EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF PSYCHOLOGISTS: THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY-BASED DOCTORAL DEGREE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF THE COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF QUEBEC

November, 1999

FOREWORD

This report, submitted to the Board of Directors of the College of Psychologists in November, 1999, is the product of the work of the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists. It was drafted by Mario Poirier, psychologist, under the supervision of the members of the Committee. The members of the Committee are Guy Lafond and Pierre Ritchie, psychologists representing the College (OPQ), Mireille Cyr and Jacques Forget, psychologists designated as representatives by the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Québec Universities (CREPUQ), and Michel Desgagnés representing the Ministry of Education (MEQ). The Committee is chaired by Guy Lafond.

Note: This English translation was done by Henry P. Edwards, Ph.D., C.Psych., at the request of PSWAIT, the Psychology Sectoral Working Group on the AIT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES (NOT TRANSLATED AT THIS TIME)

INTRODUCTION

In the September, 1999 editorial of *Psychologie Québec* (*Quebec Psychology*), "the stakes are high, the game is not yet over". Rosie-Marie Charest, President of the College of Psychologists, reminds [the readers] of the importance of renewed reflection concerning the initial education and training of psychologists. She summarizes some of the advantages of adopting the doctorate as the minimum standard for admission, from the viewpoint of recognition by the public of the professional competence of psychologists, but she also stresses as important that such a standard, if it becomes a requirement, must reflect accurately the needs of practitioners and the realities of their work settings. It is within this perspective that the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists has worked for some time.

The Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists was created by the College on a temporary basis in January, 1996, and then formally established subsequent to the implementation of the *Regulation Concerning the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists* in September, 1997. At present, the members of the Committee are Guy Lafond and Pierre Ritchie, psychologists representing the College (OPQ), Mireille Cyr and Jacques Forget, psychologists designated as representatives by the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Québec Universities (CREPUQ), and Michel Desgagnés representing the Ministry of Education (MEQ). The Committee is chaired by Guy Lafond[1].

While the work of the Committee started formally in 1997, thoughtful reflection about the education and training of psychologists as well as the entry standards to the profession had been ongoing for several years before that. As of 1989, the Board of Directors of the College had passed a motion in anticipation of raising the standards for education and training. In 1993, a sub-committee of the Joint Committee of the College and the Universities recommended a substantial increase in the number of

practicum and internship hours. Two years later, in a document that was distributed in the winter of 1995 to the chairs of psychology departments, the College estimated that "Quebec is probably the jurisdiction which has the lowest requirements, if one goes by the labels of the diplomas. [...] Other jurisdictions make room for master's diplomas, but usually with limited responsibilities or with the requirement of practice under supervision. With respect to requirements in addition to the diploma, most jurisdictions require years of supervised experience before certifying or registering the psychologist, especially in cases where only the master's is required. Here again Quebec finds itself with the least post-master's requirements[2]". A bit further on in the document, the College presented its position in a paragraph titled "Motion of the College", suggesting that a practitioner doctorate (*doctorat d'intervention de troisième cycle*) become the minimum standard for entry to the profession.

Therefore, the College has contemplated concretely for several years the possibility of modifying its entry standards. The discussions that took place at the Board of Directors of the College of Psychologists reflect these concerns clearly. Thus, the minutes of the meeting of May 30, 1996 (item 7.2) show that "the President reminds the members of the Board of Directors that the key mandate of the persons representing the College on the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists is to develop a model for an education and training program that is, as a type of program, a practitioner doctorate (*doctorat d'intervention*). She points out that the members of the Committee, having embarked upon their work, seek clarification of the intent of the of the Board of Directors in this regard". Upon discussion, an amended motion is *adopted unanimously* by the Board of Directors: "The Board of Directors mandates its representatives on the Committee on Education and Training to elaborate a project in view of establishing the criteria for admission and basic education and training in psychology at the level of a treatment oriented doctorate (Psy.D.) which would be eligible for accreditation by APA and/or CPA". This resolution entails two points that are noteworthy for the introduction to this report: a) The idea of moving to the doctorate as the standard for admission to the College has already been the object of discussions and of a motion to this effect at the

Board of Directors; b) it is the Board of Directors that mandated its own representatives on the Committee on Education and Training to elaborate a project on the criteria for admission to the College based on the doctorate.

The present report summarizes information which may be helpful in documenting the decisions to be made by the Board of Directors regarding the doctorate. In particular, the report outlines a precise doctoral hypothesis based on the acquisition of eight competencies considered essential for professional practice. This hypothesis has been discussed with the representatives of the psychology departments, and overall has been very well received. Finally, this report presents recommendations to the Board of Directors concerning the follow-up which can be given to this dossier.

1. Education and training in today's complex times

The psychology profession has evolved considerably in Quebec during the past thirty years. Thirty years ago, the majority of the several hundred psychologists who were members of the CPPQ (predecessor of the OPQ) worked in educational institutions or in hospitals. Some also worked as psychologists or guidance counselors in school settings. An even smaller number worked in private practice, usually within a psychoanalytic framework. Beyond any doubt fields of practice were few, theoretical models were largely isolated from each other, and clients were rather homogeneous in their cultural background. Within the hospitals and schools professional practice was tightly structured (*encadrée*) and often restricted to precise tasks, most commonly in the context of psychometric assessments. On the whole, psychologists were seldom asked to develop new services, to direct teams, to supervise other professionals.

What is the situation today? The six-thousand members of the College work in a multitude of public, para-public, and private fields of practice. Psychologists work in a large number of hospitals, not only in clinical mental health services, but also in health psychology (e.g. cardiology, oncology), neuropsychology, and rehabilitation. Hundreds of psychologists work in community health centers (*CLSC*) located in

various regions of Quebec. Others work in correctional settings, in crisis centers, or in community settings that offer specialized services (social integration, half-way houses, resources in the area of conjugal violence, homelessness, alcoholism, drug abuse, AIDS). Still others are integrated into regional government agencies and public health teams (in prevention, promotion, organization of services, evaluation research). Psychologists in school settings are equally numerous and are called upon to carry out duties that greatly surpass the traditional limits of psychometric assessment: they offer direct services to children, provide support to teachers, evaluate treatments, facilitate parent groups, serve as consultants in their communities, and develop new programs. Many other psychologists work in industry, as consultants to organizations or as change agents in employee assistance programs. On the other hand, one finds thousands of psychologists offering private practice services (the vast majority on a part-time basis), not only clinical but also in the context of psycho-legal expertise, adoption assessments, family mediation, and neuropsychological evaluations. Finally, an increasing number of psychologists are asked to carry out management functions in the area of health and social services, sometimes as directors of their institutions, or to engage in training, to serve as consultants for other professionals, or to supervise teams. To sum up, the profession has undergone rapid expansion in a matter of decades, commensurate with the diversity and creativity of its members. For example, a study of counseling psychologists by Perron and Tremblay (1995) reveals that these psychologists offer 33 categories of services, with 70% of practitioners offering between six and sixteen different types of psychological services, among which some, as stressed by Savoie and Leclerc (1999, p. 115) stem from new social problems such as helping those with AIDS, carrying out interventions with cultural minorities, doing child custody assessments, etc. In fact, the clientele itself is so diversified that two-thirds of psychologists treat between three and five distinct clienteles.

Such expansion does not take place in a cultural “vacuum”. Here, it is would be unproductive to recall all the transformations that have taken place in Quebec society since the Quiet Revolution, because everything or almost everything has changed: social, religious, economic and family practices; the work market in the context of

economic globalization; the collective identity in the context of an increasing cultural mix. For example, demographic transformations and the growing integration of persons from other cultural communities into Quebec society undoubtedly have repercussions for the practices, both public and private, of many professionals. A good number of psychologists already face, or will do so more and more, ethnic diversity and its implications for the cultural understanding of behaviours and clinical syndromes, for the adaptation of treatment tools, for the elaboration of services and programs[3]. Another obvious example of increasing complexity relates to all that bears, closely or remotely, upon family interventions (including those with school children): the contemporary "family" is a far more heterogeneous group than it was thirty years ago, much less sharply demarcated in its contours, far less immutable - families undergoing parental divorce (with or without mediation), one-parent families (and custody arrangements), reconstituted families (sometimes more than once). These days, the psychologist who treats youths and families must acquire far more varied treatment competencies than was the case thirty or forty years ago.

This all-encompassing explosion of professional practice cannot help but have implications for education and training. In effect, how can one prepare a psychologist for such a diversified work market? How can one provide that psychologist with sufficient tools to enable him/her to feel competent and at ease in his/her new profession, with changing clienteles and evolving services? How can one ascertain that the psychologist will offer services of the quality that is required both for the public to be protected and for the reputation of the psychology profession to be upheld? The answer to these questions is obvious: through high quality education and training, both initially and on a continuing basis.

Basically, there is nothing surprising in continually having to adjust the level and substance of education and training to evolving needs and practices. Other professional colleges are moving in the same direction. Thus, the education and training required now in medicine is far more extensive than it was twenty or thirty years ago; furthermore, faculties of medicine increasingly tend to admit students who

already possess a first bachelor's degree. In law, legal practice is now so complex that one can consider lawyers to practice while permanently taking continuing education, particularly since the introduction of the new civil code. Other professions have evolved in the direction of marked tayloring or customizing (*taylorisation*): in the training of "engineers" only a very small percentage of time is devoted to a common curriculum - the most difficult years are devoted to the acquisition of knowledge in a specific field of engineering (civil, systems, mechanical, chemical, etc.). Finally, even technical professions such as nursing regularly consider the idea of requiring a higher level diploma for initial entry to the profession (the bachelor's rather than the *DEC*).

In psychology all of these trends can be observed, and they may be summarized in four key points: a) a tendency to increase the number of course credits or internship hours required for entry to the profession; b) a tendency to require a higher level diploma (the doctorate); c) a tendency on the part of the members to make greater efforts to acquire complementary knowledge (private programs, continuing education); d) a tendency for universities to develop increasingly specialized training programs as a function of fields of practice (neuropsychology, clinical, school, etc.). Some of these changes seem unavoidable, given the increasing complexity of psychology as science and profession, but other factors are also at play: interrelating psychology with other professions on the basis of shared elements; adjusting to a constantly changing market, especially with respect to private services. Finally, as was noted recently by the "Psy.D. Task Force" (1998, p. 8) of the Canadian Psychological Association, the increased power of consumers also influences the evolution of training programs: "The public is now less prepared to be in support of academic freedom and the scientific rigour of the laboratory, preferring instead training based on professional accountability and relevance to practice". In sum, society is requiring its professionals to be more and more ... professional.

2. Deficiencies in education and training

How can we know if present-day education and training coincides with the practice of

the profession? Two approaches seem to provide the most relevant information: a) the viewpoint of those most directly involved, the practitioners (and the students) who are directly involved in the practice [of psychology]; and b) the extent of knowledge considered useful for professional practice by experienced peers.

In the first instance, we have above all the feelings of new graduates and psychologists, of being or not being adequately prepared for an increasingly diversified and complex professional practice. Thus, at this first level, the deficiency (*malaise*) is already clearly apparent, as recently acknowledged by the President of the College of Psychologists, Rose-Marie Charest (1999, p. 4): "Young psychologists, unfortunately for them and for the profession, don't feel adequately prepared for practice upon graduation from a master's program that gives access to the profession".

This acknowledgment is based particularly on studies carried out in Quebec during the past decade with students, graduates and new psychologists, concerning possible gaps in their initial education and training. All these surveys seem to document serious deficiencies. These studies are not always perfect: one can readily identify methodological limitations. Thus, comparisons are difficult because training programs differ considerably from each other, not only as a function of the university of origin, but also depending on the time period during which the training took place because psychology programs undergo constant modifications, even without considering that individual courses in a program are also modified from year to year. This said, these surveys end up painting, through successive approximations (*coups de pinceaux - "brush strokes"*) a reasonably clear overall picture of perceived deficiencies in psychology education and training. We will summarize very briefly the essence of the relevant information arising from six of these studies[4].

2.1. Study of graduating students from the University of Montreal

Chouinard & Hamel (1995, 1996) who are psychologists at SOCP (*sic*), caried out a

study of 2641 students in the 1994 graduating class at the University of Montreal. This large-scale study enabled comparisons of graduating students from various disciplines, in terms of demographic characteristics and entry into the job market. The findings permit one to state that, overall, master's graduates in psychology succeed quickly enough in integrating themselves into the job market, but more often than not on a part-time or temporary basis. Nevertheless, one important aspect sharply separates psychology graduates from graduates of other programs: the feeling that their training prepared them less well for their job. In effect, while 83.6% master's graduates from the university of Montreal judge that their university education prepared them well for their work, only 59.4% of master's graduates in psychology (who are working in their field) have this impression. The spread observed here is very large (almost 25%) and clearly indicates discomfort (*malaise*).

2.2. The counseling psychology survey (1963-1991) at the University of Montreal

In the spring of 1991, Perron et al. (1992) surveyed 173 graduates of the counseling program, Department of Psychology, University of Montreal. According to the respondents, this study shows that a doctorate prepared them better (average reply of 4/5 on a Likert scale) for their career than did the master's (3.48/5). Moreover, a complementary study that collated the replies of 111 graduates who had completed the master's in counseling psychology after the important program modifications that took place in 1976 shows that 74.2% of these graduates obtained, after their university training, additional practical training. According to the respondents, this additional training seems to have better prepared them for their career (4.33/5). Moreover, 52% of these graduates undertook additional theoretical education after their university studies.

These figures show that a substantial number of psychology graduates felt the need for additional training after obtaining their degree in order to feel at ease at the start of their career. Now, while this undertaking by new graduates is commendable, it would

seem to indicate that there are substantial deficiencies in the pre-degree theoretical and practical education and training provided by the university. Besides, the fact that doctoral graduates feel better prepared than do master's graduates also illustrates the idea that part of the additional training needed for feeling at ease in the profession should normally stem from extra education and training at the university, and not just from subsequent training.

2.3. The study carried out at Laval's School of Psychology

Morin & Lacroix (1995) surveyed 157 persons who completed their studies between 1980 and 1991 at Laval University's School of Psychology and went on to become psychologists. A content analysis revealed three major sources of dissatisfaction: a) the university preparation (pre-internship) was not enough; b) the time spent on practical learning was poorly implemented; and c) relationships with the internship supervisor were sometimes difficult. In summary, this research also brought out three main suggestions on the part of the subjects (see Poirier, 1996, p. 27): a) that university education and training prior to internship ought to prepare one better for the profession; b) that internships should be longer, better structured, and offer more direct contact with clients; and c) that the profession's regulatory body (the College) should become more involved in the training of future psychologists.

The value of this survey lies mainly in the fact that its authors tried to delineate better the transition period between strictly academic learning and the internship setting. According to the results, one should simultaneously increase the number of internship hours (ensuring better follow-up) and better prepare the student prior to internship, especially with respect to practical knowledge. The results also illustrate the notion that the passage from theory to practice is not axiomatic in psychology, that the interface is somehow deficient, and that one must, [therefore], iron out a number of difficulties by making provision both for activities focused on internship preparation and for the acquisition of adequate know-how throughout the period of university education and training.

2.4. The study of psychology students from six universities

At the request of the Committee of Heads of Psychological Services in Hospitals (*Comité des chefs de services de psychologie en milieu hospitalier*), Tassé (1992) surveyed 89 clinical psychology students from six Quebec universities (UQAM, UQTR, McGill, Laval, Concordia, Montréal).

With respect to the part of the academic program that they had already completed, 66% of the subjects indicated that they would make changes to the pre-internship training. Only 49% of respondents felt that they had acquired sufficient knowledge of psychopathology prior to the start of their internship, and only 35% felt sufficiently prepared to carry out interventions. One-third had never been exposed at all to the codes of ethics of the College, CPA or APA before the start of their internship.

While it is true that programs in general have made progress since 1992, especially with respect to the teaching of ethics, one must remark all the same on the helplessness of a good number of students when they are suddenly face to face with their internship: many feel poorly equipped and ill-prepared for practice, even with respect to the most fundamental aspects of clinical knowledge. As highlighted by Tassé (1992, pp. 14-15): "The most notable aspect is the respondents' feeling of not being adequately prepared to do psychotherapy. (...) The respondents also indicate that they feel they are not adequately prepared in psychopathology (51%) or in assessment interviewing (40%). Such low satisfaction levels in relation to skills that are essential for assessment and diagnosis are worrisome (...)".

2.5. The survey carried out by the College of Psychologists in 1996

In 1996, the College completed a survey of the professional training of new psychologists (Poirier, 1996). The object of the study was to document the

perceptions of new members regarding the relevance of their education and training for their professional practice. The sample consisted of 80 respondents, drawn at random from the list of members, taking into account geographical distribution (proportional) and selection criteria (terminal diploma and registration certificate both obtained between 1990 and 1995).

With respect to the general question regarding degree of satisfaction with the university education and training received prior to internship, the results show that 47.5% of the subjects declare themselves to be satisfied and 46.25% dissatisfied (6.25% did not answer). In other words, approximately half of the subjects were dissatisfied with their pre-internship university education and training. Moreover, 87.5% of the respondents stated that they would have made changes to their training program. The most frequently suggested improvement was *to increase the number of university courses that prepare for internship* (71.42% of the subjects), while other frequently suggested improvements were an increase in the total number of hours of internship supervision, more direct contact with clients, and an overall increase in the length of the internship. From another perspective, 65% of the subjects (versus 26.25%) felt that the College should increase the minimum standard for entry to the profession with respect to length of internship. By the same token, it must be noted that 88.75% of the respondents - the highest quantitative result of all - have felt the need to complete the professional training offered by the university (including the internship) by additional training activities (often privately) for the professional practice of psychology. Only 10% of the subjects did not feel this need (1.25% did not reply).

To summarize, the results show that a clear majority of respondents would make substantial changes to the system of education and training, while a strong majority would favour increasing the number of courses whose content is relevant to the exercise of the profession as well as increasing the length of internships. The results also illustrate, as do the other studies, that a substantial number of psychologists feel the need for complementary training shortly after obtaining their diploma and registration certificate for entry to the profession.

2.6. The study of graduate students at Laval University

In 1997, the Graduate Students' Association of the School of Psychology at Laval University surveyed its members for the purpose of identifying their concerns about the clinical training they were receiving (Executive Council of the Graduate Students' Association of the School of Psychology, 1997). Of 150 questionnaires distributed to students, 56 were returned. In addition, a sample of 36 professors of clinical psychology (out of 80) likewise completed the survey.

The main results show that a clear majority of students (67%) and clinical professors (76%) feel that the teaching of clinical psychology is insufficient, negligible in comparison to the teaching of research skills.

The students report important gaps in the teaching of interpersonal skills applicable to the treatment of populations in helping relationships, and they note that: the number of courses devoted to psychometrics is insufficient (65% of the students); the teaching of psychopathology is insufficient; and the acquisition of theoretical and practical knowledge regarding the nature and establishment of a therapeutic relationship is inadequate. In summary, a good number of *graduate* students (55%) believe that they do not possess the necessary skills to establish a psychotherapeutic process, something which is confirmed to a similar extent by the clinical professors (58%), who specifically point to the weaknesses of students in interviewing and intervention techniques. Lack of training in crisis interventions, although this is obviously needed, is also brought up, as are poor introductions to specific problem areas (suicide, sexual abuse, substance abuse, personality disorders, schizophrenia).

Moreover, 58% of the students judge that they don't possess the necessary skills to meet the requirements of internship settings. This percentage rises to 63% in the replies of the clinical professors. The document correctly summarizes this as follows (p. 12): "Overall, the students' concerns are the following: lack of theoretical and practical content that is more extensive (*élaboré*) and better adapted to today's psychological

realities, and lack of in-depth teaching of therapeutic approaches in psychopathology and of their modes intervention".

Discussion

Overall, the results of these surveys carried out in Quebec with students, graduates, new members and psychologists with some years of experience are in strong agreement. In summary, several common observations are found in these studies: a) with respect to both theoretical and practical content, the subjects feel (felt) insufficiently prepared by the psychology programs not only for the practice of the profession but even for undertaking the internship; b) the respondents would like (would have wished for) courses that deal more extensively with aspects related to the practice of the profession, especially in the clinical realm; and c) the respondents wanted (would have wanted) longer internships, with more hours of supervision and of contact with clients.

While keeping in mind the methodological limitations of these surveys, and placing the results obtained in the specific context from which they arose - the programs may have re-asserted themselves in the meantime - one notes that the more recent surveys (by the College in 1996, graduate students in 1997), when all is said and done, yield similar results to those of earlier studies (cf. Tassé's in 1992, and that by Perron et al. in 1992). No doubt progress has been made, especially in the teaching of ethics, but the fact remains that today's programs don't seem to satisfy the training needs. To sum up, the results obtained are so congruent from study to study, from survey to survey, that one is led to believe with good reason that they reflect accurately a situation that is real and enduring.

If these results shake to some extent the columns of the academic temple, they also put into question directly the College of Psychologists, given its mandate to protect the public. In effect, the College must ask itself if the education and training provided by the universities is adequate for the competent practice [of the profession]. More

specifically, the College must address a series of inter-related questions: a) Are the education and training programs sufficiently oriented to professional practice? b) Is the number of courses that prepare students for the profession sufficient, given the breadth of knowledge to be acquired? c) Are the programs taking sufficient account of the integration of theoretical and practical knowledge - through internships, but also through preparation for internships? d) Can one really entrust to the non-regulated sector that offers professional post-university training (this is generally offered in the private sector) the onerous responsibility of making up for deficits observed in the initial university education and training?

To summarize, these findings show that the education and training of psychologists must be re-examined, taking into account the needs that were expressed. These needs seem to lead to two main avenues of intervention: a) the need to extend education and training beyond the master's so as allow [students] to acquire what is needed for professional practice - something that new psychologists are already accomplishing although by seeking it in the private sector that does training; and b) the need to review the programs - even doctoral programs - to ensure that the content can really address professional education and training needs.

3. Comparing the knowledge of master's and doctoral graduates

It is always difficult to compare one level of training to another. All the same, given the training needs expressed in all the surveys conducted, one cannot avoid the key question: Could doctoral training better contribute to preparation for the professional practice of psychology than master's training?

At first glance, common sense tells us that normally this should be the case. After all, people who register in graduate programs learn something useful there, otherwise what would be the sense in requiring any type of advanced training for the practice of a profession? The question, rather, is whether the additional training needs - expressed by new psychologists and observed in the field - are enough to justify raising the entry

requirements. Now, in fact, new graduates and psychologists have already pointed out that it is difficult to be well prepared for the profession through the present psychology programs in Quebec. A similar finding, over a period of decades, has led more and more Canadian provinces and American states to require the doctorate as the minimum education and training standard.

Thus, in an important article based on the fact that Minnesota changed the professional entry standard from the master's to the doctorate some years back, Robiner et al. (1994) provide a synthesis of the information, research and thoughtful reflection that lead to a consideration of the doctorate as more and more necessary for undertaking professional practice nowadays. In the first place, the authors recall several easily observed facts: Master's graduates have fewer hours of specialized courses, fewer internship hours, fewer hours of supervised experience, fewer client contact hours, less extensive contact with their thesis (or major paper) supervisor, less time for interactions with peers who have similar concerns (less seminars), and less training in understanding of the relevant professional literature. They also stress that master's internships (*stages*) are often less structured than doctoral internships (*internats*) (Robiner et al., 1994, p. 236). From all of this it follows that, independently of the level of theoretical knowledge, doctoral graduates will have had greater opportunity than master's graduates to be exposed to a set of treatment approaches, practice settings, varied client groups and different psychological problems.

Having said this, few systematic studies have permitted a comparison of master's and doctoral level psychologists. Two studies, by Colliver et al. (1985) and Havens et al. (1982), compared the competencies of persons who had these two levels of education and training, based on the evaluations done by the directors of some 400 mental health centres in the United States. The authors found significant differences (often at $p<.0001$) in the directors' evaluations. As emphasized by Robiner et al. (1994), such studies are not methodologically perfect, as the directors could have different viewpoints on the notion of competency, but all the same the value of these results lies in their high statistical significance and in their stability over time. One should not,

however, draw strong conclusions from these studies: at the beginning of the 1980s, the level of preparation for the profession could vary considerably from one academic program to another, since the development of a core curriculum did not really take place until later. In addition, these studies do not take into account the experience of the subjects. Evidently, a psychologist who just obtained the doctorate may be compared up to a point to one who just obtained the master's, but much less so to a psychologist with the master's and ten years of experience. Such nuances are completely missing in the above studies. That is why an analysis that compares persons according to the levels of their diplomas must be limited primarily to the comparison of persons *entering* the profession, before the role of experience and post-degree training considerably transform the professional competence equation.

To do this, there exists a reasonably reliable means for comparing objectively the level of knowledge acquired by master's and doctoral graduates at the start of their professional careers: the results obtained on the standardized professional psychology examination, the EPPP (*Examination for Professional Practice of Psychology*), developed by ASPPB (*Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards*). This examination is used by the vast majority of American states and a number of Canadian provinces. The EPPP consists of more than 200 multiple-choice questions on knowledge of psychology and professional practice. The exam also assesses knowledge of fundamental principles of ethics. The EPPP is the product of a "consensus of expert practitioners" who are themselves trained in the professional practice of psychology. The purpose of the EPPP is thus to evaluate the knowledge that is considered by peers to be at the core of professional practice in psychology (ASPPB, 1999; Robiner et al., 1994).

While no test enables a true prediction of a practitioner's eventual competence, and although every test is, by definition, limited in the scope of what it can measure, several studies have permitted the determination of some external validity in the EPPP, for example by obtaining significant correlations between the scores obtained in this examination and clinical performance as evaluated by the *Clinical Proficiency*

Progress Review (Tori, 1989, 1990: see ASPPB, 1999, p. 11, and Robiner et al., 1994, p. 246). All the same, this research area should be developed further.

Robiner et al. (1994) bring up some studies that compare the EPPP scores of recent master's and doctoral graduates. All of these results indicate clearly that doctoral training permits the acquisition of a more extensive set of professional competencies. Thus, for example, with respect to the 1989 EPPP in Minnesota (which was at the time one of the few American states that enabled master's graduates to enter the profession), 36% of master's candidates passed the test as opposed to 81% of candidates with a doctorate[5].

Very recently, ASPPB (1999) published a document summarizing the professional practice patterns of master's level practitioners. There, one finds that even in the 28 jurisdictions which regulate the practice of master's persons by one means or other, 21 of them require the EPPP. Among these 28 jurisdictions, Quebec has the largest number of master's practitioners (around 5000) but it does not require this examination. In summary, ASPPB (1999) notes that the differences in EPPP scores of recent master's versus doctoral graduates have been confirmed in several independent studies and also reflect the analysis done by ASPPB for EPPP scores obtained between 1985 and 1996. This last analysis, based on 14,748 master's candidates (23.9% of the total sample) and 47,051 doctoral candidates (76.1%) reveals a significant difference ($p<.001$) between the two levels which is stable across time and across all the components of the test.

A more detailed analysis cleared up an interesting fact in these results. In effect, ASPPB compared the scores of recent doctoral graduates with those of persons who had obtained a master's but who also had undertaken studies beyond the master's (without, however, obtaining the doctorate)[6]. Here, the results also show differences between the two levels, but the differences are smaller and less significant. Similarly, a comparison of candidates with the master's versus candidates with the master's plus additional post-master's studies (but without the doctorate) reveal that the latter obtain

significantly higher scores than the former ($p<.001$). In sum, one can logically conclude that there is somehow a continuum of knowledge - as measured by the EPPP - which develops gradually throughout the post-master's training period, the duration of studies thus constituting a determining element, beyond the obtaining of a diploma, in the acquisition of knowledge of psychology[7].

Without doubt, the preponderant trend in North America is to adopt the doctorate as the minimum standard for entry to the profession, in addition to requiring a substantial number of practicum and internship (*stages ... internats*) hours as well as, most often, passing the EPPP and, often enough, passing an exam specifically devoted to ethics and jurisprudence (Poirier, 1996). In addition, a good number of American jurisdictions likewise require post-doctoral supervision (the first year of practice). Without doing a comprehensive review, one can provide some examples of the standards of some ASPPB members (1993) for obtaining a certificate to practice as a psychologist.

Thus, California requires a doctorate[8], 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised work experience, and passing the EPPP. Pennsylvania requires the doctorate, a year of post-doctoral supervised experience, the EPPP, and Pennsylvania's legal issues exam. Connecticut requires the doctorate, a year of post-doctoral supervised experience, the EPPP and a jurisprudence exam. Louisiana requires the doctorate, a year of post-doctoral supervised experience, and the EPPP. Massachusetts requires the doctorate, 1600 hours of post-doctoral supervised experience, the EPPP and a jurisprudence exam. New Brunswick requires the master's with four years of relevant experience or the doctorate with one year of experience, the EPPP, and an oral ethics exam. New Jersey requires the doctorate, 1750 hours of supervised post-doctoral work, the EPPP and an oral exam. New York State requires the doctorate , the EPPP, and a year of full-time (35 hours per week) post-doctoral supervised experience. Alberta requires a master's (including practica), 1500 hours of supervised experience *after* the master's, and passing the EPPP. Ontario requires the doctorate, twelve months of full-time post-doctoral supervised experience, and the EPPP. Manitoba now requires the doctorate,

a year of post-doctoral supervised experience, and the EPPP (Poirier, 1996).

Appendix 1 presents a table comparing the requirements of three national organizations (APA, ASPPB, CPA) with those of the College of Psychologists: one is obliged to note that the Quebec standards fall below those of the national organizations, not only with respect to the diploma (master's rather than doctorate), but also with respect to practica and internships[9]. Nonetheless, one must remember that it is provincial (or state) legislation that regulates access to a certificate for practice. Thus, each state and each province has the authority to establish its own standards. The national organizations are nonetheless very influential, and their standards are often incorporated into local regulations. This creates a tendency toward harmonization, at least in the North American context[10]. Appendix 2 provides a table comparing the admission standards of the Canadian provinces as matters stood in 1998 (see Breault, 1998)[11]. Although here is found greater variability than in the comparison against Canadian or American national standards, one notes that again Quebec stands out as the province that is overall the least stringent, not only because its entry level is at the master's, but also because it requires neither post-university supervised experience nor a professional knowledge examination (the EPPP).

It is important to stress again that it is the entry levels of training for the profession that are being compared here - and not experienced practitioners who were trained at the master's or the doctorate. Furthermore, it is evident that Quebec compares favourably to other provinces and states with respect to psychology education and training prior to advanced studies: the *DEC* plus a specialized baccalaureate with approximately 90 credits in psychology, as opposed to a four-year bachelor's with forty, fifty, or sixty credits in psychology. All the same, it is at the level of graduate education and training that the necessary professional training takes place - not at the undergraduate level. It is also during master's and doctoral studies (*deuxièmes et troisièmes cycles*) that practica and internships take place. It is at these levels that the difference goes against Quebec, as the young psychologists coming from Quebec's master's programs are professionally less meticulously prepared over a shorter time period than their North

American colleagues. Now, it is precisely with respect to the level of professional preparation, including the transition to practica and internships (*stages*), and not at the level of undergraduate theoretical courses, that the needs of recent graduates are felt most strongly, according to their own judgment.

4. The role of post-university training

The surveys reviewed above document the fact that psychologists often resort to complementary training which somehow fills gaps in their initial university education and training. Some of this training is offered in public settings, particularly in large hospital centres, but for the most part it is provided by the private sector.

A quick review of several issues of the journal *Psychologie Québec* gives us a good glimpse of the private training market. There one finds particularly: a) offers of individual or small group supervision; b) workshops and courses, more or less structured, for the purpose of highly focused learning, most often concerning treatment approaches or an introduction to particular problems or themes; and c) genuine professional training programs, which may at times be spaced out over several years.

While a good number of private training offerings stem (*relèvent*) from a superficial process of continuing education, others constitute real programs with well defined objectives, methods and content, and at times given by large enough teams of trainers. These training experiences can be rather costly, even in comparison to university tuition fees. Although they usually lead to an explicit form of recognition (a certificate of training, for example), it is still recognition between peers, more specifically between peers of a single school, and it is rarely recognition by official structures, government entities, public employers, or even private sector employers. One may derive from this the implication that the clients taking such training are, not so much people interested in breaking rapidly into the job market or in getting a promotion, but rather people who want to equip themselves with concrete tools for carrying out treatments, for practising

their profession in a more adequate manner. Their motivation is thus mainly intrinsic, linked to the feeling of having a need to acquire more tools in order to practice the profession more appropriately. This is truly a reflection or mirror image of the gaps found in university education and training.

Robiner et al. (1994) accurately stress, however, that most private professional training cannot entirely overcome the initial gaps: a) private programs are typically aimed at learning specific techniques or deepening within a single theoretical school, while doctoral education and training aims at the acquisition of knowledge that is broader, more universal, trans-theoretical, applicable to highly varied contexts and clients; b) the [trainee] evaluation requirements are usually less stringent in private settings (few exams or formal papers); and c) private trainers are not usually as competent in the evaluation of their own programs, while university programs are constantly under detailed scrutiny by a multitude of observers, including professional regulatory bodies, university administrations, accreditation committees, and higher education government agencies. In sum, with the possible exception of certain private programs that are especially demanding, spread over several years and constructed around highly competent practitioners, there is nothing to indicate that private training can fully compensate for doctoral training, at least as regards the training necessary during the first years of professional experience[12].

To summarize, while new practitioners may seek to address crying needs for acquiring professional competencies by increasing their training undertakings in the private sector - and this is to their credit - a professional regulatory body can hardly count on such mechanisms as constituting a reliable and adequate means for allowing new registrants to remedy deficiencies which have their roots in an insufficient university education and training.

5. Public protection and ethical concerns

In Quebec, the *Codes of the Professions* (*Code des professions*) delegates to the professional Colleges [(that is, regulatory bodies)] the mandate of protecting the public in the area of competence of their members. The Colleges therefore have a primary responsibility, not only to manage their membership lists, conduct professional inspections and maintain a disciplinary system, but also necessarily to determine the criteria that will provide entry to the profession. To accomplish this, the Colleges use various regulatory mechanisms: *the regulation concerning doiplomas that give access to the profession*, *the regulation concerning equivalence of diplomas*, and *the regulation concerning equivalence of training*. It is by adopting new refinements of these regulations, which are then reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Professions and approved by the government, that the professional Colleges can influence whether university programs will be offered and what their structure will be. Thus, it is clearly in the mandate of the professional College, rather than that of the universities, to decide if the entry to the profession will be at the master's or the doctoral level. All the same, such decisions are not made in isolation because, while the Colleges can determine - with the agreement of the state - the entry standards, in reality they must ascertain that: a) there is sufficient consensus around the standards (which explains, for example, the creation of a committee on training that brings together delegates of the College but also representatives of the universities and of Quebec's Ministry of Education (*MEQ*); b) the universities and the state will be able to address the requirements in terms of resources and orientations; and c) the protection of the public will benefit from the new entry standards. All of these considerations often lead the professional Colleges to move slowly in the regulatory area. The most powerful impetus for change remains the need to act for the protection of the public.

In the present situation, we seem to be truly facing one such need: a) the facts show clearly that a substantial number of new members or recently trained psychologists feel wanting in professional knowledge; b) the comparative scores on professional examinations show that master's graduates, upon entry to the profession, possess less knowledge of psychology and professional practice than do doctoral graduates. Even

when on takes into account the idiosynchrasies of education and training in Quebec, these two points sound important alarm signals which are difficult to avoid.

In North America, similar findings have led a number of Canadian provinces and American states to require the doctorate for professional practice, and to ensure moreover that entry to the profession will only take place following practica and internships often totaling over 2,000 hours, exclusive of any hours of post-doctoral supervised practice. In Quebec, only 600 hours of practicum (*stages*) in total are required. On the other hand, one must insist that the doctorate not be viewed as the only component that must be taken into account: such doctoral training must prepare explicitly for professional practice. There remains an increasing concern that doctoral education and training not be oriented only to research but that it be focused on practice issues. This concern is at the origin of the development of new models of training which, while adopting the doctoral standard, give priority to learning for professional practice. This movement, in motion for several decades, now occupies a well established position in the area of professional psychology university training in North America.

6. The evolution of models of training in North America

The Boulder Conference in 1949 was without doubt the most influential gathering in the history of professional psychology(Barrom et al., 1988; Dobson & Dobson, 1993; Raimy, 1950; Poirier, 1996; Routh, 1994; Weitz, 1992). This conference gave birth to the scientist-professional model or the scientist-practitioner model, linked to the conferring of the Ph.D. diploma. The guiding principle in this model is to train professionals who will also be, simultaneously, researchers capable of carrying out independent research and of producing cutting-edge knowledge. It must be emphasized that, since the Boulder Conference (Raimy, 1950; Stricker & Cummings, 1992; Stricker & Trierweiler, 1995), researchers have made efforts to facilitate the development of a kind of professional psychology, on the assumption that professional practice should be isomorphic with applied technical know-how that

results directly from research based discoveries. The scientist-practitioner model was also prone to give some credibility to the young wave of professionals by linking them as closely as possible to the academic research expertise of university departments of psychology.

The Boulder model retains its predominance and its relevance has often been reiterated in fourteen major national conferences in the United states between 1950 and 1985 (Peterson, 1955), and in some others since that time. Between 1950 and 1970, there has been constant growth in the number of Ph.D. programs based on this model. However, the Boulder model has begun to meet resistance and has been increasingly questioned (Stricker, 1992). As stressed by the Psy.D. Task Force (1998)[13]: " (...) it has become evident that in most cases the practice of psychologists did not correspond to the scientific training they had received, as most practitioners did not conduct any research after their doctorate, even when their thinking continued to be critical and scientific. Considering this factor, as well as the time required for mastering scientific skills, some people have come to question the value of the scientist-practitioner model; thus, an alternative training model, the professional model, has come to light".

In practice, few professional psychologists, even those who have a Ph.D., do research aimed at the advancement of knowledge after obtaining their diploma, with the exception of those who obtain academic positions and those who work in institutions in which research is important. In other words, unless the time spent on research is recognized or funded somehow in the context of work, holders of doctorates, even research doctorates (Ph.D.), do very little research (Barrom et al., 1988; Garfield & Kurtz, 1976; Kelly et al., 1978). From this it follows, for example, that in Quebec there would be little research output in many public practice settings (schools, *CLSC*, many hospitals, community organizations) and in virtually all types of private practice, regardless of which doctorate is awarded. Does this mean that research skills are useless? One cannot affirm this because such skills help one to refine (*peaufiner*) one's day to day work, to keep up with the specialized literature in one's areas, and

to maintain a critical attitude with respect to new developments in one's field of expertise. All the same, pragmatically, it must be noted that the long research training inherent to the classical Boulder model program (the traditional Ph.D.) does not often yield the expected results in terms of scientific fallout and may not represent an ideal investment for a substantial number of students going on to the professional practice of psychology. It is this realization that, more than any other, seems to have influenced the gradual emergence of professional doctoral programs (Barlow, 1981; Barrom et al., 1988; Peterson, 1976, 1985, 1991, 1995)[14]. Analyses of the activities actually carried out by psychologists have also brought out the true nature of professional practice. In effect, professional activity - in psychology, but also for instance in medicine - is based on a set of practices and hypotheses arising as much, if not more, from daily contact with clients and the idiosynchrasies of each treatment than from the systematic application of techniques drawn directly from research (Fox, 1994; Poirier, 1996; Stricker, 1992; Stricker & Trierwwiler, 1995).

The Vail Conference in 1974 marked an important turning point by proposing the creation of university programs dedicated specifically to professional training (Korman, 1974)[15]. Donald R. Peterson of the University of Illinois was the originator of the first professional doctoral program, which was accredited in 1973[16]. According to Peterson (1985), the pressure of the population's needs for psychological help was one of the factors that ended up influencing the academic system to force a (partial and gradual) reorientation of its programs toward greater professionalization.

In 1964, only one program in the United States was devoted specifically to the training of professional psychologists (Adelphi University). In 1965, the Fuller Graduate School of Psychology was created. The program titled *Illinois Doctor of Psychology* (Psy.D., University of Illinois) started in 1968. In 1969, the California School of Professional Psychology accepted its first students. The Vail Conference in 1974 accelerated this movement by officially sanctioning the professional training model and the "Psy.D." degree (Task Force on the Psy.D., 1998)[17]. In 1982, 44 practice based programs were in operation in the United States, with an enrolment of 4,993 students.

Of these 44 programs, 20 were housed in a university department and 24 in autonomous professional schools. Twenty-seven of these programs led to the Psy.D. and seventeen to the Ph.D. (Peterson, 1985). Nowadays, almost half of new American psychologists have completed a professional doctorate rather than the Ph.D., something which constitutes a remarkable evolution with respect to the Boulder model (Shapiro & Wiggins, 1994).

Those who promote professional programs often insist that such programs must maintain close contact with research. Research continues to be important, but the emphasis is placed more on comprehension, assessment of interventions and critical analysis of findings than on the production of entirely new knowledge. " (...) To those who fear that in accepting the Psy.D. one splits up practice from its scientific base by giving to the latter an excessively limited place in the training of future psychologists, we say that psychology practitioners must, on the one hand, have a good understanding of psychic processes and, on the other, master the techniques required for analyzing or treating them. In other words, we want to rid students of a technical mind-set: solving problems by means of all-purpose protocols. Thus, science must feed practice in order to maintain the credibility of the profession, but one must consider the impact of science from a new perspective"[18]. In effect, as highlighted by the Psy.D. Task Force (1998, p. 5), professional psychologists must become mainly "informed consumers" of research rather than "producers" of new knowledge.

All the same, one may note that doctoral models are not monolithic: many connecting lines may be drawn among them. Doctoral training can take on highly varied forms and meet accreditation standards in different ways (Task Force on the Psy.D., 1998, p. 6). Having said this, notwithstanding such flexibility, the evolution of professional doctoral programs seems slower in Canada than in the United States. Despite efforts made to date, no Psy.D. Canadian program has yet been approved by Canada's accrediting bodies (Task Force on the Psy.D., 1998, p. 8). Is this to say that it would be less popular in Quebec? This does not appear to be the case. For one, the Quebec universities (U of M, UQAM) have already tried out professional doctoral training

programs (“Psy.D.”). Recently, in addition, a committee of the Department oif Psychology of the University of Montreal sketched out a new professional doctorate project (April, 1997).

In effect, as was recently emphasized by the Commission on University Programs (*Commission des universités sur les programmes*), Quebec was at the forefront in testing out programs that were more and more professionally oriented, both at the master’s and at the doctorate (1999, p. 11): “The strictly professional model, which appeared in the 1960s, inspired the development of programs that were composed mainly of courses, directed readings and internships, and which were sometimes devoid of research activities as such. Research, in this model, is not regarded as a key component in the training of practitioners. These programs have led to the creation of specific graduate degrees in psychology, the M.Ps. and the D.Ps. The University of Montreal was among the first establishments in North America to implement such programs. They are more common in the United States than in Canada”.

7. Converging toward the doctorate in Quebec

The Commission on University Programs (CUP, 1999) recently analyzed the present psychology education and training programs in Quebec. This commission is a recent creation (January, 1997) of the Ministry of Education of Quebec (MEQ) in cooperation with the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Quebec Universities (CREPUQ). The commission entrusted to sectoral sub-commissions the task of analyzing the various education and training sectors and making recommendations. Its role is therefore important and influential. It is in keeping with the desire for efficiency and rationalization expressed by decision-makers in order to improve the Quebec university system, by eliminating where possible, for example, useless redundancy, ill-targeted programs, and programs that fail to meet the standards of quality and productivity articulated in various settingss (*divers milieux*). The main objective is to facilitate dialogue among universities, by bringing together in one place the analyses done by experts and administrations.

In its April, 1999 report, a sub-commission of CUP[19] did an analysis of all psychology, psycho-education and sexology programs in Quebec universities, and remarked that, on the one hand, "the relevance of these programs is beyond doubt" (p. v) while, on the other, "the oldest among them, psychology, has defined itself as an autonomous discipline from the 1920s at McGill and, over time, in virtually all other institutions as of the 1940s" (p. v).

The CUP notes that eduation and training in psychology if offered at present throughout Quebec: thirteen university establishments offer psychology programs (sometimes a certificate), ten universities offer the bachelor's in psychology, eight offer the master's, and six the doctorate. Over 5,000 students are enroled in undergraduate students, in programs that frequently have strongly restricted enrolment quotas, and there are almost 2,000 in graduate programs. Appendix 3 (see CUP, 1999, pp. 101-103) provides the data concerning enrolments and diplomas for the various undergraduate and graduate psychology programs in Quebec, [for the years 1986-1997]. The commission remarks that "the data from the Ministry of Education (MEQ) show that these programs are worth as much as those of other sectors with respect to diplomas awarded and the entry of graduates to the profession" (p. v). The commission also points out that the departments and schools of psychology make strong contributions to teaching in a number of other academic disciplines, since psychology courses are included in a number of programs. The commission notes moreover that graduate studies in psychology follow three major models of training: programs whose first objective is research training, those that train for research and practice (*intervention*), and those that train for practice. Appendix 4 (CUP, 1999, p. 2) presents the list of psychology, psycho-education and sexology programs offered in Quebec, and Appendix 5 (CUP, 1999, p. 3) provides the distribution of students (*clientèles*) by program and university.

CUP remarks, accurately, that there are three levels of regulation which determine the boundaries (*encadrent*) for the development of psychology programs in Quebec (p. 9): a) the departments of psychology, to facilitate student mobility, agreed at the start

of the 1990s upon a common undergraduate core curriculum corresponding to roughly half the credits of the program; b) the College of Psychologists, which regulates the title *psychologist*, determines together with the Office of the Professions what diplomas give access to the profession and thereby influences various programs through this mechanism for selection; and c) finally, some universities develop their applied psychology programs (clinical, school, industrial, etc.) So as to meet the CPA and/or APA accreditation criteria. The pressures exerted by these three levels ensure some homogeneity in the education and training provided in Quebec, while enabling each university setting to retain a high degree of autonomy and specificity. In fact, many avenues are possible within such education and training, and they give rise to highly varied routes by which one may enter the profession (on this topic, see Appendix 6, CUP, 1999, pp. 17-19).

Having completed its analysis of programs, the commission formulated eight recommendations, addressed mainly to the universities, for managing the development of psychology programs. Some of these recommendations deal with the dialogue among universities and the assessment of overlap; others are intended to reiterate the importance of offering a variety of programs while facilitating both complementarity and evaluation of programs. One recommendation addresses directly the issue of doctoral training as the entry standard to the profession: recommendation number 2 (CUP, 1999, p. 52), which stipulates that “The Commission recommends that departments and schools of psychology in Quebec define and assess, with the appropriate authorities, the possibility of responding to an increase in the entry standard for the profession to the professional doctorate. The sub-commission should report on this matter to the Commission by December, 1999".

In fact, this recommendation stems directly from the discussions undertaken by the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists and the departments of psychology, especially during the meeting of February 9, 1999: “The College has invited all departments and schools of psychology to join it in the study of this question. According to the information provided by the members of the sub-

commission, it appears that the academic units agree with the principle of enshrining the professional doctorate as the level of education and training to be required for entry to the profession" (CUP, 1999, p. 52). The Commission's recommendation must be interpreted in the context of close interaction - and rapid feedback - between the members of the sub-commission (which included several psychology department chairs) and the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists. However, the Commission goes further in its remarks providing a context for the resolution: "According to some stakeholders (*acteurs du champ*), the professional doctorate represents more complete training than the present master's and better prepares psychologists for autonomous practice outside of institutional settings. It should be noted in this respect that professional Psy.D. doctorates are at present rather widespread in North America. In addition, the Psy.D. Task Force of the Canadian Psychological Association has just reached the conclusion that the implementation of this type of program is relevant" (CUP, 1999, p. 52). In summary, the Commission seems to favour the idea of proceeding to the doctoral level as the entry standard for the psychology profession, and it point out that a substantial consensus is developing on this matter. Moreover, it may be of interest to note that the Commission passed another resolution (resolution number 8) which, while trivial at first sight, supports very concretely the development of professional doctoral programs in psychology: "The Commission invites the Ministry of Education to acknowledge financially the work of doctoral interns in professional psychology, and to review this matter with the other ministries concerned" (CUP, 1999, p. 56).

From another perspective, an independent review of current psychology programs in Quebec was carried out by the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists in 1998-1999 and submitted at its meeting with departments of psychology in February, 1999. It is noteworthy that this review was within the legal mandate given to the Committee in the context of the regulation that set up its constitution and functions (Regulation concerning the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists, 1997, L.R.Q., c.C-26, a.184, 2^{e} al.). This mandate is also reiterated in a resolution of the Administrative Committee of the College of Psychologists (adopted in 1998) which

stipulates that: “the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists, in keeping with its mandate established by regulation, should be invited to validate, with those responsible for the university programs which give access to a certificate from the College, its analyses of their course calendars, to make an inventory of education and training programs in relation to article 4 of the *Regulation on Criteria for Equivalence of Training in View of the Award of a Certificate by the College of Psychologists of Quebec (OPQ)*, and then to make recommendations to the Board of Directors by its regular meeting of September, 1998"[20].

The above review gave rise to some important conclusions, which highlight the need to once more look at and refine the training structures that give access to the profession. In effect, the Committee noted that, if the education received at the level of the bachelor’s meets the requirements of the College in general terms, the totality of education and training giving access to the profession does not conform to the *present* standards. To quote the three main conclusions on this point[21]:

1. *None* of the Quebec university programs which currently give access to a certificate from the College provide assurance that the graduates have successfully completed the required minimum number of course credits, practica, internships, assignments, etc.
2. In essence, the problem seems to stem from the very structure of the university programs, which do not include a sufficient number of compulsory course credits to satisfy the profile required by the College.
3. As shown by this study, it is with respect to the number of course credits in the areas of *evaluation, diagnosis and treatment* that one finds the main gaps in the university programs that presently give access to the certificates issued by the College.”

One cannot help but be struck by the fact that it is especially with reference to that which first touches upon professional practice - *evaluation, diagnosis and treatment* - that the gaps are most evident. In effect, these are the very gaps that graduating students and new psychologists point to when surveyed concerning their education

and training. In sum, whether one does the analysis "from above" through a systematic examination of the content of the programs or "from below" by studying the replies of those who have studies in the programs, the same finding emerges to the effect that the important [curriculum] streams related to practice are covered too superficially in the psychology university programs.

Faced with such findings, the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists formulated the following recommendations to the Board of Directors (same document):

"1. *Not* to ask the Quebec universities to make the necessary efforts to ensure that their present training programs meet the requirements of the College;
2. Rather, to offer to collaborate with the Quebec universities toward the implementation of professional doctoral programs;
3. In the meantime, to approve a draft Regulation on the standards for equivalence of training in view of the issuing of a certificate by the College. This will allow the Committee on equivalences to show more flexibility in studying the files that are brought to its attention;
4. To limit to 3 years the validity of the Regulation".

In sum, the Committee, in its work during 1998-1999, opted for a comprehensive solution to the problem of education and training: a) to do something new, by suggesting moving to the doctorate rather than proposing piecemeal amendments to the present programs which, in varying degrees, all show deficits with respect to the *present* standards of the College; b) to undertake a real process of dialogue with the universities for the purpose of achieving a constructive climate (*dynamique*) facilitative to the evolution of programs (which the meeting of February 9, 1999 set in motion, and the sub-commission of the Commission of Universities Concerning Programs will need to support in parallel somehow); and c) to adopt temporary transition measures concerning the study of training equivalencies.

In summary, the evolution toward in-depth reform of the minimum entry standards, and toward the doctorate, appears to result from several converging elements: a) the gaps identified by graduating students and psychologists alike lead one to question the relevance of present programs with respect to preparation for professional practice - something which necessarily mobilizes the College of Psychologists, given its mandate to protect the public; b) the analysis of current programs done by the Committee on Education and Training concludes that there are major problems with respect to the "fit" between the programs and the standards of the College, especially in those areas that have to do directly with professional practice (*diagnosis, evaluation and treatment*), and thereby confirms the impressions based on the studies of graduating students and psychologists; c) the dialogue that was established with the universities facilitates reaching a speedy consensus on the doctorate as the minimum standard for access to the College. This seems unavoidable, as the departments cannot continue to "jam-pack" the already too demanding master's programs by adding even more courses and longer internships; d) having already met concerning other matters, these departments have clearly reiterated their agreement with the doctoral standard for entry to the profession. They have adopted the first resolution of the Commission on University Programs (1999) which was intended to encourage the study of this option. They have also adopted a second resolution asking the ministries to fund the interns enroled in professional doctoral programs; and finally e) the students and members seem overall to be rather in favour of such an evolution, if one judges by their reactions to numerous articles and editorials which have appeared for at least ten years in the pages of *Quebec Psychology* - notwithstanding some notorious reservations - and if one takes into account the meetings where such projects have been debated, for example a very recent one in the context of a workshop on the professional doctorate organized by the College of Psychologists in September, 1999, and the following annual General Assembly.

On the other hand, as we have briefly indicated already, external factors also contribute to the move to the doctorate as the entry standard to the profession. One such factor is the increasing permeability of economic and workplace boundaries. The

cornerstones of this factor are the multilateral mobility agreements on trade and services. They affect all professions.

Thus, NAFTA, the European Union and Canada's Agreement on Internal Trade are mechanisms that lead both to a radical transformation of the job market and to ever increasing mobility in the professions at the dawn of the next millennium (see Lenn & Miller, 1998; Gauthier, 1997; Ritchie & Gauthier, 1999). One could also mention the appearance of new information and communication technologies, among them the internet (see Poirier & Poirier, 1998), as another factor that contributes to the fluidity and trans-national communication of expertise and services[22]. These agreements and factors will increasingly allow professionals to be mobile - physically or virtually - for the purpose of offering specialized services, training programs, and more and more pointed or in-depth (*pointue*) thematic supervision as a function of the emergence of increasingly specific fields of expertise. Thus, mobility requires the introduction of "standards" for mutual recognition. Ritchie & Gauthier (19990 point out the fundamental ingredients which could evolve toward a consensus on education and training in Canadian psychology: *obtaining a diploma from a doctoral program that is accredited by the national organizations, based on the acquisition of well defined competencies in the framework of a professional training model that includes a core curriculum and typically requires three years of post-bachelor's studies and a one-year internship*. These ingredients would constitute a "passport" for professional mobility in psychology with full reciprocity in practice (that is, no exams to pass or programs to complete for registration in another province). Ritchie & Gauthier (1999) also point out that such and agreement, in Canada, should include grandparent clauses permitting all present psychologists to benefit fully and completely from reciprocity[23].

In summary, the forces that are leading the profession toward the doctorate in Quebec are equally applicable to the internal situation - the deficiencies of present programs, the needs of new professionals, the increasing complexity of the profession - and to external pressures, both those linked to the identity of the profession in North America and the transformation of work in the context of mobile expertise. All the same, such

convergence should not be allowed to obscure what is essential: the doctorate is not the only "winning" ingredient. This diploma must sanction education and training which are truly focused on the practice of the profession.

8. The doctorate: core curriculum and competency model

During the last decade primarily, a new trend has come to light in training programs: the search for and articulation of a set of competencies and knowledge which would be at the heart of all professional doctoral training in psychology (Peterson et al., 1991; Savoie & Leclerc, 1999; Shapiro, 1994). The search for such a core curriculum became necessary in order to elucidate the very concept of "professional training", to increase the credibility of programs, and for the development of common accreditation standards. The Vail Conference in 1974 had already proposed that training objectives be defined in terms of competencies to be acquired rather than simply academic content (more or less arbitrary lists of courses and credits). The Mission Bay Conference held in 1987 by the National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology (NCSPP) proposed that every training program in professional psychology encompass well defined fields of professional competencies which are considered essential for professional practice. The San Antonio Conference of 1990 proposed six competency fields: relations, evaluation, treatment, consultation, training, and management & supervision. The choice of these fields stems largely from analyses of the actual work of psychologists (Savoie & Leclerc, 1999): What doe they do? What must they master? What competencies are indispensable to them?

The key document for this trend is, beyond doubt, the volume edited by Peterson (Peterson et al., 1991), bringing together a group of co-authors who have studied in detail the various knowledge and competency components that are necessary in a core curriculum. There are two delineating aspects: a) the description of skills or competencies to be developed; and b) the preferred pedagogical approach.

Bent (1991, p. 77) makes the observation that each "competency" is composed of the knowledge, skills and attitudes which, as a coherent grouping, are considered to be necessary for professional practice. One can readily appreciate that these notions bear a strong resemblance to what several Quebec authors have labeled the three levels of knowledge: knowing as such (*savoir-savoir*), having know-how (*savoir-faire*), and being comfortable in oneself (*savoir-être*). The subtlety to bring out here may be that the emphasis is placed on the notion of competence, that is, the integration in one's actions of the three levels, thereby allowing professional practice coupled with a certain ease, a certain comfort in one's practice, that comes with the "feeling of competence".

In addition, Bent (1991, p. 78) reminds us that, in professional training, competency must also be acquired in a context of *diversity* and this for each of the six competency fields: diversity of clients, diversity of areas of practice, diversities of problems, and diversity of approaches used. Thus, competency necessarily goes together with a certain breadth rather than super-competence in a single super-specialized field. In this sense, to make a comparison with medicine, the issue is not initially to train specialists but rather general practitioners able to treat a wide range of clients, without necessarily (of course) being able to treat every single client (referral to a colleague is always an option).

One might add that the competency based approach has snowballed in the community of universities with an interest in professional training. In Canada, the Psy.D. Task Force (1998, p. 4) recently expressed its support for this approach and specified that every professional program should explicitly take it into account: "the training program should define the acquisition of professional competencies in terms of *results or outcomes* and ensure *diversified* practice". In Quebec, the professional doctorate project recently sketched out by the psychology department of the University of Montreal (April, 1997) is based largely on this approach. The project's authors, though inspired by Peterson et al. (1991), deviate slightly from the San Antonio model by listing instead *seven* large competency areas: relations, evaluation, treatment, consultation, research, training & supervision, and management & ethics.

Most recently, the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists, in the document that it submitted during its meeting with the psychology departments of Quebec universities on February 9, 1999[24], proposed its own version of the six competency areas described by Peterson et al. (1991) by grouping them into *eight* domains: *interpersonal relationships, evaluation, intervention, research, ethics and standards, consultation, management,* and *supervision*.

We will return to the descriptive account of the eight competency domains as it was presented at the meeting with representatives of the psychology departments. Appendix 7, taken from the document presented at that meeting (February, 1999), further describes them and clarifies the skills to be developed in relation to each competency. [The eight competencies are]:

1. **Interpersonal relationships**
   The ability to develop and maintain a constructive working alliance with the clients.

2. **Evaluation**
   The ongoing, interactive and inclusive process that allows one to describe, conceptualize, characterize and predict the relevant aspects of the client.

3. **Intervention**
   Intervention implies those activities that facilitate, restore, maintain, or enhance positive functioning and feelings of well-being in clients by means of preventive, healing or developmental services.

4. **Research**
   Research is a scientific mode of inquiry that involves gathering and interpreting information with respect to a psychological phenomenon. Professional psychologists systematically gather and organize information

on psychological phenomena and are thus regular involved in a general practice of science.

5. **Ethics and standards**

   Professionals must face up to their obligations, be sensitive to others, and be impeccable in their behaviour. In addition, they must be able to demonstrate that they can establish professional relations within the constraints of applicable [regulatory and] ethical standards.

6. **Consultation**

   Consultation is a planned interaction, an explicit process of intervention based on the principles and procedures of psychology and related disciplines, in which the psychologist does not have direct control over the change process.

7. **Management**

   Management consists of activities involved in the direction, organization or control of services offered or rendered to the public by psychologists or other contributors (*intervenants*).

8. **Supervision**

   Supervision is a type of management that includes teaching in the context of a relationship for the purpose of developing the competency being supervised.

The model proposed by the Committee on Education and Training, therefore, differs somewhat from the San Antonio model (see Bent, 1991), which it clearly resembles a great deal. The main differences are found in the regrouping of everything that has to do with ethics and standards and in making a sharper distinction between management and supervision. Finally, the model proposed by the Committee on Education and Training makes it more explicit that, by “research”, one must understand the

acquisition and of methodological knowledge and of general applied research skills rather than the production of in-depth research aimed at increasing original knowledge (as is the case in traditional Ph.D. programs).

From another perspective, pedagogically speaking, the competency based approach advocates teaching centred about the expertise that comes not only from applied research but [also] from the total expertise acquired in professional practice (Peterson et al., 1991). It is not only a matter of transmitting theoretical knowledge, or even "bookish" methods and techniques, but also of successfully developing in the student a philosophy of professional behaviour, comprised of attitudes and behaviours that integrate not only knowledge but ethical principles, a sense of critical analysis and relationship skills as well as know-how and self-confidence (*savoir-être*) which are necessarily linked to some personal growth and which will enable the student in due course to intervene with comfort in the sum total of situations that he or she will encounter in practice (Lubin & Stricker, 1991; Savoie & Leclerc, 1999; Webbe et al., 1991)[25]. The purpose is to instill an approach through which problems encountered in practice can be tackled concretely, not just to acquire knowledge or even in-depth knowledge "about" such problems. It is also not a question of training simply technicians who can use a well defined but limited set of specific interventions - judgement and professional skills are most necessary in precisely those situations where the problems are complex and/or the intervention requires creativity and the integration of a whole set of concepts and tools (Beutler et al., 1995; Hoshmand & Poikinghorne, 1992; Kanfer, 1990; Fox, 1994; Poirier, 1996).

The proposal of the Committee on Education and Training

During the meeting of February 9, 1999 with the psychology departments of the Quebec universities, the Committee on Education and Training put forth its proposal for starting up a process of proactive collaboration, starting from a well defined working hypothesis which can be summarized in terms of two key points: a) the doctorate would become the standard for entry to the profession; and b) this doctorate

would rotate about the acquisition of professional competencies and have a core curriculum comprised of the eight competencies considered essential by the Committee (see Appendix 7): interpersonal relationships, assessment, intervention, research, ethics & standards, consultation, management, and supervision.

This proposal was discussed during the meeting with representatives of the psychology departments. Then, each department was invited to provide following the meeting, formally and in writing, its thoughts and its position. For the Committee, an important objective was to create a positive climate for discussing and working with the psychology departments, so that a dynamic of effective dialogue would develop, thereby giving rise to tangible results. It appears that this approach was especially well received by the departments, to judge from spontaneous reactions during the meeting and from the letters sent to the College following the meeting.

Already, during the course of the meeting, a number of positions favoured by a clear majority could be could be extracted, in particular[26]:

1. The vast majority of university representatives approve of the idea of a professional doctorate as the minimum standard for admission to the College.
2. The flexibility proposed for the transition years is appreciated[27].
3. The representatives of the departments stress that, with the doctorate, future psychologists will enter the job market better prepared and more mature.

Some concerns were also raised and suggestions made during the course of the meeting, in particular the for the competency based model to leave, all the same, sufficient margin of action for different university settings by taking into account their respective areas of specialization and their available resources.

Over the following weeks, each department studied the Committee’s proposal in

greater depth and sent a letter summarizing its thoughts and position. Without reviewing every part of every letter, one can sketch out the main comments of the various psychology departments, as follows, by alphabetical order of universities (that is, those whose programs give entry to the profession):

- **Concordia**: The Department of Psychology clearly approves of the move to the doctorate as the minimum entry standard ("We at Concordia have long supported the adoption of a doctoral standard for admission to membership in the College, and applaud your efforts in this direction"), and judges that a professional doctorate project is certainly feasible to the extent that it is congruent with the orientations defined in the final report of the CPA Task Force on the Psy.D. Concordia also points out that it may be difficult to obtain the resources needed for the development of new programs, and also feels that an area of competence - program evaluation - should be integrated more explicitly into the eight components proposed by the Committee on Education and Training. Finally, Concordia remarks upon the importance of the dialogue that was initiated and invites both the College and the Committee on Education and Training to continue in this vein ("We commend the College again for this initiative and thank you for inviting representatives of university programs to discuss it with you.")[28].

- **Laval**: The School of Psychology is clearly in agreement with the position advocating the Psy.D. diploma as the minimum standard for becoming member of the College, while considering that, for Laval, the Ph.D. in clinical psychology will continue to be offered and the Psy.D. should include research training equivalent to a master's project (*mémoire de maîtrise*) and accounting for approximately 25% of the doctoral program. Laval approves of the competency based approach, with the caveat that one should not require too much in the competency areas of management and supervision. Laval also believes that the College should recognize, without further review, the programs accredited by CPA or APA. Moreover, Laval stresses that the two to three year deadline

proposed by the Committee on Education and Training is too tight, although " (...) the sooner the College (*OPQ*) adopts an official position concerning the Psy.D. requirement, the more feasible it will be for the universities to meet the proposed deadlines". In conclusion, "the School of Psychology is in favour of the proposal of the College and is particularly pleased with the partnership approach that appears to characterize the work of the Committee on Education and Training"[29].

- **McGill**: The position of the Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology is, likewise, favourable on the whole[30]. This department is not opposed to the creation of professional doctorates, but it suggests that this is simply a minimum standard for the training of psychologists, such that various alternative routes may lead to acceptable training to the extent that a core curriculum of professional competencies is well defined and approved. ("The Department is not opposed to the creation of a professional doctorate leading to accreditation; but it would like to see this type of program recognized as the minimu necessary for accreditation. (...) We would be very much in favour of an accreditation procedure which, assuming of course a core curriculum necessary for the integrity of the profession, recognized different models of training for professional psychologists.")[31].

- **University of Montreal**: The Department of Psychology expresses its agreement with the idea that the doctorate become the minimum standard for admission to the College, and confirms that the Department will cease to offer the professional master's once the decision to go ahead with this choice is taken officially by the College, something which the Department hopes for very soon ("In effect this issue has been debated for over two decades and it is about time a decision was taken"). Likewise, the Department agrees with the professional Psy.D. model proposed on condition, however, that it be interpreted with flexibility so as to leave some latitude for universities within whatever modalities enable them to attain the proposed objectives. Finally, the Department considers

that the College, while focusing on the professional doctorate, should continue to recognize the scientist-practitioner Ph.D. diplomas in clinical psychology, especially when they meet the CPA or APA accreditation criteria[32].

- **UQAM**: The Department of Psychology "welcomes the initiative of the College to promote a professional doctorate as the minimum standard for accreditation" and remarks that the eight training competencies seem very relevant. UQAM questions, however, the required duration of such training, judging on the one hand that it may be difficult to fit all the desired content in 4 years of graduate studies but, on the other hand, "[that] one must not prolong the duration excessively in order to include everything while thereby creating a training program that would become too daunting for future candidates due to its length". In this sense, UQAM notes that training in supervision should perhaps not a major in-depth component of entry-level education and training in psychology. UQAM also stresses that one must retain some flexibility in the development of programs with respect to each competency, so as to allow students room for making some choices as a function of their interests and needs, so that for instance one competency might entail five compulsory activities out of seven and another two out of five[33].

- **UQTR**: The Department of Psychology states that the document of the College was very well received by the professors and that it was seen as a serious, relevant and useful document. UQTR notes that the Committee's position n education and training is right on target because an internal committee was already at work on an eventual professional doctorate. The document from the Committee on Education and Training has been integrated into the work of the internal committee[34].

- **Sherbrooke**: The position of the Department of Psychology at Sherbrooke is particularly shaded or qualified (*nuancée*) with respect to the proposal of the Committee on Education and Training. One may try to abstract the two key

> elements, without making assumptions about the overall thoughts of the Department: a) the Department judges that the work of the Committee is serious and well documented but that the perspective of practitioners deserves further examination; and b) the competency based approach seems to rasie some questions as to the origins of this movement, the latitude within which the competencies may be inetgrated, and the particularly "clinical" flavour (*couleur*) of the definitions (Sherbrooke bases itself more on a "professional consultant" model which defines the practice of psychologists more broadly). The Department also believes that the College (*OPQ*) should expand upon and clarify its definition of practicum or internship setting. On the whole - and making it clear that its position does not include that of M. St. Arnaud "whose position with respect to the Psy.D. you already know" - the Department emphasizes its interest in and agreement with the overall orientations proposed in the document from the Committee on Education and Training, but is does so with a number of reservations and questions ("We reiterate our overall agreement with this orientation, but we stress the importance of the work that remains to be done before it can be operationalized in the various contexts of university education and training")[35].

In summary, the *doctoral standard* as the minimum education and training requirement seems to be acceptable to all, as is the *competency based approach* (with some questions and comments). In essence, difficulties stem mainly from clarifications to be obtained, modalities to be made explicit, and resources to be obtained.

In its report, the Committee on Education and Training states that it has taken into account the flexibility articulated by the departments of psychology: "The objective is to propose a model that will enable the attainment of the desired goals, that is, at the same time to ensure a competency based core curriculum and to allow various institutions to maintain those specialties which reflect their own strengths.[38]".

During the course of the regular meeting of the Committee on Education and Training

that took place on June 4, 1999, the members summarized the requests made by the departments of psychology, and the work yet to be done in order to further clarify the proposed model[37]:

- Reconsider the proposed transition period (3 years)
- Make clear the difference between “clinical” and “professional”
- Articulate implicit as well as explicit competencies
- Arrange the competencies hierarchically
- Study the issue of compulsory versus optional courses
- Give thought to the supervised training requirement
- Further define the concept of “internship setting”
- Consider retaining the present Ph.D. (scientist-practitioner) and Psy.D. programs

In another context, the proposal of the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists was presented to and discussed with the members during a workshop, on the occasion of a recent colloquium held by the College on September 17, 1999. Most of the workshop participants were in favour of this idea. They came from a number of different settings and from at least three regions of Quebec. Sophie desjardins summarized this event in the November, 1999, isue of *Quebec Psychology* (*Psychologie Québec*, p. 6): “At a workshop on the professional doctorate, psychologists expressed strong support for a professional doctorate project presented by the members of the Committee on Education and Training. The participants expressed the wish for the concerned bodies to involve themselves so as to provide a proper foundation for the implementation of this doctorate in the near future”. During the course of the annual general meeting of the College that followed the colloquium, the project was again discussed briefly, and the overall reactions were again very favourable.

At the time of submission of the present report, the work of the Committee on Education and Training has the reached the step of refining the project and bringing to

light the regulatory aspects. The findings concerning present gaps in the training of psychologists for increasingly complex professional practice and the corresponding gaps in the university professional training programs; the review of the evolution in North America toward the creation of professional doctoral programs that stress the acquisition of competencies; and the examination of North American trends in accreditation standards for the profession, have led the Committee to propose changes in the entry standards. These changes - passing to the doctorate as the entry standard, requiring a core curriculum based on professional competencies - have been proposed for discussed to the departments of psychology of the Quebec universities. These interactions have highlighted the importance of such meetings and dialogue for facilitating harmonious progress on questions related to training, *but at the same time they have served to confirm overall - with some reservations and some clarifications needed - the validity of the model proposed by the Committee*.

It must be stressed that, in the view of the Committee, the College should not required a precise type of doctoral program. The universities must be able to determine to their satisfaction the "content" of the doctorate, to the extent that it truly conforms to the requirements of the College (a common core of eight professional competencies). In this sense, a scientist-practitioner Ph.D. program (or its equivalent) could fit the standards as well as a Psy.D. program to the extent that the professional content is adequately integrated in each program. In practice, the type of doctoral diploma will be determined by the universities, for instance by deciding whether or not the program will be eligible for accreditation by CPA or APA. Moreover, demand may also determined whether a program is offered or not. A professional doctoral program of shorter duration, for example a four-year program (including a full year of internship), which integrates all the professional competency requirements, could well be in greater demand than a doctoral training program of longer duration. Finally, this flexibility in content will enable various departments to elaborate their programs with more suppleness as a function of their professoral resources and their fields of expertise.

From the perspective of implementation, the Committee on Education and Training

would also like to make clear the following two elements: a) that the College should determine carefully and rapidly the date for implementation of the new entry standard in order to inform the students as soon as possible so that they, as of the end of their "college studies" (CEGEP), can make a clearly informed choice of undergraduate studies knowing in advance the entry requirements that may subsequently affect them; and b) that the College should, in close dialogue with the university departments, facilitate the development of programs (or program modalities) intended to enable practicing master's psychologists to undertake doctoral studies if they so wish. On the other hand, it goes without saying that the transition to the doctorate should not affect the status of members of the College - all present psychologists would retain all of their privileges, as the proposed modification to the entry requirements has as its principal objective to better plan the future of the profession rather than to alter the current practice of members.

Conclusion and recommendations

As we pointed out in the introduction, the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists came to the Board of Directors following two years of work with respect to the mandate that the Board had conferred upon it, that is, to further the documentation and validation of the project intended to move the entry standard to the doctoral level. Its principal recommendations are, therefore, addressed to the Board, which is invited to take a decision as soon as possible on the fundamental elements of this dossier.

The Committee on Education and Training hereby submits two sets of recommendations. The first concerns the main points of the work that was carried out; the second is for the purpose of developing complementary aspects in relation to the main recommendations in the first set.

The principal recommendations:

1. That the Board adopt a resolution declaring its intention to require that the professional competency based doctorate in psychology become the minimum entry standard for membership in the College of Psychologists of Quebec.

2. That the Board approve that the doctorate giving entry to the College be constituted of a core curriculum comprised of the following eight professional competencies: interpersonal relationships, assessment, intervention, research, ethics and standards, consultation, management, and supervision.

Moreover, from the perspective that the College would give its assent to these recommendations by adopting resolutions to this effect, the Committee on Education and Training formulates the following complementary recommendations:

1. That the Board mandate the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists to continue its work of documentation and follow-up with reference to the desired doctoral training, as well as its work in assessing programs together with the departments of psychology, in order to ensure that the concern for training that is sufficient for the practice of the profession is at the heart of every doctoral program which gives access to the profession.

2. That the Board mandate the Committee on Education and Training of Psychologists, together with the other authorities of the College, to sketch out the changes that must be made to present regulations regarding entry to the profession; and that these changes be submitted to the Board at one of its regular meetings before May, 2000.

3. That the Board mandate the Committee on Education and Training to work with the departments of psychology in order to sketch out a mid-career training policy for master's psychologists who would wish to complete a competency based professional doctorate; and that a report to this effect be submitted to the Board at one of its regular meetings before December, 2000.