated) is usually regulated at a national level. The minimum numbers of years that a European psychologist will spend at the university level varies from 4 to 6, with 5 years being more or less the norm. In most countries this level of training is roughly the equivalent of a masters degree, except that in Europe the masters degree almost always has a strong professional content, including practicum and internship. In most cases, as in Quebec's terminal professional masters programmes, this training starts at what would be considered in North America to be the undergraduate level.

## **D. Regulatory Implications**

Regulatory bodies typically evaluate the academic credentials of applicants with respect to academic levels. From a university perspective bachelor's training is the first academic cycle, masters level is the second cycle and Ph.D. training has been the third cycle. It should be pointed out that the "Doctor" title is not exclusively tied to the third cycle. In fact Medical Doctor and Doctor of Optometry degrees are actually first-cycle bachelor programmes.

Based upon the above review, it appears that in the Western World the standard that a psychologist should be licensed at the doctoral (or third academic cycle) level is the exception more than the rule amongst the jurisdictions. In most countries the equivalent of a masters degree (or second academic cycle) with professional training is considered as adequate to be licensed as a psychologist. In the US and in most Canadian provinces, including those registering at the masters level, however, professional training in psychology begins at the graduate (post-BA) level. In contrast, in most other countries, and in Quebec in terminal masters professional programmes leading to registration, professional training begins at the undergraduate level, a model more typical of professional degrees in medicine and engineering. The North American practice of providing professional training exclusively at the graduate level, in conjunction with research training, is a cogent argument for the entry level to the profession being at the doctoral rather than the masters level. In the minority of Canadian provinces and the majority of US states where doctoral standards apply, both Ph.D. and Psy.D. degrees are equally acceptable for registration, provided certain criteria are met.

A majority of practitioners in Canada (i.e., 8,000-9,000) are masters licensed, a trend which seems to have been maintained over time. Nearly half the registered psychologists in Canada reside in Quebec. Masters licensing may be gaining ground in Canada and contrary to what many had predicted some years ago, the masters graduate programmes have not faded away with the increase in doctoral trained practitioners.

## **IV. CURRENT CONTEXT TO CONSIDER A SECOND DOCTORAL TRAINING MODEL FOR PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

Of particular concern are three issues: goals of doctoral models, the scope of applied training, and the desire of masters degree psychologists for upgrading and mid-career training. One of the principal reasons for considering an alternative doctoral training model is the degree to which the current scientist-practitioner Ph.D. model meets professional training needs in Canada. There are two aspects to this question. The first pertains to the question of whether current masters level training is considered sufficient in depth and breadth for independent practice in psychology. The second pertains to whether all aspects of professional training can be reasonably covered in the scientist-practitioner model of training currently endorsed by virtually all accredited Canadian doctoral programmes.

With reference to whether masters training continues to meet public need, some make the case that with changes in our health care system, the public need for mental health services and the difficulty of cases presenting has increased. Moreover, with increased information concerning specific difficulties, disorders, and their treatment, the knowledge and skills required of practicing psychologists is said to have become increasingly diverse and complex. One or two years of professional training and a relatively short internship at the masters level is not considered sufficient by most US and some Canadian regulatory bodies. In Quebec, where masters degrees lead to entry to the profession, even though training is especially extensive, building on professional coursework and practicum introduced at the bachelors level, the Ordre des Psychologues nevertheless has identified the need for more extensive and structured internship training (Poirier, 1996), and is considering advocating a doctoral standard for registration. In addition, a survey of relevantly employed masters graduates of the University of Montreal found that less than 60% of respondents felt that their training had prepared them adequately for practicing their profession (Chouinard & Hamel, 1996). Evidence is accumulating that the best job positions are being offered to doctoral psychologists. The Canadian Psychological Association has continuously re-affirmed the ideal of doctoral training in professional psychology since 1967, e.g. at the 1984 Opinion II Conference on the State of the Discipline (Ritchie, Hogan & Hogan, 1988) and at the 1994 Mississauga Conference on Professional Psychology (Dobson & King, 1994).

The second issue pertains to the adequacy of the scientist-practitioner model as the exclusive model for doctoral professional training in psychology. Professional psychologists are employed in a wide variety of settings, primarily applied, in Canada. For the majority of these psychologists, a significant role as a producer of original research is neither part of their job mandate nor their career preference (Hunsley & Lefebvre, 1990). Similarly, a majority of students seeking graduate training in professional psychology seek careers focussed primarily on the delivery of psychological services, rather than on original research. This state will continue even if the doctoral degree becomes the entry degree for practice. Yet the scientist part of the scientist-practitioner model, endorsed by virtually all our university doctoral programmes, emphasizes training and the demonstration of competence in the production of original research. Thus, there is increasing pressure on scientist-practitioner programmes to train to a high level of competence not only in the attitudes of both a scientist and a practitioner, but in the ever-increasing knowledge and skills required in both these two domains. Such pressures place an increasingly heavy demand on both the student and the doctoral programme. These demands are fuelled by the scientific standards of faculty both in professional training programmes and in other areas of academic psychology, by professional faculty wishes to keep well ahead of the professional training standards set out in the evolving guidelines of accrediting bodies, and by expectations of students, the public, and internship training programmes for accomplished practitioners.

The demand on Canadian professional doctoral programmes is so heavy that very few students (typically less than 10% of applicants) are admitted, and the average time to completion is very long (6-8 years post-bachelors degree), often held up by the doctoral dissertation. Moreover, it is not clear that the research skills emphasized for the majority of doctoral dissertations in professional psychology are those applied research skills most

necessary for professionals in practice (Beutler, Williams, Wakefield & Entwistle, 1995; Stricker & Trierweiler, 1995). Applied research skills, such as programme evaluation and consultation, and assessment knowledge and skills are the qualifications that are often cited as distinguishing psychologists from other mental health professionals working in applied settings. Doctoral programmes focussing more explicitly and specifically on applied research skills may be warranted in Canada. Given the ever increasing demands on doctoral programmes in professional psychology to meet broadening expectations, it is timely to reassess whether the Ph.D. scientist-practitioner (Boulder) model should remain the only gold standard of Canadian professional training, or whether an alternative scholar-practitioner model is warranted as well.

Additional regulatory and market forces have contributed to current wishes to consider the advisability of establishing Psy.D. programmes in Canada. As noted elsewhere in this document, the majority of Canadian provinces continue to register psychologists with the masters degree for independent practice, and the ideal of the doctoral standard has failed to be realized. This failure may be in part due to regulatory standards and in part to the lack of doctoral level training appropriate to the career goals of the potential students. A significant number of masters practitioners express the wish for more academic training (Review document, School of Psychology, Laval University, 1996) and would seek to complete doctoral training geared more specifically for practice careers (Whitsett & Handy, 1991; Handy & Whitsett, 1993). For many professional psychologists in Canada all-but-dissertation (ABD) or *scholarité du doctorat* status, doctoral coursework and practical training without the dissertation, has become a de facto professional educational credential.

Another influence on the development of training programmes has been the increase of consumerism. The public has sought more accountability and applied relevance in training. Traditionally psychology has de-emphasized the role of the public in training concerns. However, as the public gains influence, becomes more familiar with the role of psychologist, and as psychology increases its involvement in the politics of the nation, the public is not likely to decrease its consumer-driven pressures for well-trained practitioners.

Also relevant are recent events such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT). Some have raised the concern that, under NAFTA, professional schools in the United States can and might open Psy.D. degree granting branches in Canada. Moreover, with reference to the AIT, in 1995 the Federal Government required all professions to take steps to facilitate interprovincial/territorial mobility. A nationwide common requisite degree for independent practice is a fundamental step. The AIT might provide the profession with the impetus to raise the basic requirements of independent practice in psychology in many provinces/territories to a national doctoral standard. There is already evidence of such an impetus. The Psychology Sectorial Workgroup for the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), consisting of members from CPAP, CRHSPP, and CPA, arrived at a consensus in April, 1998 (minutes), that training should be practice-oriented, at the doctoral level, and accredited. They also agreed that individuals already registered to practice at the time of an agreement would be fully grandparented with respect to

reciprocity of registration with other provinces/territories. Lack of practice-oriented, accredited doctoral programmes may be an impediment to such an agreement.

Furthermore, at least two provincial regulatory bodies (l'Ordre des psychologues du Québec; Psychologists Association of Alberta) have been seriously considering an invitation to universities to develop Psy.D. programmes. A concomitant change in the minimum degree requirements for entry into practice is being considered in Quebec. At least one university in Quebec has developed a proposal for the creation of a Psy.D. programme, and another has announced its intention to do so. These forces make the review of the appropriateness, feasibility and viability of Psy.D. degree in Canada particularly timely.

## **V. A CANADIAN PSY.D. MODEL**

The Task Force took an outcome focus and envisioned the product of training through a Psy.D. model as a "flexible, socially responsible, thinking practitioner who derives his / her skills from core knowledge in scientific psychology. This comprehensively trained professional is capable of performing in a number of roles, and would not be trained simply to be a technician in specific areas."

The Task Force undertook to outline in some detail the essential features of a Canadian Psy.D. training programme, including the personal and academic qualifications of entering students, programme philosophy and curriculum, and required competencies of graduates. Particular attention was given to the training in applied research skills and scientific thinking, noted as the hallmark of training which distinguishes a psychologist from other mental health professionals. The features noted below are not exhaustive, and are restricted primarily to doctoral programme components in conjunction with the CPA Accreditation Criteria.

### **A. Guiding Principles**

Several premises guided the work of the Task Force:

1. There should be a common national minimum requisite doctoral degree for registration.
2. Training should be doctoral, and university- based.
3. The training should include an outcome view of expected professional competencies and general scope of practice.
4. Regulation is an important context in considering training models.
5. The strengths of the ○scientist-practitioner○ model are reaffirmed; a parallel "scholar-practitioner" model is seen as complementary.
6. Mid-career training opportunities should be a consideration in model development.

7. Whereas CPA may choose to endorse a Psy.D. training model as acceptable, and even to lobby for its adoption, implementation of the model, either as a new programme or as a separate track/option within an existing programme, remains the prerogative of individual universities and their provincial/territorial decisional bodies. Similarly, regulatory changes remain the prerogative of provincial/territorial regulatory bodies and governments.

8. Professional education for the practice of psychology in Canada should adhere to the principles and guidelines recommended by the Joint Council on Professional Education in Psychology (JCPEP, 1990). These principles and guidelines build upon but diverge somewhat from the report of the National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology Mission Bay Conference (Bourg, Bent, McHolland & Stricker, 1989). The core principles in the training of psychologists for professional practice to be highlighted are:

9. Education and training for practice is grounded in the evolving knowledge base derived from the scientific discipline of psychology.

10. The programme should include research experience resulting in a dissertation on a meaningful problem associated with the practice of psychology, using a strategy of disciplined inquiry appropriate to the problem (JCPEP, 1991, p.7). This dissertation should be a contribution to professional psychology, for example, potentially publishable in a professional journal.

11. Programmes of professional education for the practice of psychology should meet the Accreditation Criteria (CPA, 1991). These include, a minimum of three full-time academic years of graduate study or equivalent, and completion of an internship prior to awarding the doctoral degree.

Other important principles are:

12. Doctoral programmes that prepare psychologists for practice should be held by accreditation guidelines to a common set of core curriculum requirements, over and beyond which, they should be free to augment or to supplement students' preparation in their own fashion (JCPEP, 1990, p. 2).

13. It is the responsibility of all programmes that prepare providers of psychological services to ensure that graduates are fully aware of the theoretical paradigms, empirical foundations, and scientific issues related to the assessment and treatment interventions that they employ. It is equally important that graduates achieve entry level proficiency in the delivery of professional services (JCPEP, 1990, p. 4)

## **B. Entry requirements**

Programmes should ensure that candidates have demonstrated analytic skills at the undergraduate level to prepare them adequately for graduate study in psychology. "It also should be ensured that candidates have demonstrated aptitude for, and commitment to, ... developing interpersonal skills (empathy, respect for others, personal relatedness), appreciation of cultural and individual diversity, psychological health and self-awareness,

intellectual curiosity and flexibility, and personal integrity and honesty.○ (JCPEP, 1990, p. 6)

### **C. Knowledge Domains**

Programme faculty must ensure that education and training in professional psychology is based upon the evolving academic-scientific body of knowledge in psychology, with particular attention to the following domains:

- theories of individual and systems functioning and change
- life span development
- dysfunctional behaviour or psychopathology
- professional ethics and standards
- psychological measurement
- history and systems of psychology

Faculty should require acquisition of knowledge of:

a) biological bases of behaviour (e.g., physiological psychology, comparative psychology, neuropsychology, psychopharmacology);

b) cognitive-affective bases of behaviour (e.g., learning, memory, perception, cognition, thinking, motivation, emotion);

c) social bases of behaviour (e.g., social psychology, group and family processes, sexual orientation, organizational and systems theory, gender differences);

d) individual bases of behaviour (e.g., cultural and ethnic group differences, bicultural processes, generational differences within immigrant populations)○ (JCPEP, p.6-7)

It is noted that, in keeping with the Canadian emphasis on the undergraduate honours degree, which includes specialized training, competence may be demonstrated in these areas in a variety of ways, including a full-year of coursework at the senior undergraduate level.

### **D. Science competencies**

It is imperative that students appreciate the reciprocal influence of science and practice. "A sophisticated level of research competence is expected of all graduates.... Research competence enables graduates to distinguish fact from opinion in their applications of the science of psychology. It also promotes readiness to contribute to innovation in existing theory and technique.○ (JCPEP, 1991, p.7). Students must achieve a level of research competence "that enables them to be aware of the theoretical paradigms, empirical bases and research issues related to the assessment and treatment interventions they employ.○ (JCPEP, 1991, p. 7). Competencies include:

a) statistics (descriptive and inferential)

b) research design and methods (qualitative and quantitative)

"Each programme should require a dissertation on a meaningful problem associated with the practice of psychology, using a strategy of disciplined inquiry appropriate to the problem. Students should be encouraged to select topics and methods for the dissertation related to the specific goals and objectives of each programme." (JCPEP, 1991, p.7)

○ Professional psychology programmes should include research training that enables students to develop:

a) a basic understanding and respect for the scientific bases of the discipline;

b) methodological knowledge designed to make them good consumers of scientific knowledge products;

c) enough basic skill in conducting scientific research to be able to design and execute competent projects in professional and in some cases academic contexts with the support of properly trained consultants (e.g., statisticians). . . .

Research courses offer a unique opportunity to develop skills in observation, logic and the generation of plausible inference. . . . Research training should provide a means for developing and manifesting various desirable attitude and judgement skills related to professional inquiry and problem solving. These include:

a) openness and receptivity to the multiple ways of looking at a problem (as opposed to dogmatism) and the various strengths and limitations of these approaches;

b) respect for empirical support (either local support or support offered in the scientific literature) for a particular viewpoint tempered by:

c) a healthy skepticism about the certainty such support affords and the appropriateness of its application to particular circumstances;

d) explicit recognition of one's own biases and predilections and how these might serve to limit inquiry in deleterious ways;

e) explicit recognition of the interplay between ethics and scientific inquiry especially with respect to special issues that arise in local circumstances, and

f) explicit recognition of the need for collegial input and feedback in any inquiry however routine." (Peterson et al., 1991, p. 104-106)

### **E. Practice competencies**

The primary task is preparation for effective functioning in the multiple roles graduates will assume over their professional careers. Practice competencies include:

a) interpersonal skills (interviewing skills, understanding and development of relationship skills, including interactions in cross-cultural contexts and across socioeconomic levels, varied life-styles and gender differences);

b) assessment (selecting and applying various assessment methods to describe, conceptualize and characterize professional decisions and services). The primary purpose of assessment is to provide an understanding that informs a practical plan of action rather than producing a diagnostic classification as an end in itself.

c) intervention (activities that promote positive client development or change, reflecting various psychological theories, procedures and techniques which address individuals, families, groups and organizations, and including basic understanding of biomedical technology, psychopharmacology and prevention science). Along with the information derived from psychotherapy research, the knowledge and methods appropriate to the understanding of self and self-other relationship, as well as to the significance of power and authority, are particularly relevant to the intervention component (McHolland, Peterson & Brown, 1987);

d) application of research (ability to apply scientifically derived knowledge in professional practice, including in novel situations, ability to be appropriately critical of interventions and services);

e) evaluating the efficacy of intervention (the future of all psychological intervention depends on outcome effectiveness, reasonable accessibility and cost-effectiveness (Peterson et al., 1991, p. 98));

f) consultation and teaching (consultation process and methods, teaching skills and technology of knowledge dissemination) ;

g) administration and supervision (supervision methods, basic administrative principles and methods, peer review processes) (JCPEP, 1990, p. 8).

i) appropriate attitudes, knowledge and skill with reference to the application of ethical principles

### **F. Practica/externships**

These experiences taking place concurrently with coursework:

- include an array of settings, responding to a range of human needs
- are sequenced in skills required and training provided
- numbers should ensure a learning environment
- comprise a minimum of 600 hours
- include an on-campus seminar in which students learn from each other by sharing and discussing field experiences

### **G. Internships**

As the integrative period of professional training, an internship will be required on a full time full year basis, or totalling at least 1600 hours over 24 months.

## **H. Socialization**

Faculty must foster attitudes essential for life-long learning, scholarly enquiry and professional problem-solving as psychologists in the context of an evolving body of scientific and professional knowledge (APA, 1996). The knowledge domains and science and practice competencies should be thoughtfully integrated into a professional role and professional identity consistent with the specific goals and objectives of each programme. Further, professional attitudes and values must be carefully integrated.

## **I. Evaluation**

Each programme faculty should provide a broad range of instructional modalities and appropriate evaluation mechanisms for ensuring that its graduates acquire the core competencies articulated above. Each programme faculty should document student achievement of its educational objectives pertaining to the core competencies (JCPEP, 1990, p. 6). To evaluate the professional competencies of graduates of professional programmes, better evaluation processes and procedures are needed (Bourg et al., 1989). Skills as well as knowledge must be evaluated. Much work needs to be done in reorienting curricula toward such broad competencies as critical thinking and professional judgement and in developing effective evaluation instruments and methods for ensuring that graduates of professional programmes possess these competencies (Bourg et al., 1989, p.70).

## **VI. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

### **A. Programme Characteristics**

If the entry level for the practice of psychology in Canada can be established at the doctorate, a variety of university-based doctoral programmes should be offered - programmes which match the areas of practice in which psychologists in Canada work. Existing scientist-practitioner Ph.D. programmes address the needs of those who wish to engage in research and university teaching in combination with practice. In such programmes, there should also be explicit options focussing on applied science for those who wish primarily to conduct research in applied contexts in combination with practice. Given a doctoral standard for entry to practice, there should be Psy.D. programmes, where research emphasis would be on applied science, for those pursuing a career that would primarily involve practice. While Ph.D. qualifications would be required for core faculty positions, Psy.D. training could lend itself to other academic/training roles in university programmes.

Ph.D. and Psy.D. programmes would have some commonalities because of their emphasis on science training. The major difference in the programmes would be the greater emphasis on science training in Ph.D. programmes and the greater emphasis on practice in Psy.D. programmes. Furthermore, Ph.D. programmes would stress original contributions to basic and applied science whereas Psy.D. programmes would stress the application of science to answer questions related to practice. The end product for the

students should be an improved choice of focus of doctoral study directed at differential career objectives.

All Psy.D. programmes should be accreditable, provided that they met the criteria embedded within the accreditation standards. Data from the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology suggest that quality training is most likely to be ensured by accredited university-based Psy.D. programmes which admit small numbers of students and have low student:faculty ratios (Yu, Rinaldi, Templer, Colbert, Siscoe, & Van Patten, 1997). Thus, we do not envisage or advise the admission of large numbers of new students into training in professional psychology. The Psy.D. degree should be a post-bachelors third-cycle degree that would not necessarily require a masters degree along the way. Graduates of Psy.D. programmes should qualify for provincial/territorial registration for independent practice.

### **B. Student Funding/Internships**

Funding to support students pursuing a scholar-practitioner (Psy.D.) degree understandably would be less likely to be in the form of fellowships from federal and provincial research agencies. However, other sources of funding currently available for students pursuing professional degrees, e.g. university and provincial fellowships, should be available to students in Psy.D. programmes. Programmes should pursue stipends for supervised clinical work within the university or the community as appropriate for these students. Universities establishing this new programme may wish to reevaluate philosophies of student support in light of the primarily professional focus of the Psy.D. programmes. In addition, because of the strains in the US that the number of Psy.D. candidates seeking internship training has placed on the availability of placements, Canadian universities and other bodies advocating the establishment of such programmes are advised not only to be modest in the number of students to be admitted, but to simultaneously explore support the development of new practica and internship training opportunities.

### **C. Mid-Career Practitioners**

Psychologists who are currently practising at a masters level find a special challenge in many existing doctoral programmes offered at universities in Canada. Most have stringent residency requirements, and all have extensive research requirements which do not necessarily match the interests of the practitioner. A significant number of mid-career practitioners are said to wish to upgrade their knowledge base and acquire doctoral status, but for many the desire to upgrade is counter-balanced by the time requirement to be taken away from their jobs/practices, which at mid-career are reasonably well-paying, (and which, in many instances will not be significantly improved by the new degree). Many see the scientific research component as an exercise which satisfies the needs of the university more than their needs as practitioners, whose principal goal is to add new and varied approaches to their current practice (Handy & Whitsett, 1993). If the Psy.D. programme were an option in Canadian universities, it would be more appealing than the traditional scientist-practitioner Ph.D. programme to many mid-career practitioners of psychology. It would be seen as an upgrade of their existing degrees which would lead to

a doctorate within a reasonable amount of time, with greater focus on practice and enhanced clinical awareness, and a research component of a more applied nature.

Requirements of Psy.D. programmes could and should be adapted to accommodate the skills and needs of masters practitioners. Such practitioners could submit a transcript to the university for evaluation of their existing credits and internship hours vis-à-vis those required for the Psy.D. The mid-career practitioner is more likely to need advanced specialized coursework and clinical training under expert supervision than hours of clinical experience. Flexibility in fulfilling residency requirements and the availability of part-time studies are also important considerations. It can be expected that this type of upgrading arrangement would be inviting to masters level practitioners, and would result in a relative increase in the number of doctoral level practitioners in Canada. Psy.D. programme requirements could also be adapted for the relatively small number of Ph.D. research psychologists admitted to re-orient their careers to specialize in professional psychology.

#### **D. Integration with Existing Programmes**

It is anticipated that the Psy.D. programme, as outlined above, would be most feasible and appropriately established as a transformation of a terminal masters degree programme that leads to independent practice in psychology. A Psy.D. option could be added as a separate programme or in parallel to an existing Ph.D. scientist-practitioner programme.

At present, there is a variety of masters professional programmes offered in Canadian universities, some of which are terminal but enable the graduate to fulfill the educational requirements for licensing/registration in provinces/territories where independent practice at the masters level is possible, and some of which lead directly into the Ph.D. stream. Others are terminal but do not fulfill the educational requirements for licensing, and serve simply as a second cycle degree. In transforming an existing terminal masters program leading to registration, the university would need to include new courses, reconceptualize theses and increase linkages with internship settings. However, these demands on the university would be offset, likely, by increased student tuition and government funding due to the increased number of years of residency.

Again, in provinces where registration is at the masters level, the Task Force does not recommend that universities add a Psy.D. option to an existing Ph.D. programme while maintaining a terminal masters programme. Neither the public nor the profession needs a second degree for professional practice, one which may not appeal unless registration requires it. Programmes would be wise to assess the local appeal of the new programme before undertaking it.

### **VII. STRATEGIC OPTIONS AND CONTINUING CONCERNS**

Complex issues face the practice of psychology in Canada. The aim of this report has been to examine them carefully so as to be able to make informed decisions in a proactive instead of reactive manner.

Provincial/territorial regulatory boards of psychology have the option of working together to develop a national standard for the practice of psychology in Canada. Alternatively, they can wait for governments to impose a solution. Should a governmental solution be imposed, the doctoral degree would not likely become the requisite degree for independent practice because the majority of practitioners in Canada are masters licensed. Politics and economics would readily influence government to favour the masters degree. The Psychology Sectorial Workgroup for the AIT has endorsed a doctoral standard. Should momentum develop for a nation-wide doctoral standard, university readiness across the country to offer scholar-practitioner training programmes would likely to facilitate this process. In the meantime, in provinces where the doctoral standard is already required for independent practice, scholar-practitioner programmes are appropriate.

Programmes and advocating bodies would be wise to assess the local demand for scholar-practitioner doctoral training in psychology from new bachelor graduates and from masters practitioners in mid-career before new Psy.D. programmes are established. Similarly, it is essential to establish the availability of internship training programmes.

Concerns expressed by many in the training community about CPA endorsing the establishment of Psy.D. programmes, even university-based and small in size, are that this would open the door, rather than discourage, the establishment of large, even non-university-based programmes. Whereas the profession cannot determine what changes in higher education regulations that provincial governments will make, we consider it unlikely that the recommendation of a university-based Psy.D. degree will lead to the establishment of government-approved, free-standing doctoral professional schools in Canada. As far as the numbers admitted to potential new, university-based Psy.D. programs, the CPA accreditation criteria require faculty: student ratios necessary to assure high quality training and are thus likely to constrain the scale of expansion. The existence of a Canadian template embedded within the CPA Accreditation Programme is seen as crucial to the control of magnitude and quality of such programmes.

Some critics have also questioned the need for a new degree nomenclature, maintaining that the Ph.D. research requirements are flexible enough to accommodate a wide variety of programmes, including scholar-practitioner models. For the Task Force, the important issue is the need, should the doctoral standard be widely adopted in Canada, to have a clearly defined scholar-practitioner doctoral degree programme, option, or track that is distinctive in emphasis from the traditional Boulder-model scientist practitioner, just as scientist-practitioner Ph.D. programmes are clearly distinguished from scientist Ph.D. programmes. Because existing scholar-practitioner programmes both in Canada (the D.Ps. in Quebec) and in the US (Psy.D.) have degrees distinctive from the Ph.D., we have adopted the same terminology. If, however, a university established a scholar-practitioner programme as an explicitly defined option, with its own appropriate research requirements within a Ph.D. programme, the Task Force would be respectful of this alternative educational strategy.

## **VIII. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## Summary Statement

In Spring 1997, the CPA Psy.D. Task Force was charged "with a review of education and training models in professional psychology that are appropriate and realistic."

Taking into account the context of the history, philosophies and models of training both within and outside North America, accreditation issues and the concurrent CPA Accreditation Review, regulatory issues from provincial, territorial, national and international perspectives, market-place issues including supply and demand, the university context, and desired training programme outcomes in the practice of psychology, the Psy.D. Task Force arrived at a summary position. **The Psy.D. Task Force reaffirms the Scientist-Practitioner (Ph.D.) Model and conceptually supports a particularly articulated Scholar-Practitioner (Psy.D.) Model as appropriate; we conclude that there is need and interest in the Psy.D. application and that it would be strategic to support its development within a national accreditation framework. More specifically, the model is endorsed within university-based settings. At the same time, out of respect for Canadian constituencies concerned about issues of supply and demand and the links to regulatory realities, it is the Task Force's responsibility to advise due caution in implementation.**

## Conclusions

- a) Because the knowledge and skills required of practicing psychologists have become increasingly diverse and complex, there is a strong rationale for maintaining the ideal goal of doctoral training as the standard in professional psychology, as advocated by CPA since 1967.
- b) Doctoral programmes in professional psychology which vary in emphasis on practice and science requirements can meet a common accreditation framework as reflected and noted in the current CPA Accreditation Criteria.
- c) The scholar-practitioner model, as articulated, can co-exist with the predominant scientist-practitioner model as an appropriate framework for doctoral professional training in Psychology.
- d) Graduates from doctoral training programmes in professional psychology in the scholar-practitioner model can make unique contributions to professional psychology as do those from doctoral programmes in professional psychology in the scientist-practitioner model.
- e) There is a demand and interest from psychologists and psychologists-to-be for doctoral training geared more specifically for practice careers.
- f) There are movements both within Canada and from the U.S. to establish the presence of such programmes in Canada.
- g) The trend in the development of training programmes in professional psychology in Canada suggests that the number of scholar-practitioner training programmes will grow slowly and within a common standard of quality, if they are embedded within universities

as guided by the Canadian Psychological Association Accreditation Programme. In this regard it may be preferential that they be established as expansions of terminal masters programmes or as conversions of doctoral tracks.

h) The Scholar-Practitioner (Psy.D.) model, as outlined, in conjunction with the Scientist-Practitioner (Ph.D.) model may be of assistance, by way of their combined presence, recognition and success, of encouraging and ultimately achieving doctoral training as a requirement for licensing across Canada without compromising, in extent and quality, professional training rooted in its scientific basis.

### **Recommendations**

(Presented to the Canadian Psychological Association Board of Directors for their consideration, ratification and implementation.)

- a) CPA continues to advocate for the doctorate as the national standard for education and training in professional psychology.
- b) CPA endorses both the scientist-practitioner and the scholar-practitioner model, as articulated, for doctoral training in professional psychology.
- c) CPA supports university-based training programmes in their attempt to develop examples of doctoral programmes in the scholar-practitioner model described and assists in the exploration of appropriate practica and internship resources.
- d) CPA supports regulatory boards as they may attempt to establish/re-establish the entry requirement for independent practice at the doctoral level.
- e) CPA change the current acknowledgement within the CPA Accreditation Criteria of the possible emergence of Psy.D. programmes to include the Scholar Practitioner model, as articulated, within the Criteria, themselves. That CPA assure that the Criteria encompass the relevant Psy.D. programme guidelines and content as contained in this report.
- f) CPA thereafter inform all Psychology constituencies, including universities and provincial bodies, of the expanded accreditation guidelines for both Scientist-Practitioner (Ph.D.) and Scholar-Practitioner (Psy.D.) programmes.

### **Implementation Guidelines**

On the basis of its review and consultation, the Task Force advises the following:

- a) CPA continue to accredit only doctoral programmes which are university-based.
- b) CPA support the development of Scholar-Practitioner (Psy.D.) programmes, as described, in collaboration with interested universities, psychology associations and regulatory bodies.
- c) CPA counsel caution about the scale of expansion of new Psy.D. programmes and the potential need to develop practica and internship resources.

d) CPA encourage adaptations of programme formats to support mid-career training within accredited doctoral programmes.

Respectfully submitted:

R.W. (Bob) Robinson, Ph.D., C.Psych, Chair,  
on behalf of the CPA Psy.D. Task Force

November 6, 1998

## REFERENCES

American Psychological Association (1996). Book 1. Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology Book 2. Accreditation Operating Procedure. Washington, D.S.: American Psychological Association.

Belar, C. (1998). Graduate Education in Clinical Psychology, ○We§re not in Kansas anymore,○ American Psychologist, 53, 456-464.

Beutler, L.E., Williams, R.E., Wakefield, P.J., & Entwisle, S.R. (1995) Bridging scientist and practitioner perspectives in clinical psychology. American Psychologist, 50, 984-994.

Bourg, E., Bent, R., McHolland, H. & Stricker, G. (1989). Standards and evaluation in the education and training of professional psychologists, American Psychologist, 44, 66-72.

Breault, L. (1998). Provincial/territorial licensing requirements for psychologists. Psynopsis, Winter Issue.

Canadian Psychological Association (1991). Accreditation Manual. Ottawa, Ontario: Author.

Choinard, D., & Hamel, C. (1996) Que sont devenus les diplômés en psychologie? Psychologie Québec, Janvier, 28-29.

Conway, J. (1984). Clinical Psychology Training in Canada: Its Development, Current Status and the prospects for accreditation. Canadian Psychology, 25, 177-191.

Craig, K. D. (1993). The organization of professional psychology in Canada. In K. S. Dobson and D. J. G. Dobson (Eds.) Professional Psychology in Canada. Toronto: Hogrefe-Huber.

Dobson, K. S., & King, M. C. (1994). The Mississauga Conference on Professional Psychology. Ottawa: Canadian Psychological Association.

Edwards, K. J. (No date). A comprehensive survey of NCSPP Alumni. National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology.

- Gaddy, C. D., Charlot-Swilley, D., Nelson, P. D. & Reich, J. N. (1995). Selected outcomes of accredited programmes, Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26, 507-513.
- Garfield, S. L. & Kurtz, R. (1976). Clinical psychologists in the 1970's. American Psychologist, 31, 1-9.
- Gauthier, J. (1997), Winter Issue. Perspective: Stretching our legs - mobility in a world of fading borders. Psynopsis. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Psychological Association, 2.
- Handy, L., & Whitsett, S. (1993). Continuing education and retraining in professional psychology. In K. S. Dobson & D. J. G. Dobson (Eds.) Professional psychology in Canada (pp. 107- 121). Toronto: Hogrefe-Huber.
- Hershey, J. M., Kopplin, D. A., Cornell, J. E. (1991). Doctors of Psychology: Their career experiences and attitudes toward degree and training. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22, 351-356.
- Hunsley, J., & Lefebvre, M. (1990). A survey of the practices and activities of Canadian clinical psychologists. Canadian Psychology, 31, 350- 358.
- Joint Council on Professional Education in Psychology (JCPEP). (1990). Report. Baton Rouge, LA: Land and Land.
- Korman, M. (1974). National conference on levels and patterns of professional training in psychology: The major themes. American Psychologist, 29, 441- 449.
- McFall, R. M. (1991). Manifesto for a science of clinical psychology. The Clinical Psychologist, 44, 75- 88.
- McHolland, J., Peterson, D. R., & Brown, S. W. (1987). Assessing skills in professional psychology: A triadic strategy for developing methods. In E. F. Bourg, R. J. Bent, J. E. Callan, N. F. Jones, J. McHolland & G. Stricker (Eds.) Standards and evaluation in the education and training of professional psychologists: Knowledge, attitudes and skills. (Pp. 105- 128). Norman, OK: Transcript Press.
- Peterson, D. R., Eaton, M. M., Levine, A. R. & Snapp, F. P. (1982). Career experiences of doctors of psychology. Professional Psychology, 13, 268-277.
- Peterson, R., McHolland, J., Bent, R., David-Russell, E., Edwall, G., Polite, K., Singer, D., & Stricker, G. (1991). The Core Curriculum in Professional Psychology. Washington, D.C.
- Pinard, A. (1964). Le Modél Scientiste-Professionel: Synthèse ou prothèse. Canadian Psychology, 5, 187-208.
- Ritchie, P. L.-J., Hogan, T.P., & Hogan, T. V. (Eds.) (1988). Psychology in Canada: The State of the Discipline: 1984. Old Chelsea, Quebec: Canadian Psychological Association.

Robiner, W. N. (1991). How many psychologists are needed? A call for a national psychology human resource agenda. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22, 427- 440.

Routh, D.K. (1994). Clinical Psychology since 1917: Science, practice, and organization. New York: Plenum Press.

Sechrest, L. B. (1992). The past future of clinical psychology: A reflection on Woodworth (1937). Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60, 18- 23.

Snepp, F. & Peterson, D. (1988). Evaluative comparison of Psy.D. and Ph.D. students by clinical internship supervisors. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19, 180-183.

Stricker, G., & Trierweiler, S.J. (1995) The local clinical scientist: A bridge between science and practice. American Psychologist, 50, 995- 1002.

VandenBos, G. R., DeLeon, P. H., & Belar, C. D. (1991). How many psychological practitioners are needed? It's too early to know! Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22, 441- 448.

Whitsett, S. & Handy, L. (1991). Doctoral level training for professional psychologists: Report of the CPA/CPAP Task Force on Mid-Career Training for Psychologists. Chelsea, Quebec, Canadian Psychological Association.

Yu, L. M., Rinaldi, S. A., Templer, D. I., Colbert, L., Siscoe, K., & Van Patten, K. (1997) Score on the examination for professional practice in psychology as a function of attributes of clinical psychology graduate programs. Psychological Science, 8, 347-350.

