August 11, 2017

Niels-Erik Andreasen  
President 
Andrews University  
Office of the President 
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

Dear President Andreasen,

At its meeting on July 13-16, 2017 the Commission on Accreditation conducted a review of the applicant doctoral Ph.D. program in Counseling psychology at Andrews University. This review included consideration of the program's initial self-study report, the preliminary review of November 22, 2016 and the program’s response to the preliminary review on February 22, 2017, the report of the team that visited the program on March 30-31, 2017, and the program's response to the site visit report on June 12, 2017.

On the basis of this review, the Commission on Accreditation (CoA) voted to award accreditation to this program, with the date of initial accreditation as March 31, 2017. In so doing, the Commission scheduled the next accreditation site visit to be held in 2020. During the interim, the program will be listed annually among accredited programs on the Accreditation web pages. The Commission also encourages you to share information about your program's accredited status with agencies and others of the public as appropriate.

The program received a three-year term of accreditation (calculated from the date of the last site visit) based on concerns that remain on several domain-related issues. The Commission would like to provide the program with a summary of the review which led to the decision to accredit for three years. This is provided below according to each of the accreditation domains. While concerns remain, the Commission believes the issues cited in this letter can be corrected in the near future. At the end of the letter, the program will be provided with an itemized list of any actions that the program needs to take prior to the next accreditation review.

---

**Domain A: Eligibility**

As a prerequisite for accreditation, the program's purpose must be within the scope of the accrediting body and must be pursued in an institutional setting appropriate for the doctoral education and training of professional psychologists.

The Counseling Ph.D. psychology program at Andrews University provides its written policies and procedures in its program materials. The time in training and residency requirements are
clear, and the program has developed strategies for tracking student progress that ensure residency requirements are met.

The program’s goals and objectives are consistent with the overarching goals of the college and the university, which is faith and service based. The program has policies in place to ensure that students are not evaluated based on factors not relevant to success.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain B: Program Philosophy, Objectives and Curriculum Plan**

*The program has a clearly specified philosophy of education and training, compatible with the mission of its sponsor institution and appropriate to the science and practice of psychology. The program’s education and training model and its curriculum plan are consistent with this philosophy.*

The program has identified a strategy for assessing sequential complexity, and has also integrated specific critical thinking and integration activities or processes into its courses. The program indicated that it has decided to identify its training model as practitioner-scholar, as this is currently in line with the state of the program (site visit report response [SVR-R], p. 1). However, the program webpage continues to identify the training model as scientist-practitioner. Under the *Standards of Accreditation (SoA)*, programs are not required to declare a specific training model; however, it should be clear how science and practice are integrated to meet program outcomes. By **September 1, 2018**, the program is asked to demonstrate that the integration of science and practice is in place.

A program’s curriculum plan must demonstrate that the content is representative of graduate level understanding and competence. For courses, this includes exposure to the existing and evolving body of general knowledge and methods in science and practice of psychology. For the following courses used to meet these requirements, it is unclear, upon review of syllabi, how the program ensures graduate level knowledge and competence, including exposure to the existing and evolving body of knowledge in the field: GDPC 644: *Psychological Testing*; GDPC 670: *Advanced Social Psychology*; GDPC 686: *Interventions and Diagnosis with Children and Adolescents*; GDPC 688: *Group Therapy*; EDRM 710: *Seminar in Research Methodology*; GDCP 735: *Clinician Self-assessment...Diverse Populations*; GDCP 750: *Personality Assessment*; GDCP 616: *Psychology of Religious Experience*; and GDCP 629: *Psychopathology.* By **September 1, 2018**, the program is asked to provide revised syllabi for these courses which demonstrate that students are exposed to graduate level knowledge and competence, including exposure to the existing and evolving body of knowledge in the field of psychology, consistent with Implementing Regulations (IR) C-7 D and C-8 D (attached).

**Domain C: Program Resources**

*The program demonstrates that it has resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its education and training goals.*
The program's physical facilities and training resources are sufficient to support the program mission. The university provides appropriate clerical, technical, and student support services. There appears to be a sufficient number of students for socialization and peer interactions.

The following courses are currently being taught by faculty trained in developmental and counseling psychology: GDPC 625: Biopsychology; GDPC 626: Cognitive and Affective Psychology; and GDPC 670: Advanced Social Psychology. The curriculum vitae (CVs) for the faculty who teach these courses do not provide information about their qualifications to teach these courses. By September 1, 2018, the program is asked to clarify how the faculty who teach GDPC 625, 626, and 670 are qualified to teach these courses, consistent with IR C-23 D (attached).

**Domain D: Cultural and Individual Differences and Diversity**

*The program recognizes the importance of cultural and individual differences and diversity in the training of psychologists.*

The program actively involves students and faculty in activities designed to increase their understanding of diversity. The program emphasizes the value it places on diversity, consistent with the university's strategic goals, throughout program materials.

The program's plan for recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and students provides specific steps and activities that the program is expected to follow in order to ensure representation of diverse groups. Within the paradigm of religious affiliation, the program engages in active recruitment of faculty. Student admissions are not influenced by religious affiliation.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations**

*The program demonstrates that its education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty and that it operates in a manner that facilitates students' educational experiences.*

The program provides ready access to grievance and due policy procedures, and they are consistent with the graduate school and the university. Students are made aware of these policies at orientation. Student evaluations occur at least annually, and the program has a series of steps it follows if students are not demonstrating competency. These steps are clearly outlined in the program handbook and online.

Student files are thoroughly maintained and there is evidence that students receive written evaluations in a timely fashion. Remediation plans are carefully monitored and the resolution and progress of students through remediation is recorded and appropriately maintained.

In the professional judgment of the CoA, it is unclear if the numerical data presented in the annual evaluations of students provides meaningful feedback regarding student progress through
the program. In its next self-study, the program is asked to clarify how its annual evaluations of students provides meaningful information regarding student progress through the program.

**Domain F: Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement**
The program demonstrates a commitment to excellence through self-study, which assures that its goals and objectives are met, enhances the quality of professional education and training obtained by its students, and contributes to the fulfillment of its sponsor institution’s mission.

The program invites feedback from students regarding the program and utilizes this feedback for self-assessment and quality enhancement purposes.

**Domain F.1(a): Outcome Data**
The program, with appropriate involvement from its students, engages in regular, ongoing self-studies that address its effectiveness in achieving program goals and objectives in terms of outcome data (i.e., while students are in the program and after completion).

The program has provided proximal (current student) and distal (program alumni) data that are clearly representative of program outcomes. The has used these data to foster program improvement and make changes to the curriculum.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain G: Public Disclosure**
The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure by providing written materials and other communications that appropriately represent it to the relevant publics.

The program provides ample description of its focus and purpose to training future counseling psychologists in its public materials.

As mentioned in Domain B, under the Standards of Accreditation (SoA), programs are not required to declare a specific training model; however, the program should clearly articulate how science and practice are integrated to meet program outcomes. By September 1, 2018, the program is asked to provide documentation that the integration of science and practice is described consistently across program materials.

The attrition table provided on the program’s website indicates that one doctoral degree was conferred in 2009-2010; however, this is when the program began. Therefore, it is unclear how the program conferred a student in 2009-2010. At the time of its next self-study, the program is asked to ensure that its attrition data are accurately reflected in its public materials. The program is also reminded of Implementing Regulation C-26 D which states that all accredited programs must provide education and training outcomes in the program’s public documents, including its website (attached).
Given that the program is now accredited, the program is reminded to include the name, address, and telephone number for the Commission on Accreditation in all public documents which cite its accreditation status, consistent with Implementing Regulation C-25 D (attached).

**Domain H: Relationship with Accrediting Body**

*The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process by fulfilling its responsibilities to the accrediting body from which its accredited status is granted.*

The program has responded in a timely fashion to numerous communications from the CoA during the application process.

As a newly accredited program, the Commission on Accreditation would like to remind you that all accredited programs must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner changes that could alter the program’s quality. A copy of Implementing Regulation C-27 D (Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs) is attached for your information. Also, please note that all accredited programs are required to complete the Annual Report Online (ARO). The Training Director will receive an email containing login information when it is time to complete the ARO. As such, it is extremely important that the program inform the CoA of any staff/faculty changes in a timely manner.

Since the program is now accredited, it is reminded that an annual fee will be billed in order for the program to maintain its accredited status.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

The program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by **September 1, 2018** for formal review by the Commission:

- Demonstrate that the integration of science and practice is in place.

- Provide revised syllabi for GDPC 644: *Psychological Testing*; GDPC 670: *Advanced Social Psychology*; GDPC 686: *Interventions and Diagnosis with Children and Adolescents*; GDPC 688: *Group Therapy*; EDRM 710: *Seminar in Research Methodology*; GDCP 735: *Clinician Self-assessment...Diverse Populations*; GDCP 750: *Personality Assessment*; GDCP 616: *Psychology of Religious Experience*; and GDCP 629: *Psychopathology* which demonstrate that students are exposed to graduate level knowledge and competence, including exposure to the existing and evolving body of knowledge in the field of psychology, consistent with IRs C-7 D and C-8 D.

- Clarify how the faculty who teach GDPC 625, 626, and 670 are qualified to teach these courses, consistent with IR C-23 D.

- Provide documentation that the integration of science and practice is described consistently across program materials.
The program’s response to the items listed above should be identified as ‘Narrative Response – Program Review’ and mailed or faxed to the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation by the designated due date.

The accreditation website (www.apa.org/ed/accreditation) provides important updates and policy changes related to the accreditation process. As an accredited program, we encourage you to periodically visit the website to remain current on all new accreditation policies.

Please note that the new Standards of Accreditation (SoA) are now in effect. Additional information on the SoA and the 2017 implementation and transition to the new standards can be found on the accreditation website at http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/accreditation-roadmap.aspx. Please contact the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation with any questions related to the SoA.

In closing, on behalf of the Commission on Accreditation, I extend congratulations to the faculty and students of the program for their achievements. The Commission also expresses its appreciation for your personal commitment, and the corresponding support of your administration, to develop and maintain the best possible quality of graduate education and training in psychology. If the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation may be of service at any time on administrative matters of accreditation, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Remondet Wall, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation

cc: Robson Marinho, Professor, School of Education Dean
Rudolph Bailey, Professor, Dept. Chair
Carole Woolford-Hunt, Associate Professor, Program Coordinator, Counseling Psychology
Mark Leach, Ph.D., Site Visit Team Chair
Debra Mollen, Ph.D., Site Visit Team Member
Steve Schwartz, Ph.D., Site Visit Team Generalist
C-7 D. Discipline-Specific Knowledge
(Commission on Accreditation, November 2015; revised, July 2017)

Discipline-specific knowledge serves as a cornerstone of identity as a psychologist and orientation to health service psychology. Therefore, all students in accredited doctoral programs shall demonstrate knowledge in the discipline of psychology, broadly construed. This discipline-specific knowledge base shall include: 1) the history and systems of psychology, 2) basic knowledge in scientific psychology, 3) integrative knowledge in scientific psychology, and 4) methods of inquiry and research.

**Discipline-specific knowledge**, as it is articulated in the Standards of Accreditation (Doctoral Standards, II.B.1.a):

a. Discipline-specific knowledge represents the requisite core knowledge of psychology an individual must have to attain the profession-wide competencies. Programs may elect to demonstrate discipline-specific knowledge of students by:

   i. Using student selection criteria that involve standardized assessments of a foundational knowledge base (e.g., GRE subject tests). In this case, the program must describe how the curriculum builds upon this foundational knowledge to enable students to demonstrate graduate level discipline-specific knowledge.

   ii. Providing students with broad exposure to discipline-specific knowledge. In this case, the program is not required to demonstrate that students have specific foundational knowledge at entry, but must describe how the program's curriculum enables students to demonstrate graduate-level discipline-specific knowledge.

For purposes of this Implementing Regulation, there are four categories of discipline-specific knowledge.

**Category 1: History and Systems of Psychology**

- **History and Systems of Psychology**, including the origins and development of major ideas in the discipline of psychology.

**Category 2: Basic Content Areas in Scientific Psychology.**

- **Affective Aspects of Behavior**, including topics such as affect, mood, and emotion. Psychopathology and mood disorders do not by themselves fulfill this category.

- **Biological Aspects of Behavior**, including multiple biological underpinnings of behavior, such as neural, physiological, anatomical, and genetic aspects of behavior. Although neuropsychological assessment and psychopharmacology can be included in this category, they do not, by themselves, fulfill this category.

- **Cognitive Aspects of Behavior**, including topics such as learning, memory, thought processes, and decision-making. Cognitive testing and cognitive therapy do not, by themselves, fulfill this category.

- **Developmental Aspects of Behavior**, including transitions, growth, and development across an individual's life. A coverage limited to one developmental period (e.g., infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, or late life) is not sufficient.

- **Social Aspects of Behavior**, including topics such as group processes, attributions, discrimination, and attitudes. Individual and cultural diversity and group or family therapy do not, by themselves, fulfill this category.
Category 3: Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Scientific Psychology.

- **Advanced Integrative Knowledge of Basic Discipline-Specific Content Areas**, including graduate-level scientific knowledge that entails integration of multiple basic discipline-specific content areas identified in Category 2 (i.e., integration of at least two of: affective, biological, cognitive, social, or developmental aspects of behavior). Advanced integrative knowledge in Category 2 areas can be acquired in either of two ways: 1) an evaluated educational experience that integrates at least two Category 2 content areas that have been previously covered through other methods; or 2) an evaluated educational experience that provides basic coverage in two or more areas and integration across those areas.

Category 4: Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics

- **Research Methods**, including topics such as strengths, limitations, interpretation, and technical aspects of rigorous case study; correlational, experimental, and other quantitative research designs; measurement techniques; sampling; replication; theory testing; qualitative methods; mixed methods; meta-analysis; and quasi-experimentation.

- **Statistical Analysis**, including topics such as quantitative, mathematical modeling and analysis of psychological data, statistical description and inference, univariate and multivariate analysis, null-hypothesis testing and its alternatives, power, and estimation.

- **Psychometrics**, including topics such as theory and techniques of psychological measurement, scale and inventory construction, reliability, validity, evaluation of measurement quality, classical and contemporary measurement theory, and standardization.

Overarching considerations that apply to all aspects of DSK

Several aspects of this IR are intentionally written broadly in order to allow programs to design curricula that are consistent with their aims, the training needs of their students, and evolutions in the field. The narrative descriptions provided within the bullet points above for each of the discipline-specific content areas are not checklists of required topics; rather, they are examples of the sorts of topics that may be included. For example, under Category 4, all programs are expected to provide evaluated doctoral-level experience in research methods, statistical analysis, and psychometrics; however, different programs may elect to include customized topics within those broad headings.

Considerations specific to Category 1 (History and Systems)

The History and Systems requirement is the only portion of the DSK that may be accomplished entirely prior to matriculation into the doctoral program and/or through undergraduate-level work after matriculation into the doctoral program. Alternatively, programs may choose to cover this domain of knowledge at the graduate rather than the undergraduate level. Refer to the section below entitled *Foundational knowledge attained outside of the doctoral program* for information about evaluation of these types of educational experiences.

Considerations specific to Category 2 (Basic Content Areas in Scientific Psychology)

---

1 Evaluated educational experience: a learning experience (e.g., course, parts of courses, or independent study) the outcome of which is assessed by a person recognized as having current knowledge and expertise in the area of the learning experience.
The SoA distinguishes between 1) foundational knowledge of DSK, which may be acquired prior to matriculation into the doctoral program, at the undergraduate level after entering the doctoral program, or through graduate-level training, and 2) graduate-level knowledge of DSK.

As required by the SoA, programs must demonstrate that students are provided with the opportunity to acquire and be evaluated on Category 2 discipline-specific knowledge at the graduate level. In evaluating whether a program has provided sufficient coverage of the DSK, the CoA will require documentation that, at program completion, each of its students has demonstrated sufficient knowledge in each Category 2 area to allow 1) graduate-level interaction with the scientific literature that draws on these categories and 2) an understanding of the scientific foundations of the Profession-Wide Competencies. Refer to the section below entitled Graduate-Level Training for information about how the curriculum will be evaluated by CoA to ensure sufficient graduate-level coverage.

It is understood that accredited programs will vary in the amount of foundational knowledge of the DSK that is expected at program entry; also, within a single program, students may have variable knowledge bases at program entry. For some programs, rigorous entry criteria will result in the need for less emphasis on foundational content within the doctoral program and more extensive coverage of graduate-level knowledge of DSK. By establishing foundational knowledge in this manner, trainees will demonstrate considerable depth of knowledge when the entirety of their educational records are considered, despite relatively less emphasis on foundational material during doctoral training. In contrast, for programs that admit students with less undergraduate education in foundational knowledge of the DSK, the entire curriculum (both foundational knowledge and graduate-level knowledge) may be taught during doctoral training.

*It is not consistent with the SoA for the entirety of a student’s education in the DSK to occur prior to matriculation into the doctoral program or through undergraduate coursework following matriculation into the doctoral program.*

Coverage of graduate-level discipline-specific knowledge within an accredited program may be provided through coursework (e.g., individual courses or material infused across multiple courses) or through other evaluated educational experiences (e.g., research requirements, qualifying examinations, or other methods). Programs must provide a minimum of one integrative evaluated educational experience (Category 3: Advanced Integrative Knowledge), but it is permissible to achieve multiple required graduate-level competencies in DSK through one or more integrative experiences.

Regardless of the method by which a program chooses to satisfy the discipline-specific knowledge requirement, the program must document how each student demonstrates graduate-level knowledge in the relevant content areas. The program must also document procedures for ensuring the curriculum plan in these content areas is developed, provided, and evaluated by faculty who are well qualified in the content areas as specified in IR C-23D.

**Evaluating graduate-level training**

Graduate-level training must include evidence of graduate students’ exposure to knowledge through a curricular experience that utilizes primary source materials (including original empirical work that represents the current state of the area), emphasizes critical thinking and communication at an advanced level, and facilitates integration of discipline-specific knowledge with the program’s substantive area(s) of practice.
As programs work to confirm that their graduate-level training and evaluation is sufficient to meet these criteria, they are advised to ensure that students are interacting with current primary source materials and that they are evaluated in part on their ability to communicate critical thinking at an advanced level.

**Evaluating foundational knowledge attained outside of the doctoral program**

Programs that permit the attainment of foundational Category 1 and/or Category 2 knowledge through experiences that were not acquired within the accredited program bear a significant responsibility for documenting the quality/rigor, currency, standardization, and fairness of the method for establishing students’ knowledge.

If programs permit students to attain foundational knowledge of Category 1 or 2 areas of DSK outside of their doctoral training (i.e., prior to matriculation or through undergraduate coursework they may enroll in while they are also doctoral students), it is incumbent upon programs to develop and implement systematic processes to evaluate each individual student’s foundational knowledge. The CoA will assess the extent to which these systematic processes are:

- Relevant to the required discipline-specific knowledge areas (i.e., history and systems; affective, biological, cognitive, social, or developmental aspects of behavior).
- Sufficiently rigorous to demonstrate students’ substantial understanding of discipline-specific knowledge.
- Appropriate for the program’s intended use.
- Free from discrimination on bases irrelevant to success in the doctoral program.
- Based on a substantial educational experience that included evaluation of knowledge contemporaneous with the experience (e.g., a course for which the instructor assigned a grade at course completion, rather than an activity completed in the remote past that was evaluated post hoc by a member of the doctoral faculty).

The SoA lists the GRE subject test as an example of a standardized test; however, the CoA does not mean to imply that this is the only or the preferred method of evaluation. The Major Field Test or other standardized evaluations of knowledge in scientific psychology may also be appropriate, as may evaluations developed at the program level (e.g., tests of knowledge at program entry designed by the doctoral program). In addition, there are several instances in which the GRE subject test may not be an appropriate evaluation method for a program (e.g., if it does not evaluate the required areas of knowledge, is not considered appropriate for the program’s use, or discriminates against specific applicants on bases irrelevant to success in the program). The CoA anticipates that assessment methods will evolve as demand for them increases.

At times a program may determine that its evaluation methods or minimum criteria could inadvertently discriminate against an individual student on the basis of issues irrelevant to success in the doctoral program. In this case, the program should utilize alternative methods and corresponding criteria and document this determination process and the specific criteria used.

**Considerations specific to Category 3 (Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Scientific Psychology)**

The Advanced Integrative Knowledge category must be achieved entirely at the graduate level.
Considerations specific to Category 4 (Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics)

The Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics category of DSK must be achieved entirely at the graduate level. It is not required that coverage of Statistical Analysis or Psychometrics include original source materials.
C-8 D Profession-Wide Competencies

(Commission on Accreditation, October 2015; draft revised for public comment, November 2016; revised July 2017)

Introduction

The Commission on Accreditation (CoA) requires that all trainees who complete accredited training programs, regardless of substantive practice area, degree type, or level of training, develop certain competencies as part of their preparation for practice in health service psychology (HSP). The CoA evaluates a program’s adherence to this standard in the context of the SoA sections that articulate profession-wide competencies at the doctoral (Section II.B.1.b), (Section II.B.1) levels.

This Implementing Regulation refers specifically to aspects of a program’s curriculum or training relevant to acquisition and demonstration of the profession-wide competencies required in all accredited programs. The CoA acknowledges that programs may use a variety of methods to ensure trainee competence, consistent with their program aim(s), degree type, and level of training. However, all programs must adhere to the following training requirements:

- **Consistency with the professional value of individual and cultural diversity** (SoA Introduction, Section II.B). Although Individual and Cultural Diversity is a profession-wide competency, the CoA expects that appropriate training and attention to diversity will also be incorporated into each of the other profession-wide competencies, consistent with SoA Introduction, Section II.B.2.a.

- **Consistency with the existing and evolving body of general knowledge and methods in the science and practice of psychology** (SoA Introduction, Section II.B.2.d). The CoA expects that all profession-wide competencies will be grounded, to the greatest extent possible, in the existing empirical literature and in a scientific orientation toward psychological knowledge and methods.

- **Level-appropriate training.** The CoA expects that training in profession-wide competencies at the doctoral and internship levels will provide broad and general preparation for entry level independent practice and licensure (SoA Introduction, Section II.B.2.b) Training at the postdoctoral level will provide advanced preparation for practice (SoA Introduction, Section II.B.2.c). For postdoctoral programs that are accredited in a specialty area rather than a developed practice area of HSP, the program will provide advanced preparation for practice within the specialty.

- **Level-appropriate expectations.** The CoA expects that programs will require trainee demonstrations of profession-wide competencies that differ according to the level of training provided (i.e., doctoral, internship, post-doctoral). In general, trainees are expected to demonstrate each profession-wide competency with increasing levels of independence and complexity as they progress across levels of training.

- **Evaluation of trainee competence.** The CoA expects that evaluation of trainees’ competence in each required profession-wide competency area will be an integral part of the curriculum, with evaluation methods and minimum levels of performance that are consistent with the SoA (e.g., for clinical competencies, evaluations are based at least in part on direct observation; evaluations are consistent with best practices in student competency evaluation).
I. Research
This competency is required at the doctoral and internship levels. Demonstration of the integration of science and practice, but not the demonstration of research competency per se, is required at the post-doctoral level.

The CoA recognizes science as the foundation of HSP. Individuals who successfully complete programs accredited in HSP must demonstrate knowledge, skills, and competence sufficient to produce new knowledge, to critically evaluate and use existing knowledge to solve problems, and to disseminate research. This area of competence requires substantial knowledge of scientific methods, procedures, and practices. Trainees are expected to:

Doctoral students:

- Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.
- Conduct research or other scholarly activities.
- Critically evaluate and disseminate research or other scholarly activity via professional publication and presentation at the local (including the host institution), regional, or national level.

Interns:

- Demonstrates the substantially independent ability to critically evaluate and disseminate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., case conference, presentation, publications) at the local (including the host institution), regional, or national level.

II. Ethical and legal standards
This competency is required at the doctoral, internship, and post-doctoral levels. Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence across levels of training.

Trainees at all levels are expected to demonstrate competency in each of the following areas:

- Be knowledgeable of and act in accordance with each of the following:
  - the current version of the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct;
  - relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies governing health service psychology at the organizational, local, state, regional, and federal levels; and
  - relevant professional standards and guidelines.

- Recognize ethical dilemmas as they arise, and apply ethical decision-making processes in order to resolve the dilemmas.

- Conduct self in an ethical manner in all professional activities.
III. Individual and cultural diversity
This competency is required at the doctoral, internship, and post-doctoral levels.

Effectiveness in health service psychology requires that trainees develop the ability to conduct all professional activities with sensitivity to human diversity, including the ability to deliver high quality services to an increasingly diverse population. Therefore, trainees must demonstrate knowledge, awareness, sensitivity, and skills when working with diverse individuals and communities who embody a variety of cultural and personal background and characteristics. The Commission on Accreditation defines cultural and individual differences and diversity as including, but not limited to, age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, language, national origin, race, religion, culture, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. The CoA recognizes that development of competence in working with individuals of every variation of cultural or individual difference is not reasonable or feasible.

Trainees at all levels are expected to demonstrate:

- an understanding of how their own personal/cultural history, attitudes, and biases may affect how they understand and interact with people different from themselves;

- knowledge of the current theoretical and empirical knowledge base as it relates to addressing diversity in all professional activities including research, training, supervision/consultation, and service;

- the ability to integrate awareness and knowledge of individual and cultural differences in the conduct of professional roles (e.g., research, services, and other professional activities). This includes the ability to apply a framework for working effectively with areas of individual and cultural diversity not previously encountered over the course of their careers. Also included is the ability to work effectively with individuals whose group membership, demographic characteristics, or viewpoints create conflict with their own.

Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence as they progress across levels of training. Trainees are expected to:

Doctoral students:
- Demonstrate the requisite knowledge base, ability to articulate an approach to working effectively with diverse individuals and groups, and apply this approach effectively in their professional work.

Interns:
- Demonstrate the ability to independently apply their knowledge and approach in working effectively with the range of diverse individuals and groups encountered during internship.

Post-doctoral residents:
- Demonstrate the ability to independently apply their knowledge and demonstrate effectiveness in working with the range of diverse individuals and groups encountered during residency, tailored to the learning needs and opportunities consistent with the program's aim(s).

IV. Professional values and attitudes
This competency is required at the doctoral and internship levels. Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence across levels of training.

**Doctoral students and Interns** are expected to:

- behave in ways that reflect the values and attitudes of psychology, including integrity, deportment, professional identity, accountability, lifelong learning, and concern for the welfare of others.

- engage in self-reflection regarding one’s personal and professional functioning; engage in activities to maintain and improve performance, well-being, and professional effectiveness.

- actively seek and demonstrate openness and responsiveness to feedback and supervision.

- respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence as they progress across levels of training.

**V. Communication and interpersonal skills**

This competency is required at the doctoral and internship levels. Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence across levels of training.

The CoA views communication and interpersonal skills as foundational to education, training, and practice in health service psychology. These skills are essential for any service delivery/activity/interaction, and are evident across the program’s expected competencies.

**Doctoral students and interns** are expected to:

- develop and maintain effective relationships with a wide range of individuals, including colleagues, communities, organizations, supervisors, supervisees, and those receiving professional services.

- produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and written communications that are informative and well-integrated; demonstrate a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.

- demonstrate effective interpersonal skills and the ability to manage difficult communication well.

**VI. Assessment**

This competency is required at the doctoral and internship levels. Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence across levels of training.

Trainees demonstrate competence in conducting evidence-based assessment consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology.

**Doctoral students and Interns** are expected to:

- Demonstrate current knowledge of diagnostic classification systems, functional and dysfunctional behaviors, including consideration of client strengths and psychopathology.
• Demonstrate understanding of human behavior within its context (e.g., family, social, societal and cultural).

• Demonstrate the ability to apply the knowledge of functional and dysfunctional behaviors including context to the assessment and/or diagnostic process.

• Select and apply assessment methods that draw from the best available empirical literature and that reflect the science of measurement and psychometrics; collect relevant data using multiple sources and methods appropriate to the identified goals and questions of the assessment as well as relevant diversity characteristics of the service recipient.

• Interpret assessment results, following current research and professional standards and guidelines, to inform case conceptualization, classification, and recommendations, while guarding against decision-making biases, distinguishing the aspects of assessment that are subjective from those that are objective.

• Communicate orally and in written documents the findings and implications of the assessment in an accurate and effective manner sensitive to a range of audiences.

VII. Intervention
This competency is required at the doctoral and internship levels. Trainees are expected to respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence across levels of training.

Trainees demonstrate competence in evidence-based interventions consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology. Intervention is being defined broadly to include but not be limited to psychotherapy. Interventions may be derived from a variety of theoretical orientations or approaches. The level of intervention includes those directed at an individual, a family, a group, an organization, a community, a population or other systems.

Doctoral students and Interns are expected to demonstrate the ability to:

• establish and maintain effective relationships with the recipients of psychological services.
• develop evidence-based intervention plans specific to the service delivery goals.
• implement interventions informed by the current scientific literature, assessment findings, diversity characteristics, and contextual variables.
• demonstrate the ability to apply the relevant research literature to clinical decision making.
• modify and adapt evidence-based approaches effectively when a clear evidence-base is lacking,
• evaluate intervention effectiveness, and adapt intervention goals and methods consistent with ongoing evaluation.

VIII. Supervision
This competency is required at the doctoral and internship level.

The CoA views supervision as grounded in science and integral to the activities of health service psychology. Supervision involves the mentoring and monitoring of trainees and others in the development of competence and skill in professional practice and the effective evaluation of those skills.
Supervisors act as role models and maintain responsibility for the activities they oversee. Trainees are expected to:

**Doctoral students:**

- Demonstrate knowledge of supervision models and practices.

**Interns:**

- Apply this knowledge in direct or simulated practice with psychology trainees, or other health professionals. Examples of direct or simulated practice examples of supervision include, but are not limited to, role-played supervision with others, and peer supervision with other trainees.

**IX. Consultation and interprofessional/interdisciplinary skills**

This competency is required at the doctoral and internship level.

The CoA views consultation and interprofessional/interdisciplinary interaction as integral to the activities of health service psychology. Consultation and interprofessional/interdisciplinary skills are reflected in the intentional collaboration of professionals in health service psychology with other individuals or groups to address a problem, seek or share knowledge, or promote effectiveness in professional activities. Trainees are expected to:

**Doctoral students and Interns:**

- Demonstrate knowledge and respect for the roles and perspectives of other professions.

**Doctoral students:**

- Demonstrates knowledge of consultation models and practices.

**Interns:**

- Apply this knowledge in direct or simulated consultation with individuals and their families, other health care professionals, interprofessional groups, or systems related to health and behavior.

Direct or simulated practice examples of consultation and interprofessional/interdisciplinary skills include but are not limited to:

- role-played consultation with others.
- peer consultation, provision of consultation to other trainees.
Faculty qualifications. Individual faculty may fulfill multiple roles within a program (e.g., teaching, clinical and/or research supervision, administration). In terms of program policy, it is the program's responsibility to specify clearly articulated procedures for ensuring appropriate faculty training, current expertise, and effectiveness for each role they fulfill in the program. If such procedures exist in an administrative unit higher than the program, then the program must demonstrate how it has sufficient input or oversight to ensure training consistent with accreditation standards.

In terms of self-study content, it is the program's responsibility to provide clear and specific evidence in the self-study that faculty are appropriately qualified for each role that they hold in the program. That evidence should include current and relevant expertise (e.g., board certification, formal or other post-doctoral training, systematic study, ongoing professional development, research productivity, clinical competence, professional credential, academic degree/area of study, respecialization).
C-25 D. Accreditation Status and CoA Contact Information
(formerly C-6(b); Commission on Accreditation; November 2010; revised March 2015, November 2015)

Standard V.A.1.b of the Standards of Accreditation (SoA) for doctoral programs states that the program must include in its public materials:

"The program must disclose its status with regard to accreditation, including the specific academic program covered by that status, and the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission on Accreditation. The program should make available, as appropriate through its sponsor institution, such reports or other materials as pertain to the program's accreditation status."

Programs that are accredited by agencies recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (e.g., CoA) are required to provide the contact information for the accrediting body when the accreditation status is cited. The intent of this Implementing Regulation is to clarify how this information should be presented in order to ensure consistency across programs as well as provide useful information to the public.

**Accreditation status:**
- For doctoral programs the only official accredited statuses are: “Accredited on contingency,” “Accredited,” “Accredited on probation,” and “Accredited inactive,”
- Programs may indicate their appropriate status (see above) by referring to “APA” accredited or accredited “by the Commission on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association,” For example, “APA-accredited,” APA-accredited on contingency,” “accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association, “accredited on contingency by the Commission on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association,” etc.
- Programs should not use the term “APA-approved,” since at APA this term is used to denote approved sponsors of continuing education rather than accreditation of academic/training programs.
- If there are multiple programs in the same department, institution, or agency, it should be clearly indicated in public materials which programs are APA-accredited. Multiple accredited programs should refer to their accredited status individually and in accordance with IR C-24 D.

**CoA contact information:**
- In ALL public documents, including the program’s website (if applicable), where the program’s accreditation status is cited as above, the name and contact information for the CoA must be provided.
- Information must include the address and direct telephone number for the APA Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation. Other information (i.e., website, e-mail address) may also be included.
- Programs should clarify that this contact information should be used for questions related to the program’s accreditation status. In doing so, the program should also ensure that its own contact information is clearly indicated in its materials so that the public knows how to contact the program directly with any other questions.
- Programs are encouraged to use the following format to provide this information:

*Questions related to the program’s accredited status should be directed to the Commission on Accreditation:

Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation
American Psychological Association
750 1st Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002*
Phone: (202) 336-5979 / E-mail: apaaccred@apa.org
Web: www.apa.org/ed/accreditation
C-26 D. Disclosure of Education/Training Outcomes and Information Allowing for Informed Decision-Making to Prospective Doctoral Students

Standard V of the Standards of Accreditation (SoA) requires that doctoral graduate programs provide potential students, current students, and the public with accurate information on the program and on program expectations. This information is meant to describe the program accurately and completely, using the most up-to-date data on education and training outcomes, and be presented in a manner that allows applicants to make informed decisions about entering the program.

The CoA requires accredited programs to update the data tables annually and post the information in its public materials (e.g. website) by October 1 each year. Failure to update the information is as much of a concern as failure to provide the necessary information in the required format. After October 1, the Commission will review programs’ compliance with the below requirements and that the data provided are consistent with the program’s data from the Annual Report Online (ARO).

Presentation of Required Information
To ensure that the required information for each program is available to the public in a consistent fashion, the following provisions are required:

- The information must all be located in a single place and be titled “Student Admissions, Outcomes, and Other Data”;
- If the program has a website, the information must be located no more than one-click away from the main/home doctoral landing page; and (see update to this provision below)
- The link from the main/home doctoral landing page to the required information must also be titled “Student Admissions, Outcomes, and Other Data”;
- The data must be presented in tables consistent with those listed at the end of this regulation. Programs may choose to provide other data to supplement the requirements of this regulation, but these tables must be provided. If the program chooses to provide supplemental information, it should be provided below the corresponding required tables.
- Table cells should not be left blank; instead, please enter a “0” if not applicable except where indicated in table

Because the information required should include those education and training outcomes that will allow applicants to make informed and comparative decisions, the Commission requires that all doctoral programs minimally provide the following to prospective students in its public materials, including its website, if it has one: 1) time to program completion; 2) program costs (tuition and fees) and fellowships and other funding available; 3) internship acceptance rates; 4) student attrition rates; and 5) licensure outcomes. These are defined as follows:

1. Time to Completion

Time to completion must be presented in two ways:

*For the purposes of this Implementing Regulation, only students that have had their doctoral degrees conferred on their transcripts are considered “graduates”. “Time to completion” is the amount of time between the date of entry into the program and the date of program completion on the official transcript.
• First, programs must provide the **mean** and the **median** number of years that students have taken to complete the program from the time of first matriculation. These data should be provided for all graduates* in each of the past ten (10) years.

• Second, the program should provide the percentage of students completing the program in fewer than five years, five years, six years, seven years, and more than seven years.

In a text box below the table, programs must also note any admissions policies that allow students to enter with credit for prior graduate work and the expected implications for time to completion.

2. Program Costs

Programs are expected to make available the total costs per student for the current first year cohort. This information should include full-time student tuition, tuition per credit hour for part-time students, and any fees or costs required of students beyond tuition costs. For example, if a program requires students to travel to attend a mandatory component of the program, the estimated costs of this travel should be included as well. Programs may also provide information regarding current adjustments to tuition including, but not limited to: financial aid, grants, loans, tuition remission, assistantships, and fellowships. Even if program cost information is provided elsewhere on another university or other site, it must be provided in the doctoral program’s materials as well.

NOTE: Please enter discrete dollar values in the Program Costs table and not percentages. For instance, if the program covers students’ full costs within a category, please enter “$0” in that cell.

3. Internships

Programs are expected to provide data on students’ success in obtaining internships. The program is required to report for each of the past ten (10) years:

• The total number of students who sought or applied for internships
• The number and percent of total who obtained internships
• The number and percent of total who obtained APA/CPA-accredited internships
• The number and percent of total who obtained APPIC member internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)
• The number and percent of total who obtained other membership organization internships (e.g., CAPIC) that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)
• The number and percent of total who obtained internships conforming to CDSPP guidelines (school psychology programs only) that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)
• The number and percent of total who obtained other internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)
• The number and percent of total who obtained paid internships
• The number and percent of total who obtained half-time internships (if applicable)

NOTES: In calculating the above percentages, the program must base these on the total number of students who sought or who applied for internship in each year, including those that withdrew from the application process. To ensure readability and understanding for prospective students, Internship Placement-Table 1 and Internship Placement-Table 2 must be presented separately.

*For the purposes of this Implementing Regulation, only students that have had their doctoral degrees conferred on their transcripts are considered "graduates". “Time to completion” is the amount of time between the date of entry into the program and the date of program completion on the official transcript.
4. Attrition

Programs must report the number and percentage of students who have failed to complete the program once enrolled. These data should be calculated for each entering cohort by dividing the number of students in that cohort who have left the program for any reason by the total number of students initially enrolled in that same cohort. These data should be provided by cohort for all students who have left the program in the last ten (10) years or for all students who have left since the program became initially accredited, whichever time period is shorter.

5. Licensure

Reporting of program licensure data is an expectation of the US Secretary of Education’s National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for program accreditors, including the APA Commission on Accreditation. As such, programs must report the number and percentage of program graduates* who have become licensed psychologists within the preceding decade. In calculating the licensure percentage:

- The denominator is the total number of program graduates between 2 and 10 years ago
- The numerator is the number of these graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years
- The licensure percentage, then, is calculated by dividing the number of graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years by the number of graduates during the 8 year span from 2 to 10 years ago. For example, the figures reported by a program for 2017 would be number of graduates from the program between 2007 and 2017 who have achieved licensure in the past 10 years divided by the total number of students graduating from the program between 2007 and 2017

Programs may clarify their licensure rate for the public in light of their training model and program aims.

*Please refer to footnote on first page of this Implementing Regulation for definition of graduates.
*Please refer to footnote on first page of this Implementing Regulation for definition of graduates.
Time to Completion for all students entering the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students with doctoral degree conferred on transcript</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of years to complete the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of years to complete the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Degree Ranges</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in less than 5 years</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 5 years</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 6 years</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 7 years</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in more than 7 years</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (b+c+d+e+f)=a each year; (g+h+i+j+k)=100 each year

Also, please describe or provide a link to program admissions policies that allow students to enter with credit for prior graduate work, an the expected implications for time to completion. Please indicate NA if not applicable:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017-2018 1st-year Cohort Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition for full-time students (in-state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition for full-time students (out-of-state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition per credit hour for part-time students <em>(if applicable enter amount; if not applicable enter &quot;NA&quot;)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/institution fees or costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional estimated fees or costs to students (e.g. books, travel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained APA/CPA-accredited internships*</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained APPIC member internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained other membership organization internships (e.g. CAPIC) that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained internships conforming to CDSPP guidelines that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained other internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited (if applicable)</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained any internship</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who sought or applied for internships including those who withdrew from the application process</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This includes students that withdrew from the internship application process.

Note: h = b / a x 100; (c+d+e+f+g) = b each year; (i+j+k+l+m) = h each year
### Internship Placement - Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year Applied for Internship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who sought or applied for internships including those who withdrew from the application process</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained paid internships</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained half-time internships* (if applicable)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cell "o" should only include students who applied for internships and are included in cell "g" from "Internship Placement - Table 1."

**Note:** \( p = n/g \times 100; \quad q = o/g \times 100 \)

### Attrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Year of First Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students for whom this is the year of first enrollment (i.e. new students)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students whose doctoral degrees were conferred on their transcripts</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students still enrolled in program</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students no longer enrolled for any reason other than conferral of doctoral degree</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** \( (b+c+d) = a \) each year; \( (e+f+g) = 100 \) each year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2005-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The total number of program graduates (doctoral degrees conferred on transcript) between 2 and 10 years ago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of these graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C-27 D. Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs
(formerly C-19; Commission on Accreditation, February 2005; revised October 2006, November 2015)

In accordance with Standard V.B.2 of the Standards of Accreditation (SoA) and Section 8.7 D of the Accreditation Operating Procedures (AOP), all accredited programs whether under a single administrative entity or in a consortium, must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes that could alter the program's quality.

The Commission on Accreditation (CoA) must be informed in advance of major program changes such as changes in degree offered, policies/procedures, administrative structure, faculty resources, supervision resources, area of emphases, or tracks/rotations. In the case of doctoral programs, this includes changes in the areas of emphasis.

Programs must submit to the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation a detailed written description of the proposed change(s) and the potential impact upon the relevant accreditation standards. The CoA will review the program change(s) and may request additional information or a new self-study. In the case of a substantive change (such as a change in consortium membership), the Commission may also determine that a site visit is needed to assess whether the revised program is consistent with the SoA. Upon completion of this review, the Commission will note the proposed change and include the information in the next scheduled review or inform the program of any needed immediate additional actions.

The only exception to the policy of informing the Commission in advance is the occurrence of an unavoidable event beyond the reasonable control and anticipation of the program (e.g., educational/training site unexpectedly withdrawing from a consortium because of financial crisis; resources affected by a natural disaster). In such circumstances, it is incumbent upon the program to immediately inform the CoA in writing of the change and to include in its notification a proposed plan for maintaining program consistency with the SoA. The CoA will then proceed as above.

Consultation on program changes is available from the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation.