April 20, 2015

V. Burns Hargis, J.D.
President and System CEO
Oklahoma State University
Office of the President
107 Whitehurst Hall
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear President Hargis,

At its meeting on March 19-22, 2015 the Commission on Accreditation conducted a review of the doctoral Ph.D. program in Clinical psychology at Oklahoma State University. This review included consideration of the program’s most recent self-study report, the preliminary review of October 16, 2013 and the program’s response to the preliminary review on February 28, 2014, the report of the team that visited the program on April 14-15, 2014, the program’s response to the site visit report on June 8, 2014, the deferral for information letter dated August 18, 2014, and the response to the deferral letter received February 9, 2015.

I am pleased to inform you that, on the basis of this review, the Commission on Accreditation (CoA) voted to award accreditation to this program. In so doing, the Commission scheduled the next accreditation site visit to be held in 2021. During the interim, the program will be listed annually among accredited programs of professional psychology in the American Psychologist and on the Accreditation web pages. The Commission also encourages you to share information about your program’s accredited status with agencies and others of the public as appropriate.

Drs. Debora Bell and Jan Culbertson recused and therefore did not participate in the discussion and vote on your program. Elizabeth Klonoff, Board of Educational Affairs liaison to CoA; and Jacqueline Wall, Director of the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation, recused and therefore were not present for the discussion on your program.

The Commission would like to provide the program with a summary of its review. This is provided below according to each of the accreditation domains. At the end of the letter, the program will be provided with an itemized list of any actions that the program needs to take prior to the next accreditation review.

---

**Domain A: Eligibility**

*As a prerequisite for accreditation, the program’s purpose must be within the scope of the accrediting body and must be pursued in an institutional setting appropriate for the doctoral education and training of professional psychologists.*
The Clinical psychology Ph.D. program at Oklahoma State University seeks to prepare its graduates for the practice of clinical psychology. The program is housed in the Department of Psychology, which is part of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University. The University is a large regionally-accredited land-grant public university that provides administrative and financial stability to the program within a mission that matches well with the goals of the department and program. Written program policies are clear, comprehensive, and readily available to current and prospective students.

By September 1, 2015, the program is asked to indicate where in the Graduate Student Handbook information regarding residency requirements can be found and how the Handbook is made available to current and prospective students, and the public.

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

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

The program describes itself as adhering to a scientist-practitioner model for the purpose of producing graduates who are prepared for roles as scientists and clinicians. Curriculum and practica experiences are sequential, cumulative, and graded in complexity. Research training is conducted under a mentorship model that appears to be successful. Practica are vertically integrated, and the practicum team model has been used to good effect, linking science and practice early and frequently during the curriculum.

In its Table B.2, the program describes minimal levels of achievement that apply to the program as a whole rather than to each student. For example, for Goal 1, Competency 5, measures 1 and 2, the minimum levels of achievement (MLAs) refer to the percentages of students in the program authoring presentations (MLA 80%) and publications (MLA 50%) (defer for information response [DFI-R]). While such data are useful for overall program evaluation, these MLAs are not an effective measure of student competence. In a narrative response by September 1, 2015, the program is asked to describe how it evaluates student attainment of Goal 1, Competency 5 and what its minimal levels of achievement are for each student.

For Goal 5 (to produce responsible and mature professional psychologists), Competency 1 (demonstrate the ability to meet professional obligations including class attendance, punctuality with deadlines, as well as accurate timely record keeping in clinical contexts), the first measure indicates that the MLA is achieving a rating of “making satisfactory progress” on an overall rating from the “Annual Review of Student Progress” form (DFI-R; self-study [SS], Appendix I-19). It is unclear how this rating applies to “regular class and meeting attendance, punctuality, and record keeping” as indicated on Table B.2. Additionally, making progress does not reflect attainment of competency. In a response by September 1, 2015, the program is asked to clarify its means of assessing Competency 1 of Goal 5, and the minimum levels of achievement for this competency.
**Domain C: Program Resources**

The program demonstrates that it has resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its education and training goals.

The program faculty are accomplished and productive scholars, and all appear dedicated to the integrative scientist-practitioner goals of the program. There are sufficient faculty to meet the program's training needs.

Program students are of high quality at admissions and they perform successfully during and after their time in the program. Students are sufficient in number and are distributed across cohorts to produce meaningful support and socialization.

The in-house training clinic is an excellent program resource. The university provides a very broad array of student support services.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

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

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

The program has maintained a long-standing commitment to diversity, and its systematic approach to attracting and retaining students and faculty from diverse backgrounds has produced laudable outcomes.

Cultural and individual diversity training is infused throughout the curriculum, including formal coursework, practicum training sites, and faculty role models. Diversity continues to be a strength of the program as it has been for many years.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations**

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

Student-faculty relations are characterized by mutual respect, collegiality, and shared values and ethics. Students reported generally positive and helpful interactions across a variety of domains, that faculty were readily available as needed, and that feedback systems were appropriate and helpful (site visit report [SVR], Domain E). Students are represented on many committees, and their input is influential.

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

The program engages in regular and effective self-assessment, utilizing monthly core clinical faculty meetings for extensive review of the program’s successes and areas for improvement. Student input is regularly gathered and carefully considered. A number of substantial changes to the program, such as the nature of several courses, have resulted from consideration of student input.

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

The program’s proximal data demonstrate that students are achieving the program’s goals, objectives, and competencies. The program’s distal data indicate that alumni are highly satisfied with their doctoral preparation, and the program is achieving its goals and objectives.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

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

The program is well-described in its public materials.

The program’s website accurately presents student outcome data, consistent with Implementing Regulation C-20. Please note that the program’s public information will be reviewed on or after October 1 of each year to ensure that the disclosure data has been updated and is in compliance with the most recent version of IR C-20. The most current version of IR C-20 is attached for your information.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

Domain H: Relationship with Accrediting Body
The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process by fulfilling its responsibilities to the accrediting body from which its accredited status is granted.

Through prior correspondence with CoA, the program gave detailed explanations of how some curriculum areas are infused throughout the program (self-study [SS], P3-11 & P17-31). Additionally, the program clarified the rationale behind its means of achieving exposure to these areas through non-traditional course pairings. Given that correspondence preceding this letter will not be part of the next reaccreditation review, the program is asked to explain in its next
self-study where in the program this infusion of curriculum areas is found, citing specific course content or practicum experiences. For instance, it will be crucial for the program to revisit the rationale for specialty developmental courses satisfying the developmental bases of behavior area and for practicum to satisfy the individual differences area (along with specified other courses) if these practices continue. Similarly, the mechanism(s) through which adequate exposure to all curriculum areas is provided will need to be carefully described in the next self-study.

In order to keep the Commission informed of the program’s commitment to the ongoing self-study process, the program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1, 2015:

- Indicate where in the Graduate Student Handbook information regarding residency requirements can be found and how the Handbook is made available to current and prospective students and the public.

The program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1, 2015 for formal review by the Commission:

- Describe how it evaluates student attainment of competence and what its minimal levels of achievement are for each student.

- Clarify its means of assessing Competency 1 of Goal 5, and the minimum levels of achievement for this competency.

While these items are considered an addendum to the data provided in the Annual Report Online (ARO), they are not to be submitted online. The program’s response to the items listed above should be identified as ‘Narrative Response – Program Review’ and mailed or faxed to the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation by the designated due date(s).

The accreditation website (www.apa.org/ed/accreditation) provides important updates and policy changes related to the accreditation process. As an accredited program, we encourage you to periodically visit the website to remain current on all new accreditation policies. The Commission on Accreditation would also like to remind you that all accredited programs must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes that could alter the program’s quality. A copy of Implementing Regulation C-19 (Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs) is attached for your information.

Please note that at the time of your next self-study submission, your program will be reviewed under the new Standards for Accreditation (SoA). Additional information on the 2017 implementation of the SoA will be provided in the coming months. Please visit the accreditation website for updates and information.
In closing, on behalf of the Commission on Accreditation, I extend congratulations to the faculty and students of the professional psychology program for their achievements. The Commission also expresses its appreciation for your personal commitment, and the corresponding support of your administration, to develop and maintain the best possible quality of graduate education and training in psychology. If the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation may be of service at any time on administrative matters of accreditation, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Betsy Reed
Associate Director, Operations
Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation

cc: Robert J Sternberg, Ph.D., Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs
    Bret Danilowicz, Ph.D., Dean, Colleg of Arts and Sciences
    Thad R. Leffingwell, Ph.D., Head, Department of Psychology
    Larry Mullins, Ph.D., Director of Clinical Training
    Dr. Gary E. Jones, Site Visit Team Chair
    Dr. Elizabeth O’Laughlin, Site Visit Team Member
    Dr. Richard McGlynn, Site Visit Team Generalist
C-20. Disclosure of Education/Training Outcomes and Information Allowing for Informed Decision-Making to Prospective Doctoral Students

(Commission on Accreditation, May 2006; revised November 2006; July 2007; July 2010; March 2012; April 2013; March 2014; May 2014)

Domain G of the Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology (G&P) requires that doctoral graduate programs provide potential students, current students, and the public with accurate information on the program and on program expectations. This information is meant to describe the program accurately and completely, using the most up-to-date data on education and training outcomes, and be presented in a manner that allows applicants to make informed decisions about entering the program.

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

Presentation of Required Information
To ensure that the required information for each program is available to the public in a consistent fashion, the following three provisions are effective September 15, 2012:

- The information must all be located in a single place and be titled “Student Admissions, Outcomes, and Other Data”;
- If the program has a website, the information must be located no more than one-click away from the main/home doctoral landing page; and (see update to this provision below)
- The data must be presented in tables consistent with those listed at the end of this regulation. Programs may choose to provide other data to supplement the requirements of this regulation, but these tables must be provided. If the program chooses to provide supplemental information, it should be provided below the corresponding required tables.

In addition to the provisions already in effect, two additional requirements are effective September 15, 2013:

- The link from the main/home doctoral landing page to the required information must also be titled “Student Admissions, Outcomes, and Other Data”;
- Table cells should not be left blank; instead, please enter a “0” if not applicable except where indicated in table

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


1. Time to Completion

Time to completion must be presented in two ways:

- First, programs must provide the **mean** and the **median** number of years that students have taken to complete the program from the time of first matriculation. These data should be provided for all graduates* in each of the past seven (7) years.
- Second, the program should provide the percentage of students completing the program in fewer than five years, five years, six years, seven years, and more than seven years.

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

2. Program Costs

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

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

3. Internships

Programs are expected to provide data on students’ success in obtaining internships. The program is required to report for **each** of the past seven (7) years:

- The total number of students who sought or applied for internships
- The number and percent of total who obtained internships
- The number and percent of total who obtained APA/CPA-accredited internships
- The number and percent of total who obtained APPIC member internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited *(if applicable)*
- The number and percent of total who obtained other membership organization internships (e.g., CAPIC) that were not APA/CPA-accredited *(if applicable)*
- The number and percent of total who obtained internships conforming to CDSSPP guidelines (school psychology programs only) that were not APA/CPA-accredited *(if applicable)*
- The number and percent of total who obtained other internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited *(if applicable)*
- The number and percent of total who obtained paid internships
- The number and percent of total who obtained half-time internships *(if applicable)*
NOTES: In calculating the above percentages, the program must base these on the **total number of students** who sought or who applied for internship in each year, including those that withdrew from the application process. To ensure readability and understanding for prospective students, Internship Placement-Table 1 and Internship Placement-Table 2 must be presented separately.

4. Attrition

Programs must report the number and percentage of students who have failed to complete the program once enrolled. These data should be calculated for each entering cohort by dividing the number of students in that cohort who have left the program for any reason by the total number of students initially enrolled in that same cohort. These data should be provided by cohort for all students who have left the program in the last seven (7) years or for all students who have left since the program became initially accredited, whichever time period is shorter.

5. Licensure

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

- The denominator is the total number of program graduates between 2 and 10 years ago
- The numerator is the number of these graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years
- The licensure percentage, then, is calculated by dividing the number of graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years by the number of graduates during the 8 year span from 2 to 10 years ago. For example, the figures reported by a program for 2014 would be number of graduates from the program between 2004 and 2012 who have achieved licensure in the past 10 years divided by the total number of students graduating from the program between 2004 and 2012.

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

*Please refer to footnote on first page of this *Implementing Regulation* for definition of graduates.
*Please refer to footnote on first page of this Implementing Regulation for definition of graduates.
The following formatted tables are required to be placed in your public materials for data due October 1, 2014. These tables must be updated each subsequent year.

### Time to Completion for all students entering the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year in which Degrees were Conferred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students with doctoral degree conferred on transcript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of years to complete the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of years to complete the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Degree Ranges</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in less than 5 years</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 5 years</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 6 years</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in 7 years</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in more than 7 years</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Also, please describe or provide a link to program admissions policies that allow students to enter with credit for prior graduate work, and the expected implications for time to completion. Please indicate NA if not applicable:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014-2015 1st-year Cohort Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition for full-time students (in-state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition for full-time students (out-of-state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition per credit hour for part-time students (if applicable enter amount; if not applicable enter “NA”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/institution fees or costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional estimated fees or costs to students (e.g. books, travel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Internship Placement - Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained APA/CPA-accredited internships</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained APPIC member internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited <em>(if applicable)</em></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained other membership organization internships (e.g. CAPIC) that were not APA/CPA-accredited <em>(if applicable)</em></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained internships conforming to CDSPP guidelines that were not APA/CPA-accredited <em>(if applicable)</em></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained other internships that were not APA/CPA-accredited <em>(if applicable)</em></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who obtained any internship</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who sought or applied for internships including those who withdrew from the application process</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( h = a \times \frac{g}{100}; i = b \times \frac{g}{100}; j = c \times \frac{g}{100}; k = d \times \frac{g}{100}; l = e \times \frac{g}{100}; m = f \times \frac{g}{100}; (a+b+c+d+e) = f \) each year; \( (h+i+j+k+l) = m \) each year.

### Internship Placement - Table 2

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

Cell “o” should only include students who applied for internship and are included in cell “g” from “Internship Placement – Table 1.”

Note: \( p = n \times \frac{g}{100}; q = o \times \frac{g}{100} \)
### Attrition

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

*Note: \((b+c+d) = a\) each year; \((e+f+g) = 100\) each year*

### Licensure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2004 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The total number of program graduates (doctoral degrees conferred on transcript) between 2 and 10 years ago</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of these graduates (between 2 and 10 years ago) who became licensed psychologists in the past 10 years</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure percentage</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \(c = b/a \times 100\)*
C-19. Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs
(Commission on Accreditation, February 2005; revised October 2006)

In accordance with Domain H.2 of the Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation (G&P) and Section 4.7(b) of the Accreditation Operating Procedures (AOP), all accredited programs (doctoral, internship and postdoctoral residencies) whether under a single administrative entity or in a consortium, must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes that could alter the program's quality.

The Commission on Accreditation (CoA) must be informed in advance of major program changes such as changes in model, degree offered, policies/procedures, administrative structure, faculty resources, supervision resources, area of emphases, or tracks/rotations. In the case of doctoral programs, this includes changes in the areas of emphasis. For internship/postdoctoral programs, this includes new, additional, or eliminated rotation or training sites. For example, consortium programs must inform the CoA of any substantial changes in structure, design or training sites.

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

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

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