

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCHOOLS
AND PROGRAMS
OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**A SELF-STUDY
of
QUALITY ASSURANCE, QUALITY
ENHANCEMENT, QUALITY CONTROL
AND STANDARDS IN PROFESSIONAL
PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING**

1993 – 1996

Running Head: STUDY II OVERVIEW OF NCSPP ARTICLES

Standards for Education in Professional Psychology:

A Self-Study

James E. Dobbins

Wright State University

Standards for Education in Professional Psychology:

A Self-Study

Ivin Toffler, projects the twenty first century as an era when information rich environments will characterize the development of an information rich world culture (Toffler, 1990). He especially believes that methods and paradigms like those commonly used by psychologists will be needed to help groups and individuals cope with the stresses of technology as well as the inherent problems associated with intercultural communication. Toffler is interpreted as saying that there are sufficient human and systems problems to keep psychology busy well into the next century. His pronouncement further encourages us to focus attention on new roles for psychologists while also maintaining an identity based on traditional skills. Professional psychologists in particular have applied themselves to the challenge of developing a program of self study which has enabled practitioner based training to keep pace with emergent societal, organizational, and business trends.

Callan (1986) reminds us that professional psychology, like most educational fields, has need to take inventory in order to manage its development and processes for implementing change. Proactive to this challenge, the National Counsel of Schools and Programs in Professional Psychology (NCSPP) have conducted two self-studies over the past decade which have shown great utility for guiding the advancement of practitioner-based training.

At the time of the initial self-study (Study I) in 1983-1986, the NCSPP had reached consensus on a set of formal framing resolutions which were organized into three domains of aspirational goals. General (training), Curriculum, and Evaluation Resolutions. These goals were made operational by applying them to an evaluation of Quality Enhancement and Quality

Assurance outcomes in training. Quality Assurance is a well known term which speaks to the establishment of concepts and procedures designed to guide, monitor, and evaluate the production of quality practice according to specified forms and functions (Bent, 1986). Quality Enhancement is the specification of how well training outcomes not only reflect training goals but also how quality assurance provides added value to performance and outcomes. Said differently, Quality Enhancement speaks to how well we meet aspirational goals and the degree to which the process of goal achievement promotes the establishment of agreed upon standards. In general, however, Study I focused more on Quality Assurance than Quality Enhancement. Study II is by definition designed to assess how the field has grown and elaborated its training methods and procedures. It will therefore examine the impact of professional training in a Quality Enhancement way more so than Study I.

It may also be helpful to state how Study I .has informed the design and implementation of Study II. For example, if we view standards as a reflection of how we allocate budgets, faculty and students, such an analysis is key to any examination of quality assurance and quality enhancement. Summarily, these sources of information were used much more extensively in Study II than in Study I. A second area where Study 1 informed Study II was in data collection. It was stated by some critics that Study I data was over interpreted because it was collected from a relatively small number of NCSPP representatives who provided data on almost all of the sampling procedures. This was corrected in Study II which specifically used direct input from faculty, alumni and students. Consideration was also given to how we might derive input from external organizational, regulatory and client populations. In the interest of time and controls, sampling was circumscribed to students, alumni and faculty although external organizations and

client populations are considered a logical next step in the long term program of self-study.

Another dimension where Study I informed Study II concerned the issue of commonly held dichotomies. In Study I dichotomies such as the type of school or the settings of schools were presumed to carry large sources of variance. However, the observation of dichotomies in Study I turned out to be almost non-significant across all categories of analysis. This suggested that questions oriented toward Ph.D. vs Psy.D. or free-standing vs institutionally based programs yield less significant information than observations drawn on aggregate data. The current self study generally reflects this awareness although some investigations of dichotomies were done as a matter of responding to the context of a given set of observations. It is nevertheless a given that there are still many dichotomies in professional psychology, but that most attempts to distill conclusive differences lead back to an awareness that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

In Study I, an examination of curricula is one of the clearest examples of how dichotomies in context lead back to a meaningful holistic outcome. Wilkins and Giannetti, (1986) illustrated significant differences between Ph.D. and Psy.D. training among professional schools in regard to (1) a curricular emphasis on statistics and measurement, (2) requirements for cognate course work, (3) internship requirements; and (4) academic credit for internship training. Psy.D. programs required more group intervention courses, courses in program administration/evaluation, greater pre-internship practice experience, and full-time one year internships. Further exploration of the data revealed that ten of the eighteen free standing schools that responded to Study I required two year part-time internships and the majority of institution based programs had a one year full time internship requirement. However, Wilkins and Giannetti

summarized their analysis of curriculum review by saying “Instead of dichotomies representing the model distribution, each with relatively small variances, the picture appears to be a unimodal distribution with a relatively large variance.”

In Study II, investigators found that a similar picture emerged from examination of APA self studies, but the interpretations of the results in the context of the Resolutions provides a clearer picture of the need to examine what is meant by a “core curriculum” in professional psychology training. It may well be that the core was there from the very start but the Resolutions helped to crystallize its components and categories. Indeed, the impact of the core curriculum as specified in NCSPP Resolutions has created an additional pull on how schools develop and review curriculum. Traditional faculty competencies, A1~A standards, and student needs have shaped curriculum under a broad set of content domains established by precedence and regulatory bodies. However, Resolutions form an organizational dynamic within our programs which also pulls for active consideration in curriculum development and implementation.

Finally, since there was virtually no sampling of alumni, students or faculty in the original self study, and only a rudimentary set of resolutions (aspirational goals) to guide the interpretation our investigations, several of the Study II articles represent new dimensions of investigation and greatly contribute to an operational understanding of how Resolutions are impacting training at the local level. Moreover, the organization has subsequently added other resolutions and integrated the prior ones into a coherent statement about the intent of the Integrated Resolutions for guiding the development of professional psychology (Peterson, Peterson, and Abrams, in press). Thus Quality Enhancement is generic to Study II. Study II is an

ear to the ground which lets us know what might be shaking in the inner life of our schools, but also sets clear example of how professional training has internalized Resolutions as standards and values of excellence in practitioner based training.

Methods

Definition

Study II is designed to inform the reader about quality enhancement and quality assurance issues as related to a specific set of resolutions adopted by schools and programs of professional psychology. This process is used in a quality enhancement manner to provide guidance for standards of training. Paraphrasing Webster, a standard is an acknowledge measure of comparison for quantitative or qualitative comparison, which generally symbolizes a degree or level of requirement, excellence, or attainment. Moreover, standards are evident in almost every aspect of culture. In government standards are icons of how nations and empires were built; in economics or finance, standards are thought of as units of monetary value; in theology standards speak to a prescribed code of morality. For our purposes, in education, standards are a measure of graded achievement, or an expected norm.

Population

The students, alumni, faculty, and administrators of member schools of NCSPP were respondents in the various investigations which were conducted as a part of this self study. Seven teams collected data from one or more of these population groups. Only full or associate member schools of the NCSPP were used in the self study, except in the study of Psychology Service Centers where data from one observer school was included. For the most part, participant programs represent doctoral training organizations that have APA accreditation.

Procedures

In November of 1993 the Program Committee for the 1995 Midwinter Conference (Roger Peterson, Mary Beth Kinkel, Maryka Braggio and James Dobbins) in collaboration with the NCSPP Evaluation Research Committee decided how to develop instruments that would measure the four major areas of investigation as set forth by the Executive Committee.

Instruments were needed to evaluate 1) how our alumni were utilizing and experiencing the benefits of their training 2) how do the APA self studies speak to the utility of the Resolutions for the establishment of local and organizational standards. 3) how faculty and students and administrators differ in regard to the perceptions of the impact of the Resolutions on training, and 4) how faculty, students and administrators perceive the future of professional psychology.

However, two additional studies were added via discussions between the self study coordinator and the 1995 Program Committee. One study focused on internship resources as an emergent concern and relative to the perception of an imbalance between the availability to APA or APPIC sites as compared to students needing sites. The second study was a replication of the Bent study on Psychological Service facilities as centers of excellence for professional psychology training.

The Evaluation and Research Committee was given the charge by NCSPP Executive Committee to design and implement Study II. Don Peterson was used as an internal consultant to help frame the study perspective. His principal advice was to construct a self study which would have broad appeal beyond general concerns of the administrators of NCSPP member schools, but especially to consider constituents in nonmember schools, regulatory and governing bodies, and students and faculty. The principal architects of the design were the Chair of the Evaluation Research Committee (ERC), James Dobbins who became the Coordinator of Study II, in

collaboration with the two ERC subcommittee chairs, Keith Edwards and Kjell Rudestam. The ERC used the Cancun Conference (Winter 1994) to recruit additional members for each of the areas of investigation. Four teams were constructed who met individually to begin to design their respective investigations. Dobbins, Rudestam and Edwards met in April 1994 to finalize survey protocols and to agree on the logistics of how to coordinate the data called for in each team's protocol. After this meeting the self study began its implementation phase. The exact procedures used for each study will not be discussed here because they are presented as each investigation is discussed.

There were several methodological issues which were informed by the design of Study I. In order to avoid the problem of over interpreting data drawn on a small sample, i.e., NCSPP representatives, this study also included alumni, faculty and students who are not representatives. In order to familiarize faculty and students with the focus of the self study and to provide a minimally sufficient knowledge base about the history of the organization and its Resolutions, a video tape was made by the coordinator, James Dobbins and his assistant, Deneen Crandell, which explicated key historical material, the purposes of the self study, and the components of the self study. The video was sent to each member school and faculty where students were convened in order to view the material prior to data collection. They provided a minimal base of information about NCSPP resolutions and hopefully some motivation to participate in the various components of the self-study.

The lion's share of Study II was carried out by several teams of investigators. In an evaluation of APA self-studies, Jones, Case, Chaddock, Compte, Knudsen, Monroe, Scammacca, and Wollin comprised one team of investigators; and Acuff, Kustron, Cheyne, Townsend, and

Zelman found a second team which examined how different sections of APA self-studies inform the establishment of standards as related to the aspirational goals established by NCSPP. This meta analysis revealed challenging methodological issues which lead both teams to some rather pointed conclusions about how the process and structure of programs respond to the APA self-study and how the results of the study reflect the incorporation of the resolutions into the standard operational procedures of individual programs. They also make inferences about the utility of APA self studies in terms of strategic placing and organizational growth and development.

Keith Edwards' analysis examines quality enhancement issues which are reflected in the responses to an alumni survey. This type of investigation will become increasingly important to individual programs as outcome oriented procedures for accreditation are implemented. Dr. Edwards' work is a prototype of the kind of data that programs might use to verify that their model of training is consistent with the kinds of professional activities their graduates actually perform. The deep structure of this investigation is a satisfaction survey which informs how well Professional Psychology training has met the expectations of its graduates.

The team of Rudestam, Mallory and King conducted a more global appraisal of how the Resolutions have helped individual programs to establish training standards. Their investigation factorially examines how the NCSPP Resolutions are evaluated in a quality assurance context. The power of this work is in the sampling of faculty, administration, and students as providers and consumers of training. The Rudestam, et al., analysis is not a satisfaction survey, but may be used at the local level to calibrate student and faculty awareness of training priorities and practices.

Two other investigations address practical training structure and resources as aspects of quality assurance and quality enhancement. Malloy, Friedberg, Dobbins, Coleman and Mitchell discuss the emergent structure of available internship sites and plausible responses on the part of professional schools to the current accessibility profile. Malloy, et al., made several recommendations for how professional schools can better meet the challenges of shifting internship accessibility. Another study by Wolf, Dobbins, Alletzhauser, and Coleman discusses the progress professional schools have made in developing internal training resources in the form of psychological service centers. Specifically, this investigation is a replication of a Study I report, Bent (1986), which examined one of the principal assumptions of the Fox and Barclay (1989) prescription to a Thousand Flowers Bloom.” Fox and Barclay called for practitioner programs to begin the development of “homes of our own,” where the practice of psychology is Controlled and developed by psychologists. Bent’s article indicated beginning efforts at the establishment of psychological service centers as distinct from traditional psychology clinics. The following study examines the progress made in the past ten years.

The article by Hawes, McKitrick and Bob considers the perceptions of faculty, administrators, and students in regard to the future needs and issues of professional psychology training. Herein lies data which speaks to how differences in training roles shape what is commonly held as foreground and background in the day-to-day operation of local programs and national organizations. This is a more person-oriented perspective of how quality enhancement is viewed by students and faculty and administrators.

Summary

This self study is organized by seven independent investigations structured into a

meaningful whole by a defined set of resolutions which address quality control in professional psychology training. These investigations do not represent a set of examinations which could be used to explicate the full utility of the NCSPP Resolutions for establishing standards of education but sample key domains of concern. They provide evidence of how the Resolutions guide program development and implementation, and make an estimate of how programs in professional psychology are meeting the challenges of providing high quality practice-based training. Because these investigations also invite questions about training methods and procedures, they may inform local training programs about ways to more effectively implement quality assurance and enhancement. Organizationally, they help identify norms and identify variables, issues and methods which are useful for qualitative and quantitative analysis in control.

References

Bent, R. (1986). Toward quality assurance in the education of practicing psychologists. In J. Callen, D. Peterson, and G. Stricker (Eds.), Quality in professional psychology training: A national conference and self-study. The National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology.

Callan, J., Peterson, D., Stricker, G. (Eds.). (1986). Quality in professional psychology training: A national conference and self-study. National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology.

Fox, R. and Barclay A. (1989). Let a thousand flowers bloom. American Psychologist 44, 55-59.

Peterson, R., McHolland, J.D., Bent, R., Davis-Russell, E., Edwall, G., Polite, K.; Singer D., Stricker, G. (Eds.). (1991). The core curriculum in professional psychology. National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Peterson, R. L., Peterson, D. R., & Abrams, J. C. (In press). Standards for education in professional psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association and National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology.

Stricker, G., Davis-Russell, E., Bourge, E., Duran, E., Hammond W.R., McHolland, J., Polite, K., and Vaughn, B. (Eds.). (1990). Toward diversification in psychology education and training. National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Toffler, A. (1992). Powershift: Knowledge, wealth and violence at the edge of the 21 st century. New York, London: Bantam Books.

Resolutions Group Survey of NCSPP Schools and Programs:

A Summary Report

Kjell Rudestam, The Fielding Institute

Kathy Malloy, Wright State University

Neil King, John F. Kennedy University

Running Head: Resolutions Survey

During the past decade the Midwinter Conferences of the National Council of Schools and Programs in Professional Psychology have generated resolutions related to the training of professional psychologists. It was not until 1994, however, that a self-study was initiated to evaluate the implementation of the various resolutions to the training which takes place within the programs of member schools. A Resolutions Group was established by NCSPI' to review the resolutions of previous conferences (focusing on the topics of Education and Training, Core Curriculum, Diversity, Gender, and Standards). Out of that review came a questionnaire comprised of 76 statements that incorporate the values, content, and procedures endorsed by NCSPP for the graduate training of professional psychologists.

Method

The purpose of the Resolutions Group study was to assess to what extent students, faculty and administrators of NCSPP member schools perceive that the resolutions have been incorporated within their respective doctoral programs. We used a stratified sampling procedure whereby administrative and student representatives from each program were identified and asked to disseminate questionnaires to 10 faculty/administrators and 20 students, respectively. We requested the student representative to select students who had been in the program at least two years (in order to have an adequate level of understanding of the program itself), and to solicit a sample who reflected a cross-section of academic performance and was consistent with the gender and ethnicity breakdown of the student body. The administrative representative was asked to solicit a sample which was representative of the gender and ethnicity breakdown of the faculty and that contained a cross-section of seniority and content expertise.

The questionnaires included a brief description of the purpose of the survey, provided an

assurance of anonymity, and requested candor in completing it. We did ask each respondent to provide the name of the professional school or program as well as his/her age, gender, ethnicity, and status within the program. Otherwise, the questionnaires were answered anonymously and sealed in an unmarked envelope which was then forwarded to the administrators of the study.

The 76 objective statements were answered using a Likert-type scale, in which 1 signifies strong disagreement and 5 signifies strong agreement. Each question asked the respondent to assess to which extent a particular aspect of a resolution was part of the graduate program (e.g. “Our psychology program begins with generalist professional training and moves toward increasing specialization in succeeding years.”) In addition, there were two open-ended questions. The first asked the respondent to provide innovative examples of how the program subscribes to NCSPP’s recommended training model which emphasizes the development of basic knowledge and skills in the six competency areas of relationship, assessment, intervention, research/evaluation, consultation/teaching, and management/supervision. The second asked for examples of innovative methods by which the institution responds to cultural diversity at the level of recruitment, curriculum, and administrative policy and procedures.

Results

Four hundred ninety-four individuals (493) completed the questionnaire. Of these, 243 were students, 103 were faculty, 12 were administrators, 21 were NCSPP representatives, and 115 did not indicate their identification. At least 39 different programs were represented by the respondents (31 individuals did not indicate their institution). There were 213 women and 273 men (8 missing). Three-hundred eighty-four (384) of the respondents were Caucasian, 27 were Hispanic, 19 were Afro-American, 17 were Asian, three were Native American, three were

biracial, and 22 did not indicate their ethnicity.

Descriptive statistics are the most informative in terms of providing an overview of the results. The median response for the vast majority of items was a score of “4,” which signifies agreement. Median scores of “5,” signifying strong agreement, pertained to 13 items. These items are described in Table 1. The strongest overall disagreement was reserved for the use of student peer evaluations to evaluate student skill competencies ($M=2.5$) and training in managerial and administrative skills ($M=2$). Respondents were neutral ($M=3$) with regard to items endorsing the inclusion of contributions from disciplines other than psychology in the curriculum; training in diversity with respect to spirituality and religion; training in supervision skills; developing community linkages to facilitate diversity goals; involving alumni to address diversity issues; developing organizational structures and policies that facilitate women’s professional development; attending to issues relevant to women of color; attending to issues relevant to lesbians; advocating half-time internships to meet the needs of women students; and establishing promotion and tenure policies sensitive to the activities of women.

In spite of the relatively high integration of the NCSPP resolutions within the graduate programs, the ranges of scores were broad for most items. Further analysis of the results by breaking them down according to the variables of gender, ethnicity, type of respondent, and program are illuminating. On 25 of the 76 items, faculty and administrators rated the items a full point higher (median) than students did, suggesting that students either are not as aware of the program’s policies and procedures as faculty and administrators are or they perceive them differently. Since there was only one item that students rated higher than faculty and administrators, it is likely that some well-intended components of the training model are not as

well-established within the program as believed or desired.

The data were also sorted by respondent gender and ethnicity. As a whole, men gave somewhat lower ratings to the items than women did. Ten questions dealt specifically with gender and women's issues and women gave ratings a full point higher to six of them. In other words, female respondents were more likely than male respondents to perceive that the curriculum was sensitive to issues of gender and opportunities for women. There were also ten questions focusing on issues of racial and ethnic diversity in the curriculum and in program policies. On three of these items, students and faculty of color, especially African Americans, provided lower ratings than the majority Caucasian group. Specifically, they perceived less of a commitment to consciousness raising, minority student organizations, and issues relevant to women of color within their respective programs. One must proceed cautiously in interpreting these results, however, because the variables of ethnicity and gender may interact with the variable of institutional identity.

Twenty-one of the programs in the survey are university-based, while 18 are found in free-standing schools. Thus, the respondents were divided almost equally between free-standing (52%) and university-based (48%) programs. The three institutions that provided the highest overall ratings to the questionnaire represent free-standing programs. However, no obvious differences between the ratings of the two groups are evident among items that were identified as problematic or missing components within the programs, i.e. a median rating of "1" or "2". The data reveal that many programs do not include training in developing managerial or administrative skills (N=19), do not incorporate student peer evaluations of skill competencies (N=18), do not use experiential tasks in education such as teaching (N16), do not advocate half-

time internships to meet the training needs of women students (N=16), do not pay special attention to issues relevant to lesbian students (N=15) or women of color (N=9), do not incorporate contributions from disciplines other than psychology (N=11), do not have a school-administered psychological service center (N=10), and do not use individualized written contracts among students, practicum or internship center staff, and the program faculty (N=8).

This overview of the Resolutions Committee survey is necessarily brief. It does not include an analysis of the results from the open-ended questions, nor a breakdown of the data according to other variables of interest such as the longevity of a psychology program or its accreditation status (The vast majority of NCSPP programs are A.P.A. accredited). However, the overall results of the survey are gratifyingly supportive of an emerging model of graduate training in professional psychology. With few exceptions, the values, program components, and procedures espoused by administrators at NCSPP conferences appear to have been stimulated by activities taking place at member schools and have filtered back to individual programs. These programs are receiving individualized feedback about the perceptions of their faculty and students along the domains we have considered important in doctoral training. Hopefully, this feedback will serve as a further incentive to tackle challenging curricular and policy issues.

Table 1

Items Generating Strong Agreement (“5”) Among Respondents (N=493)

3. Students receive a sequence of practical experiences in our psychology program.
4. We use direct faculty involvement in supervision and evaluation of clinical skills.
5. We have a school-administered psychological service center for teaching knowledge and professional skills.
23. The knowledge base required of all students in our program includes dysfunctional behavior and psychopathology.
25. The knowledge base required of all students in our program includes life span development.
26. The knowledge base required of all students in our program includes professional ethics and standards.
27. The knowledge base required of all students in our program includes psychological measurement (assessment).
39. Our curriculum includes education in the development of interpersonal skills, including empathy, respect for others and personal relatedness.
41. Our assessment curriculum includes psychological measurement theory.
43. Supervised skill training is an essential component of our assessment curriculum.
46. Our intervention curriculum for all students includes theories and strategies of intervention.
54. Training for research competency in our program includes conducting a scholarly project on

a meaningful problem typically associated with professional practice in psychology.

**INTERNSHIP SELECTION: 1995 PRELIMINARY
DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**K. A. Malloy, ft D. Friedberg, J. E. Dobbins, & M. Coleman
Wright State University
School of Professional Psychology**

Running Head: Internship Selection

**Resolutions Group Survey of NCSPP Schools and Programs:
A Summary Report**

In order to complete doctoral training in professional psychology, a clinical internship is required. Recently, concern has risen regarding the availability of sufficient numbers of internship slots to meet training needs (Murray, 1995). This concern becomes especially salient when the increasing numbers of students enrolled in schools and programs of professional psychology are considered. This paper presents the results of a survey that attempted to gather data that will help to clarify the current situation regarding internship availability, specifically in regard to NCSPP member schools.

The current survey was originally developed in response to a request by APPIC for data that would help them to better understand the current “internship supply and demand.” The survey was completed by Directors of Training at member and affiliate schools, based on the 1994-95 internship class, and the data was forwarded to APPIC. The questionnaire was then revised and sent to Directors of Training at 40 NCSPP member and affiliate schools to be completed using the information on the 1995-96 internship class. Thirty-four of the 40 programs contacted responded. One program was not included because their students complete a totally captive internship, meaning that they neither “supply” nor “demand” internship slots. Thus, an 85% return rate was achieved.

In examining Table 1, 18% of students from NCSPP affiliated schools who responded to the survey did not get placed on Call Day 1995. Thus, if this trend in the current year is

Internship Selection

representative, approximately one in five students will not find a placement on Call Day. As of May 1, 1995, 49% of these students continue to be unplaced and this reflects 9% of the total applicant pool. Thus, it seems reasonable that for a variety of reasons to be discussed subsequently, placement is difficult for this student population.

Table 1 CURRENT DATA FOR 1995-1996 PRE~DOCTORAL INTERNSHIP CLASS

	N	%
NCSPP Schools Responding	33	85
Number of Students Seeking Internship Slots	958	---
Number of Students Unplaced on Call Day	178	18
Number of Students Unplaced of May 1, 1995	86	9

Table 2 ACCREDITATION PREFERENCE AND PLACEMENT STATUS

	APA ACCREDITED	EITHER APA ACCREDITED OR NON-APA
Total Applicants (n = 958)	n = 425 % = 44%	n = 533 % = 56
Unplaced Applicants (n = 174)	n = 109 % = 63	n = 65 % = 37

For the students who were unplaced on Call Day, approximately 2/3 exclusively sought APA sites (See Table 2). The remaining 1/3 applied to both APA accredited and non-APA accredited sites. Thus, a high number of students were searching for APA accredited sites and a significant number remain unplaced.

Table 3 DISPOSITION OF STUDENTS PLACED BETWEEN CALL DAY AND MAY 1 (N = 91)

	CLEARING-HOUSE	DEVELOPED OWN SPOT	SCHOOL DEVELOPED SPOT	APA ACCRED.	NON-ACCRED.
N	43	20	28	24	67
%	47	22	31	26	74

For students unplaced on Call Day but placed at a site by May 1, 1995, nearly 1/2 (47%) used APPIC's clearinghouse as an option for securing an internship (See Table 3). Thus, the clearinghouse seems to be serving a useful function. Further, for students placed after Call Day, only approximately one in four earned a spot in an APA accredited internship. When these numbers are compared to the 74% (316/425) of students who applied solely to APA accredited sites and were accepted, it appears that if a student doesn't get an accredited internship on Call Day, their chances of receiving one subsequently are dramatically reduced. This finding becomes particularly compelling in light of the importance placed on both APA and APPIC accreditation by training directors. When asked to rate the importance of both APA accreditation and APPIC registration on a 1 (not important) to 5 (extremely important) scale, APA accreditation received a mean score of 4.24 and APPIC registration received a mean score of 4.48.

Table 4 TRAINING DIRECTORS' EXPLANATIONS FOR NO PLACEMENT

	STUDENT PLACED BETWEEN FEB. & MAY (Total Respondents = 24)		STUDEBTS CURRENTLY UNPLACED (Total Respondents - 20)	
	N	%	N	%
Geographical Limitations	12	50	13	33
Too Few Applications	10	42	10	26
Apply to Highly Competitive Program	13	54	5	13
Poor Interview Skills	4	17	3	8
Luck	5	21	1	3
Poor Academic or Clinical Skills	1	4	1	3

The most frequent reasons given by Training Directors to explain students' lack of placement are geographic limitations, too few applications, and applying to highly competitive programs. Rarely was lack of placement attributed to poor academic or clinical skills.

Table 5 PLANS FOR STUDENTS CURRENTLY UNPLACED (n = 86)

	n	%
Continued Academic Program	41	43
Continued Look – APA	13	14
Continued Look – Non-APA	19	20
Work in Psychology Field	3	3
Work in Non-Psychology Field	18	19

In terms of plans for currently unplaced students, approximately 1/3 are continuing to look for APA or Non-APA sites. Sixty-five percent are continuing in the academic program or working outside of their academic program in a psychology or non-psychology field. Thus, they will need to be added to next year's applicant pool.

In attempting to project the need for future slots; training directors were asked to report

the number of students in their first year classes. In the 33 schools that responded, there were a total of 1,151 first year students. Thus, there will be a considerable demand for internship placements.

Finally, the 33 responding schools were asked if they administered a pre-doctoral internship program. Findings indicate that only three programs offer APA accredited internship sites for a total of only 16 available slots.

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this article indicate that across 33 NCSPP affiliated schools, approximately one out of five students did not get placed on Uniform Notification Day. Moreover, the findings reveal that approximately 10% of these students are continuing to experience difficulty with placement. Most of these unplaced students persist in searching for APA accredited spots, but their likelihood of obtaining an APA placement after Call Day is low. These unsettling trends are likely to continue since there are an increasing number of students in the internship selection pool.

The data from responding NCSPP affiliated programs suggests the clearinghouse serves a worthwhile function in helping unplaced students find pre-doctoral internship training sites. Nonetheless, a considerable number of training programs develop training options for their students and some students develop their own internship placement. Most currently unplaced students continue their studies in their academic program.

Training directors from the responding schools most frequently attribute students' lack of placement to factors such as students' geographic limitations, applying to too few programs, and applying to too many highly competitive programs. Interestingly, only one training director attributed the lack of placement to poor academic or clinical skills.

Training directors continue to view APA accreditation and APPIC registration as very important. However, there are very few APA accredited internship training slots provided by NCSPP affiliated programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Supply and demand ratios clearly indicate that NCSPP member schools and programs either administer or oversee internship training programs.
- 2) NCSPP programs and schools should consider affiliations with community agencies to develop additional APA and APPIC sites.
- 3) Special attention should be paid to developing internship training programs where students are geographically restricted.
- 4) Since the internship selection process is becoming extremely competitive, students are well-advised to buttress their application with some already established clinical skills (e.g. considerable assessment experience, experience in specific treatment approaches) rather than expect the internship training year

to provide them with an array of completely new skills.

- 5) Moreover, it seems incumbent on NCSPP affiliated schools to more fully prepare students for the rigorous application process. For instance, programs are well-advised to offer such things as vita writing and interviewing workshops for their students.
- 6) Since internship training can be expensive for programs and funding is likely to remain limited, internships should actively pursue external and non-traditional forms of funding. Perhaps, some managed mental health care companies can support specific training sites.
- 7) APA and APPIC may wish to explore broadening their accreditation criteria. In particular, a few Training Directors suggested accrediting programs which offer quality training but can only provide unpaid positions or positions with low stipends.

Reference

Murray, B. (1995, July). Are internships getting harder to find? American Psychological Association Monitor, 26 (7), 58.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICE CENTERS:
KEY TRAINING ARENAS FOR PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS**

**Wolf, E. M., Dobbins, J. E.,
Alletzhauser, H., and Coleman, M**

Running Head: Psych Centers Survey

INTRODUCTION

In 1986, Russell Bent surveyed NCSPP member schools to determine the extent to which psychological service centers (PSCs) were being used to integrate the School's training mission with the provision of psychological services to the community. However, because so many of the programs were in their early development, providing a significant resource to the community was not well supported by the data. Nonetheless, providing services to the community has remained an aspirational goal of professional psychology and is broadly reflected in NCSPP training resolutions (Peterson, 1995), adopted after Bent's original study. There has undoubtedly been expansion in the number of PSCs established at professional schools since Bent's original survey and the present survey was designed to obtain current information on PSC development, the defining parameters of these centers, and how they have become a resource to the community and to the training of professional psychologists.

PSCS AND NCSPP TRAINING RESOLUTIONS

Since Bent's original study, NCSPP has adopted a set of training resolutions which are predicated on the belief that "the primary purpose of education for professional psychology is preparation for the delivery of human services in a manner that is effective and responsive to individual needs, societal needs, and diversity" (Peterson, 1994). The aspirational intent of the resolutions emphasizes explicit and implicit components of training within each program. Nowhere are the results of program design and implementation made more clearly observable than in the houses we build for training future psychologists, and especially in the development and use of psychological service centers as examples of each program's training philosophy."

The resolutions also assert that diversity of models within professional psychology should be strongly supported. But irrespective of training models, we collectively have a responsibility to prepare our students for new roles and attitudes, values, and aptitudes to deal with the emerging needs of our society. The following contents are excerpted from the resolutions as guides to professional training in service centers. PSC's are encouraged to:

- use integrative service, training inquiry and teaching models which especially value work with other disciplines.
- include social action as a valued aspect of training and supervision. implement training as a collaborative enterprise between the doctoral program and the professional community.
- directly use program faculty in supervision, and primary supervisors should be competent, licensed, doctoral-level psychologists.
- promote a variety of education and training opportunities beyond the doctoral, i.e., postdoctoral and life-long learning.
- integrate internship level training within the full curriculum, to include the PSC.

The current study is not intended to sample each of these domains but nonetheless in some instances it will serve that purpose. Four general hypotheses developed by Bent in 1986 are used to frame the results of this study. This will serve to both update his work, and to broaden the heuristic value of the relationship between the resolutions and the development of psychological service centers. These hypotheses are:

1. PSCs are established or planned at most SPPs.
2. PSCs have clear administrative organization and support in the SPPs.
3. PSCs provide a range of psychological services and are a significant service resource to the community.
4. PSCs serve as a major training resource for professional schools

SURVEY METHOD

The survey questionnaire used in this study was adapted from Bent's 1986 survey. The modified instrument assessed twelve content areas: PSC status, description, service and treatment programs, administrative organization, funding, client demographics and presenting problems, faculty roles, student roles, use of non-university personnel, areas of strengths and weaknesses, evaluation, and operational procedures. The survey was nine pages in length and allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data.

Thirty-nine NCSPP member programs were given the opportunity to participate in the survey. Thirty-eight programs completed the survey resulting in a response rate of 97%. This represents eleven more schools than the 1986 sample. Schools were initially contacted by telephone and asked to complete the surveys orally, but due to length of time needed to complete the survey using this method, procedures were revised so that the surveys could be completed by hand. Follow-up calls were made to all schools who did not return the questionnaires within the time parameters requested.

RESULTS OF PSC REPLICATION

I. PSC STATUS

Twenty-seven of the 38 responding schools (71%) reported that they had a Psychological Service Center. (In addition, the one school that did not return the survey acknowledged having a PSC.) The length of time these PSCs had been in operation ranged from three to 60 years, with a mean of 16 years. Table 1 summarizes data regarding the PSC status of surveyed schools.

II. DESCRIPTION OF PSCS

Schools were asked to provide physical and conceptual descriptions of their PSCs. Respondents varied in reporting as few as one to more than five locations for their PSCs. The average number of locations was two, with most schools having both on- and off-campus locations. All but one school reported an on-campus PSC location. The most common off-campus site was urban, with only two schools having off-campus rural PSC settings.

In describing their physical facilities, only five out of the 27 respondents reported PSCs which were physically free-standing, ranging in size from a small house to a large urban institute. Clearly, most PSCs occupy space within larger facilities or office buildings such as office complexes, dormitories, health centers, and psychology departments. PSCs varied in the total number of rooms, ranging from 4 to 45 with a mean of 12.

Individual therapy rooms (reported in 100% of PSCs), rooms for clerical/administrative space (96%), and group/family therapy rooms (92%) were present in almost all PSCs. Playrooms (81%), faculty offices (79%), and observation rooms (77%) were also commonly present. Least reported rooms were testing areas (65%) and student offices (50%). Other rooms reported by respondents including records/billing areas, a learning resource center, conference rooms, video-monitoring rooms, computer rooms, classrooms test-supplies rooms, and recreational areas.

Most schools conceptualized their PSCs as centers serving the dual purpose of training and service provision with a university and/or greater community focus. Not surprisingly, when questioned about the main function(s) of their PSCs, most schools reported student training (96%) and service provision to the community (85%). Other functions reported include research (38%), income generation (35%), and postdoctoral/postgraduate training (15%).

III. SERVICE AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Schools were surveyed with regard to their hours of operation, emergency procedures¹, and range of clinical services offered at their PSCs. All PSCs were reported to be open Monday through Friday. Most offered year-round services (88%) and evening appointments (96%), while half provided some weekend availability.

Most PSCs used a Faculty-On-Call system (77%) for student back-up and emergencies and some included interns or advanced trainees in their on-call procedures (46%). A variety of procedures were described with regard to the handling of walk-in and after-hours emergencies. About 35% of the PSCs were reported to refer all walk-in emergencies to community services, while the remaining offered some type of emergency services for walk-in clients. This usually involved a screening or crisis session with either a student therapist or licensed staff (often the director). With regard to after-hours emergencies, about 38% of the PSCs had in place a system to have staff handle after-hours emergencies by phone. These situations were handled by a tiered system, by on-call rotations, or by requiring the director to carry a pager at all times. The remaining PSCs relied on community crisis lines to handle after-hours crisis calls.

PSCs offered a variety of clinical services, with individual therapy, personality

assessment, and couple/family therapy being the most common services offered (see Table 2). Many other types of specialized services were described. Some common ones included treatment of eating disorders, programs for survivors and perpetrators of domestic violence and sexual abuse, and geriatric services. Other services offered were substance abuse treatment, programs for gifted children, school consultation, and programs for the deaf and hard of hearing. Some of the more specialized offerings included a Southeast Asian PTSD clinic, a program for homeless children, a mother-infant group, a men's group, a biofeedback clinic, and a brief therapy program. One PSC was reported to have a patients' right advocate.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Schools were polled regarding the administrative structure of their PSCs. The majority of the PSCs were headed by directors or executive directors. These directors reported primarily to deans or department chairs, while some reported to a Vice President (of Student Affairs), President, Board, Chancellor, Director of Clinical Training, or Provost. Seventy-seven percent of these directors or other heads of PSCs devoted from half to all of their time to the position, while the remaining 23% spent between 5 and 35% of their time in their role as direction. About half of the respondents indicated that their PSCs had some type of administrative divisions. All but three PSCs were reported to hold regular administrative meetings.

V. FUNDING

Schools were surveyed regarding PSC budgetary information. Of the 27 responding schools, 20 were able to specify the amount of their PSC budget. Most of the PSCs (84%) reported budgets at a moderate level ranging from \$48,700 to \$481,500 with a mean of \$201,000. One school reported a very modest budget of only \$1,200 but was not able to provide any other information about income generated and resulting profit/loss. Two schools reported substantial budgets of over one million dollars. One of these reported a budget of 1.5 million dollars, funded through student tuition, applied fees, government contracts, and private insurance. While they reported that their PSC operated at a loss (amount unspecified), they also noted that they were able to cover this loss by other funds in the school's budget. The other school reported the highest PSC budget of 4.5 million dollars from multiple funding sources resulting in an unspecified profit amount (amount not disclosed due to proprietary reasons).

The vast majority of PSCs reported budgets resulting from multiple funding sources (88%). The most frequently reported budgetary sources were university funding (reported by 100% of PSCs) and income generated from services (reported by 96%). Special contracts were cited as a funding base by 62% of the respondents, grants were reported by 31%, and 12% of the PSCs reported students fees as a budgetary source.

Twenty-two out of the 27 reporting PSCs (81 %) were able to provide profit/loss information. Fifteen of these schools (71%) stated that their PSCs operated at a loss for 1993-1994, with a loss range of \$2,000-\$200,000, resulting in a mean loss figure of approximately \$84,000. Five schools (19%) reported a balanced budget, and only two schools (10%) stated that their PSCs operated at a profit (one reported an \$8,000 profit and the other profit amount was unspecified). Clearly for PSCs reporting profit/loss information, operating at a loss was the most common state of affairs.

VI. CLIENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND PRESENTING PROBLEMS

Twenty-six schools (96%) provided information on client demographics and presenting problems. Approximately half (48%) of these school reported that they have a Management Information System (MIS) to track client data. Of the schools that reported that they do not have an MIS in place, 31 % stated that they are currently in the process of developing such a system.

Table 3 summarizes client demographic data. Clearly, the modal client is an adult, female, Caucasian, with an income level under \$15,000. Clients most frequently came from urban settings (40%), with 32% of PSCs reporting an exclusively suburban clientele, and 1 2% of PSCs reporting a rural clientele. Sixteen percent of PSCs described clients coming from a combination of urban, suburban, and/or rural locales. Similar to data provided by Bent (1986), these PSCs appear to be serving large segments of the “underserved” white community (lower socioeconomic levels) as well as a portion of the African-American, Hispanic-Americans and Asian-American populations. Age groups appear to be well represented, the preponderance of female clients is consistent among the centers, and most services are rendered to lower income clients. As Bent noted, “Since there is little external financial support for services rendered and fees are scaled down for ability to pay, rather than cost, it is not difficult to understand why most centers operate with a deficit.” (Bent, 1986, p. 158).

PSCs were also asked to describe the five most common areas of treatment focus. Mood disorders were most frequently reported by 64% of respondents followed by childhood disorders (59%), marital/family conflicts (59%), anxiety problems (55%) and personality disorders (55%). Schools were also asked to indicate all areas of therapy focus served in their PSCs. These results are presented in Table 4.

VII. FACULTY ROLES IN PSC

Respondents were asked to describe the roles of faculty in the PSCs, the types of faculty used, the hours devoted by faculty to the PSC (operations and supervision), types of supervision provided, and the use of faculty inservice provision. Most faculty (73%) provided some supervision in the PSCs, 30%

served an administrative role, usually as clinic directors, and less than 10% provided direct service. Other roles of faculty mentioned included direction of special projects or programs, peer review, consultation, and providing emergency back-up to student therapists.

A variety of faculty classifications and non-faculty psychologists were employed in the PSCs. While 19% of the respondents reported using only core faculty, most PSCs employed a combination of core, adjunct, full-time, and part-time faculty. Eleven percent of the surveyed schools reported using only adjunct faculty in their PSCs. Faculty who devoted time to the PSCs spent an average of eight hours per week in the PSCs; some spent minimal or no time, while others devoted two or more days to the service centers.

Schools reported having an average of ten faculty involved in their PSCs, with a range from one to 45. About 50% of the faculty involved in the PSCs were described as being core on tenure-track faculty. The amount of supervision offered to students per week varied widely, with many using a combination of individual and group supervision. Weekly individual supervision time ranged from as little as one-half hour per week to an hour of supervision provided for each trainee direct service hour. Group supervision ranged from one to four hours weekly. Some PSCs had opportunities for students to receive specialized supervision, and some offered didactic training in addition to traditional supervision.

VIII. STUDENT ROLES IN PSCS

The survey inquired about the number of students assigned to the PSCs, the percentage of the program's students that are assigned to the PSCs, the types of roles students serve (administrative and clinical), and the number of hours students spend in the PSCs. An average of 58 students were assigned to

PSCs, with a range of one to 130. The PSCs offered practicum positions to an average of 52% of their program's students. About half of the PSCs involved students in an administrative capacity. These administrative activities included program development, peer supervision, assistance in special projects, and serving as assistant director, student manager, or clinic coordinator. Some students were hired to serve an administrative role in addition to their practicum assignment. In about one-half of the PSCs, students performed some supervisory functions. These primarily included peer supervision and provision of supervision by advanced trainees, predoctoral interns, and post-doctoral interns. Most PSCs relied on the student therapists to provide all direct clinical services. On average, students were assigned to the PSCs about 13 hours per week, ranging from 2 1/2 hours to 40 hours per week. Approximately 50% of this time was spent in direct service, with 30% spent in supervision and other training activities. (The remaining 20% was unspecified.)

IX. USE OF NON-UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL

PSCs were divided in the extent to which they endorsed using non-faculty supervisors, with 62% of the respondents stating that they used non-faculty supervisors, and 38% reporting that they did not. When non-faculty were used to provide supervision, they were most commonly described as PSC alumni, community volunteers, or contracted licensed psychologists. Interestingly, while the majority of PSCs used some non-faculty supervisors in their operations, only 25% of PSCs reported using non-faculty or non-student service providers in their PSCs. Descriptions of typical non-university personnel included crisis clinicians, intake coordinators, mental health technicians, nurses, physicians, psychiatrists, and clinical social workers.

X. PSC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Schools were asked to describe areas of strength as well as problematic areas in their PSCs. There was surprising consistency in responses with the most commonly reported area of strength described as excellent, intensive, and abundant supervision provided by experienced clinicians with varying theoretical orientations and models of treatment. Other commonly reported strengths included diverse client populations, a wide range of presenting problems, high quality service provision, low cost services, good physical facilities, and motivated, bright student service providers who are conscientious, eager to learn, and committed to providing high quality services.

Funding was clearly the most frequently reported problematic area of PSCs. Many schools described a conflict between their training model and the need for income-generating services, noting that PSCs typically serve low income clients who cannot pay very much and that high quality training often precludes loading students with heavy caseloads as this does not leave sufficient time for the intensive supervision needed. As one respondent reported, "The PSC philosophy as a training site without regard to funding [is very problematic]. Only time will tell if we can pull out of our debt and enter into a pay as we go program. The issue of training versus services [must be reconciled by] finding a balance between these two." Many schools described a need to explore means of diversifying and strengthening the funding base, particularly with regard to increasing third-party reimbursements and public funding. Other problems frequently reported by PSCs included insufficient numbers of staff in terms of both supervisors and service providers, inexperienced service providers, complex, multi-problem clientele, inadequate numbers of minority clients, difficulty generating enough appropriate training cases, insufficient office space, trouble accessing enough assessment supervisors, and marketing issues due to a lack of professional PR personnel. Several schools also described a conflict between the school's academic schedule and the PSC's need to operate year round, particularly noting problems with transfer cases and difficulty maintaining an adequate client base due to student service providers changing each year. Finally, PSCs described their

administrative structure as both a strength and weakness, noting that the PSC “director” was essential to the long-term functioning and day-to-day operation of the center, yet that the director was often over burdened with responsibility with limited involvement from other faculty.

XI. PROCESS FOR EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES

Fifty-two percent of the PSCs reported a quality assurance system in place in order to systematically monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of services. Three schools (13%) stated that they are currently in the process of developing a quality assurance program. Schools reported on commonly utilized quality assurance procedures. Record completion review was most frequently endorsed by 70% of respondents. Clinical service review, client satisfaction surveys, and panel review by peers were each endorsed by 39% of respondents. While almost half (48%) of the PSCs did not report systematic quality assurance programs, many of these centers reported less formalized procedures for ensuring treatment quality. Periodic file review by director, informal case evaluation by faculty supervisor, and use of individual treatment plan to evaluate client improvement were most frequently noted.

XII. FORMALIZED OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

One hundred percent of respondents described formalized operational procedures at their PSCs. All centers reported fee policies and written documentation of client intake, termination, and/or transfer as part of these procedures. Emergency procedures and instructions on chart organization and the use of forms were reported by almost all respondents (96%). Security procedures were reported in 70% of PSCs, employee benefits and leave were reported by 52% of PSCs, and grievance policies were reported by 52% of PSCs. Thirteen percent of PSCs described formalized procedures on “other” issues such as risk control, infection prevention, trainee expectations, use of office space, telephone, and secretarial services, and guidelines for clinical research. It should be noted that several centers described overlap between their formalized operational procedures and student handbooks and university policies. Moreover, several centers states that the formalized procedures were written by the school, not the training clinic.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present survey results indicate a 34% increase in the number of PSCs among NCSPP member schools. PSCs were typically conceptualized as centers serving the dual purpose of training and service provision for a university population and/or general public. Individual and couples/family therapy as well as cognitive and personality assessment were the most frequently provided services. Most centers were open year round, provided evening services, and had some type of emergency on-call system.

The majority of PSCs were headed by directors who devoted from one-half to all of their time to this administrative position. Funding was a major area of concern for most PSCs with 71% having operating at a loss for 1993-1994. Demographic data is similar to that provided by Bent (1986) with an increase in percentages of seniors and African-Americans served by the PSCs. The modal client continues to be an adult, female, Caucasian, with an income level under \$15,000, living in an urban setting.

The most common areas of treatment focus reported by the PSCs included mood disorders, childhood disorders, marital/family conflicts, anxiety problems, and personality disorders. Most faculty provided some supervision in their PSCs with the amount of supervision ranging from one-half hour per week to an hour of supervision provided for each trainee direct client hour. PSCs offered training positions to approximately one-half of their program's students with most PSCs relying on student trainees to provide all direct clinical services. While the majority of the PSCs reported using some adjunct or special contract faculty supervisors, only one-fourth of the centers reported using adjunct or special contract faculty or non-student service providers. Supervision was consistently described as a key area of strength for PSCs with funding the most frequently reported problematic area.

Many schools noted a conflict between the PSC philosophy as a training site and the need for increased income generated by services. Approximately one-half of the PSCs described a systematic quality assurance system in place in order to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of services. All respondents reported formalized operational procedures at their PSCs, but a need for improved technological capacities is clearly indicated. Video capacities are more commonly in place than capacity for computer applications such as automated assessment. However, this survey did not ask for detailed information on technical capacities, and clearly a more indepth study would be helpful to professional psychology. Future studies should especially examine constraints to technological development.

When PSCs were categorized into small, medium, and large groups, as also discussed by Bent (1986), it is observed that a new ceiling for PSC size has been reached with two PSCs beyond the million dollar range of funded programming. This encourages study on how programs have networked with funding and referral sources to achieve a high degree of growth in general and special services which support high quality employment and training opportunities.

By way of summarizing how well member schools have operationalized the aspirational goals, PSCs provide service to the underserved, build practicum training capacities, utilize core faculty to oversee clinical practicum training, and promote learning via use of and development of interns and residents. PSCs

have become exceedingly rich environment of interns and residents. PSCs have become exceedingly rich environments for elaborating out respective training models and the integrated resolutions that apply to clinical practice. On the basis of this survey, the four hypotheses which Bent asserted in 1986 are further supported. Hypothesis #4, which was not confirmed in 1986, is well supported by these results. PSCs have become more plentiful and serve as major training resources. Likewise, Hypothesis #1, #2, and #3 are also confirmed. They have become an established part of the training culture with clear administrative organization and support. Moreover, Hypothesis #1 seems tautological at this point in time and should be excluded in future self studies. However, new hypotheses and studies regarding services and administrative structure may now be formulated in relation to the integrated resolutions and and the development and administration of PSCs. Plausible hypotheses could be drawn from the resolutions themselves vis-à-vis outcomes related to the use of integrative services, social action, collaboration, specificity of faculty roles, the inculcation of ethical practice, impact on life learning, and how well internship and post-doctoral training are integrated into PSC administration.

Psych Centers Survey

Table 1

PSC STATUS: DOES SCHOOL HAVE PSC?

SCHOOL	NO	YES	YEARS IN OPERATION
Adelphi University		X	40 years
Adler SPP		X	25 years
Antioch New England Graduate School		X	5 years
Baylor University	X		
Biola University		X	25 years
CSPP Berkley/Alameda		X	12 years
CSPP Fresno		X	Unknown
CSPP Los Angeles	X		
CPSS San Diego		X	8 years
California Institute of Integral Studies	X		
Caribbean Center For Advanced Studies		X	17 years
Central Michigan University		X	25 years
Chicago SPP	X		
Fielding Institute	X		
Florida Institute of Technology		X	15 years
Forest Institute of Professional Psychology		X	11 years
Fuller Graduate School		X	22.5 years
George Fox College		X	8.5 years
Illinois SPP	X		
Immaculata College		X	11 years
Indiana University of Pennsylvania		X	8 years
Long Island University		X	3 years
Massachusetts SPP	X		
Minnesota SPP	X		
Nova University		X	12 years
Pace University		X	11 years
Pacific Graduate School of psychology		X	7 years
Pacific University		X	15 years
Pepperdine University		X	6 years
Rutgers University		X	60 years
Spalding University	X		

Table 1 (continued)

PSC STATUS: DOES SCHOOL HAVE PSC?

SCHOOL	NO	YES	YEARS IN OPERATION
University of Hartford	X		
University of St. Thomas	X		
Widener University		X	4 years
Wisconsin SPP		X	4 years
Wright Institute		X	Unknown
Wright State University SOPP		X	14 years
Yeshiva University		X	15 years

Table 2

TYPE OF SERVICE	PERCENTAGE OF PSCs OFFERING SERVICE
Individual Therapy	100%
Personalty Assessment	100%
Couple/Family Therapy	96%
Cognitive Assessment	88%
Group Therapy	81%
Assessment – Other	77%
Neuropsychological Assessment	61%
Disability Evaluations	35%
Custody Evaluations	27%

Table 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATION SERVICED BY PSCS

CHARACTERISTIC		PERCENTAGE
AGE GROUP		
	Child	14.5%
	Adolescent	17.0%
	Adult	58.0%
	Senior	10.5%
SEX		
	Male	37.7%
	Female	62.3%
ETHNICITY		
	Caucasian	70.5 %
	Hispanic American	11.9%
	Asian American	3.8%
	African American	12.4%
	Native American	.3%
ECONOMIC LEVEL		
	Under 15K	57.6%
	15K – 24 K	24.6%
	25K – 34K	11.0%
	35K – 44K	4.1%
	Over 44K	2.7%
LOCATION		
	Urban	47.8%
	Suburban	35.9%
	Rural	16.3%

Table 4

AREAS OF THERAPY FOCUS SERVED IN PSCS

TREATMENT FOCUS	PERCENTAGE
Anxiety Disorders	92%
Suicidal Ideation	72%
Impulse Control Disorders	92%
Mood Disorders	96%
Childhood Disorders	88%
Eating Disorders	76%
Substance-Related Disorders	52%
Sexual & Gender Identity Disorders	64%
Stress Management	92%
Schizophrenia & Other Psychotic Disorders	36%
Cognitive Disorders	32%
Personality Disorders	100%
Dissociative Disorders	60%
Adjustment Disorders	96%
Sleep Disorders	48%

References

Bent, Russell J. (1986). Psychological Service Centers. In J. Callan, D. Peterson, and G. Stricker (Eds.), Quality in professional psychology training.

Peterson, R. L. (1994). Standards for education in professional psychology: Integrated resolutions from the Conferences of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology.

CHALLENGES TO THE FUTURE OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Susan E. Hawes, Ph.D.

Antioch New England

Dan McKittrick, Ph.D.

Pacific University

Running head: Challenges to Future

Challenges to the Future of Professional Psychology

Introduction

In the context of a rapidly changing health care field (Cummings, 1992, 1995), participants at Standards for Education in Professional Psychology: Reflection and integration, the 1994 Midwinter Conference of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP) identified urgent concerns and opportunities for training in professional psychology. While participants addressed many of these concerns and opportunities through resolutions made at that conference, they also recognized the need to more thoroughly address the topic in impending NCSPP Self-Study.

The “Future Challenges Group” of the Self-Study was developed to explore, through qualitative means, the range of NCSPP members’ notions of future challenges facing both their respective programs and the field of professional psychology, and to inquire into the kinds of solutions participants were considering to meet those challenges. In addition, respondents were asked to express concerns they had in their programs which were unlikely to be recorded in a public, evaluative document, such as accreditation self-study.

Method

A qualitative approach was used here because it is most suited to researchers’ attempts “to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin, 1994). NCSPP delegates at each member school coordinated the structured interviewing of four persons at their respective sites: one senior

administrator, one core faculty, one third or fourth year student, and one graduate. Interviewees were informed that their names and the names of their schools would be kept confidential. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Interviewers asked the participants to describe first the current and future challenges facing their respective schools, then those facing the field of professional psychology. Descriptions of solutions to these challenges by their schools and their relative success were also elicited. Finally, the participants were asked to describe “things that bug them,” or nagging concerns that typically are not included in site visit reports. After the interview, respondents completed the “Future Challenges Rank Ordering Questionnaire,” which contained 10 items generated at the 1994 NCSPM Midwinter Conference. The items or ‘challenges’ were ranked according to their attributed importance to the field of professional psychology.

Analysis

Qualitative Analysis

Twelve NCSPM member professional schools participated in this interview, and a total of 36 interviews analyzed. The data was incomplete to the extent that several schools omitted some interviews: most often omitted were alumni/ae interviews and some student interviews. For the analysis, students and alumni/ae were collapsed into a single group called, “students.” Transcripts of each interview were open coded for thematic content within each research question domain: (1) local challenges to specific professional schools; (2) “nagging concerns” in combination with “things that bug” the respondents. Codes were subsequently organized by respondent role (Administrator,

Faculty, Student, Alumni/ae). Working matrices were made from this material to enhance the interpretive process.

Ranked Data Analysis

Thirty-eight participants' ranking on the "Future Challenges Rank Ordering Questionnaire" were examined in stem-leaf graphic plots for their relative importance. These plots represent the median and quartile ranking distributions on each of the 10 ranked items. Due to the bimodal distributions of the rankings on some "Challenge" items and wide dispersion of rankings on others, the data was collapsed from ten ranking options to three (high, medium, low) to try to elicit more distinctive trends in the data.

Results

There was an overwhelming consensus amongst the respondents that the major challenges facing the field and professional schools concern recent changes in reimbursement for health care in the United States. From some respondents there was a pressing call to keep pace with these changes in order for the discipline and training programs to survive. Further, traditional training sites (internships and practica) for psychologists were found to be diminishing and, in some cases, demolished as hospitals and community mental health centers have been forced to cut back. The changes in health care, such as managed care and other cost-driven preferred provider systems, were viewed as leading to decreased opportunities for psychologists in the practice of independent psychotherapy.

Responses to the threat to independent practice ranged between poles of

resignation and resistance. For example, from within the same institution there was both the claim that “psychotherapy is dead” and the retort that such a claim is reactive and misleading to students. Consistent with such different views, tactical solutions also ranged from those that seek to work creatively within the changing face of mental health care and those that seek not only to raise the alarm of diminished ethical responsiveness to the needs of the public and but to find stronger political influence to counteract the changes as well. From both sides of the issue one can infer implicit accusations of reactionism to the other.

The dominant estimation of professional psychology’s appropriate response to a changing health care system and diminishing psychotherapy opportunities was to develop new roles for psychologists to fill. Some respondents asserted the need to differentiate the skills mastered by professional psychologists from other disciplines. Several argued for the need for professional psychologists to disseminate to consumers accurate information on the kind of quality of service that can be expected with managed care, and others urged psychologists to get involved in areas of public policy.

The move towards differentiation and training for new roles has led to proposals to increase proficiency training in some of the professional schools. Participants presented a range of possible skill areas to be emphasized, introduced, or expanded upon, such as health care administration, outcome research, brief psychotherapies, management, neuropsychology, prescription privileges, public health, and diversity.. Some programs suggest that psychology create affiliations with other disciplines, such as legal and management studies, and are offering programs with joint degrees.

However, such attempts at programmatic revision are viewed by some, even proponents, as a risky stab in the dark, noting that little is certain about the future health market except that it is in flux. Respondents vacillate between calling for programs to attend to reality to accusing change advocates of reification.

Some felt that the move toward proficiency training challenges the quality “generalist” psychology training. How can our programs contain all there is to be learned? Some participants note that APA’s “lock step” requirements for the core curriculum hamper professional schools’ flexibility in responding to new demands for proficiency training. Others decry the treats to “basic or foundational psychology training in the current climate. It has been asked, how we can train good supervisors and mental health consultants when the program is now minimizing the training of psychotherapists?

A concern that emerged across schools and roles was for the excessively large numbers of students in professional psychology training programs, the large numbers of doctoral candidates chasing disappearing predoctoral internships, and the large number of psychologists looking for work in a diminishing marketplace. Students and faculty alike were prone to note the difficulty providing adequate mentoring experiences for trainees when a small number of faculty were responsible for so many students. Certain administrators noted the dependency of programs on tuition alone as the cause of high numbers of students and faculty overwork, and recommendations for finding additional financial support were made by more than one interviewee. The production of large numbers of psychologists was viewed as “glutting the market”, and in combination with

managed care's apparent preference for masters level clinicians, seemed self-destructive for the profession.

The top administrative complaints or "nagging concerns" were about faculty productivity and fiscal constraints. Other nagging concerns expressed by program administrators touched on these themes: (1) concerns about the integrity of psychology in light of current health care changes; (2) worries that their program cannot keep up with the changes demanded by the marketplace; (3) the large number of psychologists being trained; (4) fractionalization amongst a specific subgroup professional psychology educators; (5) problem students and student complaints; (6) wanting the Psy.D. degree to be more rigorous than the Ph.D.; and (7) whether it is possible to require faculty to write and do research.

Faculty's nagging concerns clustered around the heavy workload, fiscal constraints at their institution, and the concomitant training of too many students. It was observed that fiscal constraints have led to excessively low faculty salaries and poor technological resources in some of the program. The heavy workload expectations were cited as detracting from adequate mentoring of students. Students and alumni/ae respondents, like their administrators and faculty, expressed concerns about the salient issues described above: (1) the changing health care situation; (2) the need for proficiency training; (3) questions about the nature of generalist clinical psychology training, (4) and, most frequently, the training of too many students. Other notable local issues cited by these students were: the lack of female faculty on staff, the cost of their education, difficulties with the library resources, and programs that do not accommodate

adult learners.

Future Challenges Ranking Form Results

Analysis of participants' ranking of ten categories of challenge to the field of professional psychology, subsequent to the data being collapsed into ranks of 1st, 2nd, or 3rd, yielded the following results. The highest ranked were, in order of importance, *Need to develop new roles, career paths, etc.*, *Need to train students for new roles*, *Need to be responsive to diverse populations*, and *Need to be responsive to managed care*. The lowest ranked challenge, with an median rank of 10, was *Need to decide whether to pursue prescription privileges*. The following challenges received a rank of 2nd: *Need to be responsive to national/state health care legislation*; *Need to address social concerns*; *Need to attend to social and political contexts*; *Need to work in collaboration with others*; and *Need to prepare students for leadership in public and social policy*. This mid-ranked group of future challenges reflected the most variation in the importance attributed to them than those ranked first and last.

Discussion

This inquiry has created a forum for participants from NCSPP programs to name the issues they believe are having the most significant impact on the field of psychology and on their individual programs. The changing health care market was almost universally cited by participants, but their responses to this external pressure were varied both within and between NCSPP programs. The majority felt an urgent need to adapt to the vicissitude of the health care market by quickly changing professional training objectives from psychotherapy skills to administrative, supervisory or highly

specialized and medically affiliated competencies. However, even proponents of these kinds of adaptations are concerned that this move notably undercuts NCSPP's and APA's expectations for core curricula and generalist training. Then there are those educators and students unwilling to abandon depth psychotherapy to lesser trained professionals, or who wonder how we can train supervisors without first training psychotherapists in depth. It was also noted that all the pressing curriculum changes being made are for an as yet uncertain job market which may still not provide sufficient employment for the large numbers of psychologists being trained. Others note the impact of health care changes on such moral issues as the loss of integrity or "soul" or integrity in the field, as well as new ethical dilemmas in treatment reimbursement. Another recurring theme mentioned by participants with no immediate solution was the seemingly insurmountable material concerns facing their programs. Solutions to the challenges ranged from the introduction of proficiency training and joint degree programs to political action and resistance.

References

Cummings, N. A. (1992). The future of psychotherapy: Society's charge to professional psychology. Independent Practitioner, 12 (3), 126-130.

Cummings, N. A. (1995). Behavioral health after managed care: The next golden opportunity for professional psychology Register Report, 20 (3) and 21(1), 1 & 30-33.

Denzin, N. S. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. S. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, Eds., Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Report of the “Meta-Study” of NCSPP Member APA Self-Study Reports:
Institutional Settings, Training Models, Students and Faculty**

Stanton L. Jones, Paul W. Case, Timothy P. Chaddock, William Compte,
Thomas E. Knudsen, Philip G. Monroe, Nancy K. Scammacca, and Erica L. Wollin

Wheaton College

Running head Wheaton Meta-Study Report

Report of the “Meta-Study” of NCSPP Member APA Self-Study Reports: Institutional Settings, Training Models, Students and Faculty

The “Self Study” of member schools of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP) for the 1995 Mid-Winter Meta Conference included a “meta-study” of the American Psychological Association (APA) self-studies submitted by member schools in pursuit or maintenance of APA accreditation over the last five years. The team leaders for this task were Catherine Acuff, University of Hartford, and Stanton Jones, Wheaton College. This chapter reports work done by the Wheaton team.

The pre-1995 APA criteria for accreditation required examination of seven domains of information (or Criteria). Acuff and Jones divided their meta-study of APA self-studies such that the Wheaton team was to examine Criterion 1 (Institutional Setting) and the Training Model component of Criterion 3. For Criteria 2 (Cultural and Individual Differences), 4 (Faculty), and 5 (Students), the Hartford team examined gender and ethnic/racial diversity issues while the Wheaton team examined other quantifiable data in the reports.

Method

Sample

Self-studies were solicited by verbal announcements and written requests from all NCSPP member schools between January and September, 1994. 22 programs out of the total APA-approved NCSPP membership of 29 (as per the 1993 NCSPP membership roster) submitted self-studies, for a 75.9% “return” rate. Dates of the self-studies ranged from 1990 to 1994. It should be noted that program accreditation by APA is a requirement for full institutional membership in NCSPP, and so all institutions in this study were APA accredited.

Procedures

The authors attempted to examine all quantifiable data from the self-studies in our area of focus. Analyzing even the simplest and most straightforward questions was found to be challenging. For instance, in attempting to examine the academic qualifications of incoming students for doctoral education, we discovered that a number of schools reported no quantified or

quantifiable data on students in the program (presenting blank cells in the required APA self-study tables), while others reported only undergraduate GPA or only GRE scores (with some reporting all GRE scores, some only one combined score, and so forth). A number of interesting questions had to be abandoned due to the rather sizable variation we found in the kinds and quality of data reported in the self-studies, or the lack of reporting of any data.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of Criterion 1: Institutional Setting

General Institutional Setting. Twelve schools in our sample were “University Affiliated,” eight were “Free Standing and Not-For-Profit” (including one “External Learning” institution), one was “Free Standing and For-Profit,” and one was “Seminary Affiliated-.” Two of the NCSPP member institutions explicitly described their institutional identity as including a distinct religious identification, and thus structured their self-studies to include responses to the “Footnote 3” requirements of the APA accreditation standards for religious institutions.

Affiliations for Clinical Training. Sixteen of the sample schools reported having an “in-house” psychological clinic of some sort. Those institutions which specified the nature of their clinic described it as an outpatient clinic; none of those reporting captive service facilities mentioned inpatient programs. All sixteen programs with in-house clinics also maintained contractual ties with other outside training sites. The six schools with no in-house clinic conducted practicum training exclusively through contracts with outside institutions.

Student Support. The tremendous variance in reporting on student support blunted our specific attempts at analysis. We found that Stafford Loans were available to students at all NCSPP member schools, as were special scholarships in support of diversity. Finally, 18 out of 22 schools noted offering teaching and/or research assistantships.

Administration and Resources. Quantification of variables related to faculty governance and administrative control proved to be impossible.

Analysis of Criterion 2: Cultural and Individual Differences

Commitment to Diversity. Fourteen schools had either a Director of Diversity (or a

staff/faculty member with a similar title) or a Committee for Diversity. One school had a student-led group on diversity issues. Only one school specifically reported an Affirmative Action plan for admissions. Specific dimensions of commitment to diversity were not mentioned in the section on Cultural and Individual Differences in six of the self-studies.

Diversity of Practicum Training Settings. We developed a simple tri-level qualitative categorization system for how racial/ethnic diversity issues were handled in practicum settings for the 20 schools which discussed diversity issues in practicum training. Six programs described themselves as having very diverse practicum sites which serve a racially and ethnically diverse clientele and where supervision from professionals who are members of minority groups is available. Eight programs reported that their practicum sites are somewhat diverse and that students desiring experiences with minority populations should be able to obtain those experiences. Six programs reported that access to diverse client populations in practicum training is very limited and may only include socioeconomic diversity (rather than racial /ethnic).

Religion as a Diversity Variable. Religion was mentioned as a specific topic of attention in the Criterion 2 section on Cultural and Individual Differences in seven self-studies. Two of these programs were the two that explicitly identified a religious identity for their institution and used Footnote 3 from the APA accreditation criteria, two were programs affiliated with host institutions with historic religious identifications but which do not use footnote 3, and three of the programs had no particular religious affiliation.

Analysis of Criterion 3: Training Model

Degrees offered. We found that 21 of the 22 NCSPP member institutions studies offer the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) degree, 10 of the 22 offer the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree, with all but one of these institutions also offering the Psy.D. In addition to their doctoral offerings, 11 schools offer a terminal Master of Arts (M.A.) degree of some sort.

Training models. Nine schools utilized the “Practitioner” model of training, three the “Scholar-Practitioner” model, three the “Practitioner-Scholar” model, three the “Practitioner-Scientist” model, two the “Scientist-Practitioner” model, one the “Practitioner-Evaluator” model, one the “Scholar-Professional” model, and two schools did not declare a model. The number of training models reported tallies to more than 22 because two schools identified different training models for their respective Ph.D. and Psy.D. programs. The articulated distinctions between these various training models were not dramatically different (which is perhaps as it should be

given the need for some uniformity in the doctoral training of clinical psychologists.) All of the articulated training models expressed the goals of 1) producing practitioners informed by scientific knowledge and research, 2) producing graduates who would be capable of both generating and evaluating/consuming research, and 3) requiring the research component of the program to be applied rather than theoretical or basic.

Student:Faculty Ratio. The mean reported Student:Faculty ratio was 1.9:1, though the meaning of this statistic is very unclear because of the differing and (unreported) definitions of core and/or full-time faculty status at differing institutions.

Practicum Requirements. Of the 16 schools reporting required practicum training hours, the mean was 1,198 hours, with school requirements ranging from 500 to 2,500 hours.

APA-Approved Predoctoral Internship Placement. Nine schools reported a means of 66.7% of students that go on APA accredited predoctoral internships.

Time to APA Accreditation. For those schools which either reported this latency, or which reported the year classes were first offered and when APA accreditation was first awarded, the average program took 8.73 years to obtain APA accreditation from the year classes were first offered toward the doctoral degree.

Analysis of Criterion 4: Faculty

Faculty variables were examined in 21 of 22 self-studies; one school was omitted because that school had many adjunct faculty and the core faculty were not clearly identified either on their vitae or in tabular reporting to APA. For a faculty member to be included in the analyses below (except the ABPP analysis), two conditions had to be met: the faculty member's name had to appear in the list of "core" faculty or faculty consistently involved with the program, and the faculty vita had to be included in the self-study data. 275 faculty met these two criteria. It is impossible to give firm statistics on the total number of faculty or the mean number of faculty per school because of unclear definitions of full-time, core, associate core, and other faculty.

Terminal Degree. The terminal degrees reported on faculty vitae are listed in Table 1 in decreasing order of frequency.

Table 1: Terminal degrees reported in faculty vitae of NCSPP schools and programs.

Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology	133	48.4
Ph.D. in Psychology – Unspecified	45	16.4
Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology	18	6.5
Psy.D. in Clinical Psychology	15	5.5
Ph.D. in Social Psychology	11	4.5
Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology	7	2.5
Ph.D. – Unspecified	7	2.5
Ed.D. in Educational Psychology	6	2.2
Ph.D. in Marriage and Family Therapy	5	1.8
Ph.D. in Personality Psychology	5	1.8
Ph.D. in Educational Psychology	4	1.5
Ph.D. in School Psychology	3	1.1
M.D. – Doctor of Medicine	3	1.1
Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology	3	1.1
Other (e.g., M.A., M.S.W., or Ph.D. in Psychometrics, Community Psychology, Management, and Philosophy)	10	4.0

Faculty Graduation From APA-Approved Training Programs. 166 faculty with doctoral training in clinical or counseling psychology graduated from APA approved training programs, while 134 with doctoral training in clinical or counseling psychology did not (Note 1). In 75 cases it was deemed that APA-accreditation was not applicable (e.g., faculty who graduated from programs in social or personality psychology, or degree programs out of the field of psychology) or was impossible to determine. Thus of the 200 faculty for whom program APA-accreditation was relevant and could be determined, 83.0% of the faculty graduated from APA approved training programs, while 17.0% did not.

Licensure. 216 out of the 275 faculty reported being licensed for the professional practice of psychology in a state within the United States. 37 faculty reported no licensure, 6 reported licensure to practice Marriage and Family Therapy, 3 reported licensure for the practice of

Medicine, 1 reported licensure in a foreign country, one reported licensure in the field of Social Work, and the remainder were missing cases.

Diplomate Status From our analysis of faculty members with the Diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) credential, we relied on faculty vitae and tabulated data in the self-studies of several programs which did not furnish faculty vitae, and thus our sample was comprised of 358 faculty, not just the 275 faculty for whom we had vitae and a listing in core faculty tables. A total of 39 faculty noted possessing the Diplomate from the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP), 10.9% of the total (358) faculty sample. The absolute number of Diplomate faculty per school ranged from 0 to 6, with the modal number being 0. Of the four schools reporting the highest absolute number of ABPP faculty (one with 6 faculty with ABPPs, three schools with 5 ABPPs), these Diplomate faculty respectively comprised 20.0%, 13.9%, 3 1.3% and 14.3% of the total faculty.

Scholarly productivity. We attempted to quantify scholarly productivity in the following manner. We identified a bracket of time from the date of the self-study (range from 1990 to 1994) backwards for five years, and categorized faculty scholarly activity during that period of time for each school. So, for example, if a school submitted a self-study dated 1993, we examined faculty activities noted on each faculty vita from 1988 through 1992 (inclusive).

Journal or serial publications were categorized in three ways: 1) articles in APA-sponsored journals (as reported annually in the American Psychologist); 2) articles in other refereed journals (as determined by listing of the journal in Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory 1994-1995); and 3) other articles (e.g., in nonrefereed journals, newsletters or magazines). Books and book chapters were categorized according to whether they were published by (or in books published by) "top psychology publishing companies" or not. The category "top psychology publishers" was defined operationally by surveying the "Publisher Index" of PsycBOOKS (American Psychological Association) for the years 1987 through 1990, and defining the "top psychology publishers" as those publishers of psychology books which published a minimum of ten books in psychology which were reviewed in this publication in each of the years surveyed. In this manner, we came up with a list of 22 "top psychology publishers" (Note 2). It is worth noting that this definition is affected both by the volume of books published in the psychology field by a publisher and by the choice of the editors of PsycBOOKS of which books to review as relevant to the field of psychology. Presentations were

categorized according to whether a paper was presented at a professional meeting, some other sort of presentation was presented at a professional meeting (such as a workshop, symposium, or discussion hour), or finally that the presentation appeared to have occurred in some other nonprofessional context such as radio interviews and addresses to civic or religious organizations. The results of these categorizations are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Scholarly productivity of faculty over five years at NCSPP schools and programs.

	Mean Per Faculty Members Over 5 Years Across All Institutions (Standard Deviation)	Range of Institutional Means Per Faculty Member Low - High
APA Journal Papers	0.26 (.82)	0 – 1.12
Non-APA Refereed Journal Papers	1.50 (2.78)	0 – 4.93
Nonrefereed Journal Papers	2.01 (3.21)	0 – 8.73
Books Published with “Top” Psychology Publishers	0.17 (0.61)	0 – 1.00
Books Published with Other Publishers	0.44 (1.40)	0 – 2.53
Book Chapters Published with “Top” Psychology Publishers	0.57 (1.59)	0 – 3.93
Book Chapters Published with Other Publishers	0.96 (1.87)	0 – 4.40
Paper Presentations at Professional Conferences or Meetings	2.12 (4.46)	0 – 11.80
Paper Presentations at Professional Conferences or Meetings	3.50 (6.32)	0 – 11.93
Other Presentations in Nonprofessional Contexts	2.55 (4.82)	0 – 7.53

We can clarify the meaning of the data in Table 2 with an example. Several Schools reported no articles in APA journals for any core faculty for the five-year period examined, and this these schools averaged zero articles in APA journal. The 16 faculty of the school with the highest average for publishing articles in APA journals produces 18 APA journal articles over five years for an average of 1.12 articles per faculty member. The overall average of 0.26 articles in APA journals means that an average NCSPP member school with a faculty of twelve would

have generated three articles in APA journals over a five year period.

Analysis of Criterion 5: Students

Academic Quality of NCSPP Doctoral Students. Table 3 presents the GRE scores and undergraduate grade point averages for the students at these schools. A surprising number of schools, fewer than half of our sample, did not provide GRE statistics on their student body.

Table 3: Student academic quality indicators upon admission at NCSPP schools and programs.

	GRE-Verbal	GRE-Quant	GRE-Analyt	GRE-Verb +Quant	GRE-Psych	Undergrad GPA
Number of Schools Reporting (out of 22)	8	8	8	8	5	19
Absolute Range of Individual Scores	300-810	300-800	240-800	630-1530	370-760	1.7 – 4.0
Range of School Means	537.5-607.6	542.6-604.6	551.2-592.7	1083-1212	560.3-581.8	3.07-3.61
Mean – All NCSPP Students	568.55	574.9	576.09	1135.33	588.06	3.31

Attrition Rates. Attrition rates were reported by 16 schools. Attrition rates ranged from 1.2% to 30.3%, with a mean of 10.4% and a median of 7.0%.

Degree Completion Time. Seventeen schools reported a statistic of years to graduate, with reported means ranging from 3.73 to 7.14 years. Because of uncertainty regarding how many students these reported means were calculated on, no overall mean for all NCSPP students could be calculated.

Prior Graduate Training. Thirteen schools reported the percentage of entering students with prior graduate training. It was impossible to determine the percentages of these students who had completed graduate degrees versus those who had “some” graduate training (possibly as little as one course). Several schools reported very high rates of prior graduate training (with two school reporting 100% and one school reporting 90%), while several schools reported very low rates (e.g., 12.2% and 13.8%).

References

- American Psychological Association. PsycBOOKS 1987-1990. Washington, DC:
American Psychological Association.
- Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory 1994-1995. New Providence, NJ: Bowker

Notes

1. Only 169 faculty reported explicitly on their vitae that they graduated from Clinical, Counseling or School Psychology ~ (as reflected in Table 2), which contrasts with our determination that APA accreditation was relevant to the programs of 200 faculty (considerably more than 169). The discrepancy is explained by a large portion of those 45 faculty who listed only an unspecified Ph.D. in psychology, but who also listed that they had graduated from an APA accredited program, being counted as graduates from APA accredited clinical or counseling programs. We took the additional step of verifying that they had in fact graduated from a school which had an APA accredited program in the year of their graduation.
2. The top psychology book publishers were: Allyn & Bacon, Brunner Mazel, Cambridge, Charles Cr. Thomas, Guilford, Harvard, International University, Jason Aronson, John Wiley, Jossey Bass, Lawrence Erlbaum, Lexington/Heath, MIT, Oxford, Pergamon, Plenum, Praeger, Prentice-Hall, Routledge, Sage, Springer, and Yale.

Diversity Statistics. Table 1 presents the means and ranges of percentages on racial/ethnic and gender diversity in the student bodies of schools and programs in our study. It is worth noting that apart from one school which recruits heavily from the Hispanic community, the range for enrollment of Caucasians was 73.3% to 95.7% of the total NCSPP student body.

	Af-Am Male	Af-Am Female	Caucas Male	Caucas Female	Hispan Male	Hispan Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Am-Ind Male	Am-Ind Female	Other Male	Other Female	Total Male	Total Female
Mean	1.5	3.1	31.4	50.8	2.3	4.4	1.1	1.5	0.1	0.3	0.9	2.2	37.5	62.5
Range	0-6.3	0-12.7	15.5-54.2	22.3-64.8	0-18.9	0-35.8	0-3.5	0-4.4	0-0.5	0-1.6	0-2.3	0-9.3	24.9-57.6	42.4-75.1

Table 1: Diversity statistics for students at NCSPP schools and programs