



REPORT, Part 1

5th International Congress on Licensure, Certification and Credentialing of Psychologists

July 7-9, 2013 at the CLARION HOTEL
SIGN, STOCKHOLM

Sponsored by ASPPB, NPA and APA

*Competence as a Common Language for Professional
Identity and International Recognition*

Content	page
1. Foreword	3
2. Planning and organization of the congress	4
2.1 The start	4
2.2 The Organizing Committee	4
2.3 Participation at ICP2013	5
2.4 Stakeholder list and invitations	5
2.5 Production of documents	5
2.6 Economy	6
3. The Congress	6
3.1 The congress in numbers	6
3.2 The program	6
3.2.1 Plenary sessions	6
3.2.2 Breakout groups	6
3.3 Facilitators	6
3.4 Participants	7
3.5 The process	7
3.5.1 Day one	7
3.5.2 Day two	11
3.5.3 Day three	12
4. Evaluation of the congress	14
5. Continuation of the project	14
6. Appendixes	15

1. Foreword

Competence as a Common Language for Professional Identity and International Recognition.

Competence was selected by the Organizing Committee during early meetings to begin planning the 5th International Congress on Licensure, Certification and Credentialing. Our goal, while intriguing, was also quite challenging: “To promote the development of a global agreement on identifying the benchmark competencies that define professional psychology”. However, because of the demonstrated interest and energy of so many knowledgeable and dedicated people, we now firmly believe that our goal is possible to achieve. It has been an incredible “voyage” through these three years of planning and then experiencing the congress.

There has been broad support for both the 5th International Congress in Stockholm during July, 2013 as an opening conversation about the guiding concept and intended goal and also the evolution of this first conversation into a multi-year, multi-stakeholder international project. It has been the willingness of all the planners and participants to move beyond discussing regional and national differences and to begin exploring areas of common understanding and agreement that inspires the belief that this effort can be successful.

First of all a huge thank you goes to the Association of State and Provincial Boards (ASPPB) CEO Steve DeMers and the Board of Directors that trusted “a pensioner” in Norway to guide and manage this project, and to the Norwegian Psychological Association (NPA), with president Tor Levin Hofgaard and the Secretary General Ole Tunold, for their unwavering support, and both organizations plus the American Psychological Association for their financial sponsorship of the Stockholm Congress. The day-to-day cooperation between ASPPB and NPA has been great. Amy Hilson, ASPPB, played an important role in this work. Thank you so much.

And then I want to express our thanks to the Organizing Committee for the active backing and many useful contributions and criticisms, the Work Group for their continued input and efforts, Dave Bartram and Emil Rodolfa for writing important documents and for their role as meta-facilitators at the congress, the ten facilitators that took on the challenge of chairing the groups, writing reports and did it so well, to APA for their sponsorship and great interest that was shown by so many representatives coming to Stockholm, to IAAP and IUPsyS for backing the congress and the project with all the support in advance of Stockholm and for a wide representation, and last but not least, to Bjørnhild Stokvik, NPA, for technical support and know-how prior to and at the congress, to Amy Hilson for impressive note-taking all through the congress, and to Alex Siegel, ASPPB, for important participation both in planning and at the venue.

The very last HUGE THANK YOU goes to all the participants at the congress for coming, some of them from far away, all at their own expense, for their positive attitude, for their efforts to create results and for the continuous support that has been shown also when we enter a new stage of this process.

Oslo 26. September 2013

On behalf of the organizers, Sverre L. Nielsen, congress co-chair, senior adviser NPA.

2. Planning and organization of the congress

2.1 The start

Towards the end of 2010 Steve DeMers, Executive Officer of ASPPB, contacted Sverre L. Nielsen to discuss the possibility of organizing a 5th International Congress in Europe. This dialog resulted in an agreement between ASPPB and the Norwegian Psychological Association (NPA) to jointly organize the 5th International Congress 7 – 9. July 2013, in Stockholm, prior to The 13th European Congress of Psychology (ECP2013). The reason why NPA was contacted has its background in the long relationship between these two organizations and the fact that NPA collaborated with ASPPB to organize a successful 2nd International Congress in Oslo in July 2000.

The agreement between ASPPB and NPA was formally negotiated in Istanbul in July 2011 and the contract signed later that year. Steve DeMers and Sverre L. Nielsen were appointed co-chairs. The latter would also function as a secretary general for the congress. ASPPB took the overall financial responsibility, while NPA handled most of secretarial functions and contact with the venue in Stockholm. Participant registration and accommodation booking was handled by ASPPB. The cooperation between the two offices was excellent.

2.2 The Organizing Committee

During the first half of 2011 an Organizing Committee was formed. Most of the invitations were issued in May 2011. With the great positive response to the invitations, the committee consisted of leading members from international, regional and national psychology associations. [See appendix 1 for list of Organizing Committee members.](#)

A work group was later formed consisting of Merry Bullock (APA), Karen Cohen (CPA), Dave Bartram (SHL), Steve DeMers (ASPPB), Amy Hilson (ASPPB), Alex Siegel (ASPPB), Ole Tunold and Sverre L. Nielsen (NPA).

The Organizing Committee (“OrgCom”) held four meetings; Istanbul July 2011, Washington DC August 2011, Cape Town July 2012 and Orlando August 2012. In addition the Work Group held a one and a half day meeting in Chicago, October 2011. The co-chairs together with Amy Hilson and Alex Siegel have also held several meetings in connection with ASPPB meetings and international conferences where they attended. When possible, Ole Tunold and Bjørnhild Stokvik, NPA, also attended.

Already at the first meeting of the OrgCom it was suggested to aim at something besides sharing our differences and to accomplish this using a different meeting format, moving away from the typical congress format consisting of keynotes, paper sessions and symposia. Due to the growing challenges connected to international mobility and global approaches to delivering psychological services, the meeting concluded with the proposal to focus on “competence” as a common denominator across countries, regions and current regulatory structures. The group decided to pursue this proposal further and suggest it as a theme for the Stockholm congress. The second OrgComm meeting, just a month later but on the other side of the globe, consisted of some members from the first meeting and other key members who could not attend the first meeting. This broader meeting of key stakeholders embraced the proposal from the first meeting and further elaborated exploring the possibility of an international agreement on competence in professional psychology” as the congress theme.

The meeting of the Work Group in October 2011 focused on developing further what had been recommended at the OrgCom meetings;

- A first draft of a detailed plan for the congress was produced.
- The congress would be a by-invitation-only working conference.

- A Foundation Document would be written to explain the motives and aims of the conference.
- The International Congress of Psychology (ICP2012) in Cape Town would be used as a start and promotion of the 5th International Congress, with two symposia and a panel discussion.
- A stakeholder list was to be established.

At the two OrgCom meetings in summer 2012, challenges and logistics of the congress-planning were addressed.

2.3 Participation at ICP2013

At the International Congress of Psychology (ICP2012), in Cape Town July 2012 the organizers of the 5th International Congress organized two invited symposia and one panel discussion:

” Competence as a common language for professional identity and international recognition”

Symposium 1: “Can international agreement on competencies in psychology help to address the emerging global challenges” Chair: Steve DeMers.

Symposium 2: “Current models of psychological competencies from around the world” Chair: Sverre L. Nielsen.

Panel discussion: “Can the current models of competence be integrated and accepted as a means of addressing current global challenges?” Chair: Dave Bartram.

Presenters at these sessions were colleagues from all over the world and the sessions were well attended. This congress was also used to promote the 5th International Congress and to establish new contacts to be invited to Stockholm.

2.4 Stakeholder list and invitations

A stakeholder list was established, using membership lists from IUPsyS, IAAP, EFPA and suggestions of relevant names from OrgCom members. Around 200 invitations were issued, most of them in the period January – March 2013. Some relevant names were proposed later and invitations subsequently issued, the last ones as late as June 2013.

2.5 Production of documents

To provide the congress participants and interested stakeholders with relevant information about the background and aim of the congress it was decided to write a “Foundation Document”. After being drafted by the Work Group the document was reviewed by the OrgCom members with many comments and a few discussions of central issues connected to the concept of competence. The final version was accepted October 2012. See Appendix 2. In addition a “Statement” was prepared as a shorter version of the Foundation Document. In these documents the final wording of the congress goal was presented; *“The central issues to be addressed are the feasibility and processes through which psychology might reach global consensus on the competencies required by psychologists across the various fields of professional practice. Such consensus would provide an internationally consistent definition of what a psychologist ‘is’, and would enhance the possibilities of international mobility within the profession.”*

Four documents, written by Dave Bartram and Emil Rodolfa were then produced to give the congress participants an overview of relevant models on competencies;

Doc 1 “Definitions of Competence”

Doc 2 “Questions to Address”

Doc 3 “Summary Models v2”

Doc 4 “International Competency Comparisons v2”

See appendix 4 – 7.

2.6 Economy

From the start ASPPB and NPA decided to sponsor the congress. APA was the only sponsor in addition to these. Many other organizations were asked to sponsor, but without success.

3. The congress

The 5th International Congress took place 7th to 9th July 2013 at Clarion Hotel Sign, Stockholm, Sweden. The majority of the participants also stayed at this hotel.

3.1 The congress in numbers

- 250 addresses were included in the “stakeholder list”
- 150 invitations were issued
- 75 persons participated at the congress
- 18 countries were represented
- 5 continents were represented
- 2 international associations were represented (IUPsyS and IAAP)

3.2 The program

See appendix 8 for the Program.

Since the plan was to have a working conference the time of the program was divided into;

- 5 ¼ hours plenary sessions
- 10 hours breakout sessions (groups)
- 7 ¾ hours facilitators meetings
-

3.2.1 Plenary sessions

An **opening session** kicked off the Congress with welcome greetings from the presidents of ASPPB and NPA (the two organizers), from the president of APA (sponsor) and from the presidents of IUPsyS and IAAP, and information from the two co-chairs. Also, Robert Roe (president of The European Federation of Psychologists Associations (EFPA) delivered a keynote address entitled: “Towards Global Standards for Psychology Competences and beyond”.

The **closing session** began with a summary report from the meta-facilitators that focused on general themes that emerged across the small groups. Next, a full hour was dedicated to participant comments and reactions in an “open floor session”. The session ended with a discussion from the co-chairs about the proposed plan to continue this work going forward, and thanks extended to all participants, facilitators, staff and sponsoring organizations.

See appendix 9 for the notes from this session.

At **other general sessions of all participants**, the meta-facilitators (Dave Bartram and Emil Rodolfa) summarized the reports from the small group facilitators, discussed common themes or interesting possibilities raised in the small groups and then suggested the tasks for the next group session.

3.2.2 Breakout groups

All participants were divided into ten small groups and each small group was led by a facilitator. All groups were given the same tasks. The mix of participants in the small groups was changed each day so that each participant was able to interact with a range of other participants and several different facilitators.

3.3 Facilitators

Ten facilitators (group chairs) were appointed in advance of the congress. They were briefed both through emails and at a meeting before the congress opening. In addition two meta-facilitators were appointed. All of these facilitators met for a brief session both before and after each breakout meeting of participants. The following individuals agreed to serve in these important roles:

Meta-facilitators

- Dave Bartram, UK
- Emil Rodolfa, USA

Facilitators

- Merry Bullock, USA
- Karen Cohen, Canada
- Steve DeMers, USA
- Judy Hyde, Australia
- Halvor Kjølstad, Norway
- Patrick W. L. Leung, Hong Kong
- Steve Osborne, New Zealand
- José María Peiró, Spain
- Ype H. Poortinga, The Netherlands
- Tholene Sodi, South Africa

3.4 Participants

See appendix 10 for the list of participants.

3.5 Staff

Staff at the congress site was

- Amy Hilson
- Bjørnhild Stokvik
- Alex Siegel
- Sverre L. Nielsen

3.6 The process

For detailed notes from the facilitators meetings and reports from facilitators (Monday and Tuesday) see “Report of the 5th International Congress on Licensure, Certification and Credentialing of Psychologists. **Part 2 –Facilitators meetings. Notes and reports”**.”

3.6.1 DAY ONE

Initial comments presented to the participants at the orientation session.

SVERRE: I hope that the output of this congress is worth the significant input. We really appreciate the time and financial support given by each participant to attend this congress.

TOR: Tasks given to a psychologist varies. What are the core competencies of those tasks.

Psychology risks becoming a footnote in history if we don't define the profession. Psychology has a common language but we may speak it differently. This is a historic opportunity not to predict the future but to create it.

STEVE: We have made great progress to move beyond the mentality in the US, that My state does it better than your state. Given the differences in culture, language, societal needs, and educational and regulatory systems across countries and regions, international practice and mobility may be even more challenging to achieve. Goal is to try and find a way to identify similarities, to seek agreements and understandings across international borders. We are here to start a dialogue about creating a process that might lead to reaching our goal.

JOSE MARIA: An outcome of this congress is to make psychology ready for the 21st century.

SATHS: The definition of psychology has dogged the International Union. Surprisingly there are many more similarities than differences. This is a serious project. We all know this is a shrinking world. The world is better placed to understand what makes a psychologist. This process will continue with the support of the international organizations. The effort we are starting will be processed and the dialogue will continue when we meet in Paris.

ROBERT: Can we reach global agreement on identifying benchmark competenc(i)es that define professional psychology.

What is needed to reach agreement:

To be successful in developing global standards for psychologists, we need

- to identify and invite stakeholders
- to determine the scope of the project
- to develop an agenda
- to decide which actions to undertake, in which order

The endeavor will profit from guidance and coordination by global organizations, i.e. IUPsyS and IAAP.

DAVE AND EMIL

Rationale

- a. The emphasis is on defining professional competence rather than specifying curricula or training requirements.
- b. Much work has been done in a number of countries on defining the competences of applied psychologists.
- c. In seeking international agreement we should build on this work rather than start from a blank sheet.
- d. With this in mind we reviewed a number of national models and one international model (EuroPsy) .
- e. We know that there will be other models which we did not review. Hopefully delegates will introduce those.

Competence

- f. Key to our work is an understanding of the construct of competence.
- g. We prepared a paper discussing this to help inform the task of agreeing on a definition of this.
- h. Key to any such definition is the notion of *professional performance that meets some defined standard in relation to some specified domain of practice*.
- i. Key challenges relate to:
 - i. the specification of that standard.
 - ii. how we judge whether an individual meets that standard
- j. There are potentially many ways of attaining a standard of competence and we see great diversity in how different institutions and countries go about this.

Process and Results

- k. We identified competence models developed in UK, Australia, North America and EFPA. We recognize that this is not an exhaustive list.
 - i. Produced short summary reviews of each model.
 - ii. Carried out a content analysis looking for similarities and differences.
 - iii. Summarised this analysis on the spreadsheet you have been sent.
- l. Produced an example 'integrated model' which you also have.
- m. General conclusions from this work:
 - i. Models differed in degree of detail in their specification (e.g. UK very detailed vs. EuroPsy general definitions)

- ii. Models differed in their structures (e.g. Based around key roles or based on general functions)
- iii. International agreement is possible, as evidenced by the EuroPsy project and agreement between USA and Canada.
- iv. Most importantly, there was a lot of commonality of content.

What do we do with this?

- n. We see this work as providing a background or starting place for the conference to work from.
- o. We now need to:
 - i. Agree what we mean by 'competence'
 - ii. Consider what an international model of competence would look like:
 - iii. Structure,
 - iv. Level of detail
 - v. Content
- p. In the longer term we need to consider how this might help to inform diverse national approaches to defining, developing, assessing, and certifying competence.

Our Tasks

- q. Two Tasks
 - i. Develop a common definition of Competence
 - 1. What does it mean to be a competent psychologist?
 - ii. Frame this definition with competences –
 - 1. What are the competences of our Profession?
 - iii. Our task is to frame a common language of psychology around the world.
 - iv. There are many Congress attendees who are knowledgeable and have influenced your countries' views of competency. We hope you will bring your knowledge to bear during this meeting.

Our Process

- r. Small Groups
- s. Facilitators
- t. Facilitators will meet and provide specific directions
- u. We will receive feedback
- v. And continue our meetings
- w. This structure is designed to encourage dialogue and interaction.
- x. Dave and Emil will float from group to group to get a sense of the issues discussed
- y. The facilitators will summarize and then provide feedback to all of us, describing what we have done and where we are going

Our Goal

- z. Hopefully, our work will inform the diverse national approaches to
 - i. defining,
 - ii. developing,
 - iii. assessing, and
 - iv. certifying
- æ. competence
- bb. Let me emphasize that each of us bring to these discussions our own national views about competence. Robert Roe described one model. There are many models. I hope these views inform our discussions, not hinder them. I hope we share, we seek areas of agreement as we explore what it means to be a psychologist.

Let the discussions begin

- cc. We have been assigned a group and a location
- dd. This afternoon we will meet until 18:00 after which there will be a social reception..

- ee. I hope you find the discussions interesting and exciting as this international dialogue will have impact for what we do and how we do it
- ff. This is the beginning of these discussions. We have much work ahead of us, so let us begin.

Summary of Topics discussed during the first day breakout groups

1. Scope of Practice: What does it mean to be a psychologist?
2. What is the definition of a psychologist?
 - a. What defines the discipline?
 - b. Are we seeking broad not restrictive definition of a psychologist?
 - c. The distinctions between school/counseling/clinical specialties has blurred.
3. Is there a common core of being a psychologist or is being a psychologist contextualized?
4. Significant discussion of multicultural issues
5. What does it mean to be competent to practice?
 - a. Possible definitions of competence developed by the workgroups based on document by Bartram and Rodolfa
 - i. Competence in professional psychology is the ability to demonstrate context – relevant knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes (as expressed in behavior) and their integration.
 - ii. The ability to perform a function to a required standard
 - iii. A competent psychologist has a substantive understanding of multiple determinants of behavior of individuals, groups, organizations or communities AND integrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes to adequately apply this learned psychological knowledge and practice, based on a culture of evidence and reasoning in context.
 - iv. Competence is comprised of knowing (foundational competence) and doing (functional competence). Both depend on experience and need to be demonstrated through the achievement of goals and outcomes to a professional standard.
 - b. Discussed specific models of competency - knowledge, skills and attitudes
 - c. Competence has two components – knowing and doing (these words need to be operationalized)
 - d. Discussion of national models of competence
 - e. How is competence assessed?
 - f. Is Foundational vs. Functional Competency a useful distinction?
 - g. The focus of the model is on applied psychological practice
 - h. It will be useful to develop a model that is not too specific or general
 - i. Look to the Universal Code of Ethics as a model for the ethics code
 - j. Need value free language to define competencies
6. Issues of Science
 - a. There are significant differences in national views of the utility and importance of science.
7. After developing competencies, it will be important to discuss and perhaps define the Education and Training needed to become a psychologist.

Other Issues discussed by the facilitators

1. Should the groups remain the same or should they change membership?

2. Participants were respectful, cautious and descriptive of home countries. Became less cautious over time.
3. Struggled to define competence
4. Discussed getting the competencies spread sheet for the facilitators
5. Discussed methods to encourage quiet participants and reduce contributions from those who are extensive speakers.
6. Language and use of terms (the terms needed to be defined and clarified).

3.6.2 DAY TWO

Summary of Comments for the Congress Participants Second Day

1. Enormous amount of data about various competencies
2. Workgroups took different paths to accomplish the task of developing a definition for competency
 - a. Some worked to revise the document
 - b. Some deconstructed and reconstructed the document
 - c. A couple of specifics about the definition
 - i. Knowledge competency was related to many questions about science
 - ii. Knowledge and skills need to be incorporated into the competencies
 - iii. Knowledge and skills need to be elaborated
3. Questions were raised about what it means to be a psychologist in each country
 - a. Is the goal of this exercise to set standards to incorporate all the countries or do we set standards that will allow countries to aspire to?
 - b. So are the competencies that we develop aspirational or realistic?

See appendix 11. Definitions of competencies
from each group.

Summary of Topics discussed during the second day breakout groups

1. Wordsmithing the definition vs. deconstructing the definition. What should be included in the broad categories of competency?
 - a. Current categories do not work.
 - b. Is this aspirational or realistic document
 - c. Can you measure the competency?
 - d. Knowledge stands out/ skills and attitudes are diluted in the competencies
 - e. Some groups using national documents to develop this document
 - f. Concern about working in proposed model vs. developing a new model
 - g. Important to take into account the specific needs of the country

Other Issues discussed by the facilitators

1. Reviewed the various definitions of competence
2. Planned afternoon session
3. Groups worked on finding a word to focus the scope of these competencies. Discussed "Professional" v. "applied" v. no other adjective
4. Multiple determinants of behavior

5. Contextual factors and diversity
6. What/Who is this definition for? Government? Public?
7. Working on this project during the coming year.
8. Competence vs. competent: what is the difference, what are we trying to define

3.6.3 DAY THREE

Summary of Comments for the Congress Participants Third Day

1. Questions to consider in the groups today
 - a. What should the final outcome of this project look like?
 - i. Competence based standard?
 - ii. Minimum qualification requirements?
 - b. What are the potential benefits for this project if we get it right?
 - i. For the profession as a whole?
 - ii. For your country in particular?
 - iii. What do individuals want from this project?
 - iv. What do countries want from this project?
 - v. What do societies want from this project?
 - c. What is a psychologist?
 - i. What is the role of science in the practice of psychology?
 - ii. What services do countries want from psychologists?
 - iii. What is the education and training of psychologists related to developing competencies?
 - d. What are the landmines and pitfalls as the project goes forward?
 - i. What are the potential de-railers for this project?
 1. Different views on the role of science in practice
 2. Diversity of national and cultural issues
 3. Others
3. A Brief Snapshot of the Competencies we discussed
 - 1) General Competency Clusters
 - 2) Knowledge
 - 3) Ethics and Legal
 - 4) Professional Practice:
 - a) Psychological Assessment
 - b) Intervention
 - c) Consulting
 - d) Interdisciplinary Collaboration
 - e) Relationships (patients/clients)
 - 5) Professionalism
 - a) Professional Functioning
 - b) Professional Attitudes and Conduct
 - c) Reflective Practice
 - 6) Culture
 - a) Individual and Cultural Diversity
4. Discrepancies
 - 1) Knowledge

- a) What is the role of Science in Psychology? Is psychology a profession built on science in all countries
 - b) Does it include research,
 - c) Understand the research literature
 - d) Scientific approach to practice
 - e) Evaluation of practice
 - f) Foundational Knowledge (Bio bases, social, etc.)
- 2) The Business of Practice
 - 3) Technology
 - 4) Supervision
 - 5) Program Evaluation
 - 6) Self-Care
5. Issues
- 1) Need Clarity in Categorization
 - 2) Need other national models:
 - a) We have UK, USA, Europsy, Australia, Canada
 - 3) Skills need to be incorporated
 - a) knowledge was consistently incorporated
6. A Snapshot of the day's discussion: Benefits
- 1) Document will help define an applied psychologist globally
 - 2) Global competencies may reduce differences between countries
 - 3) Inform education and training in psychology and provide benchmarks for what we expect of a psychologist.
 - 4) Facilitate national/international mobility
 - 5) International model for psychology
 - 6) Helps brand psychology –reduce confusion with other disciplines
 - 7) Will help enhance professional identity for psychologists
 - 8) Might help unite the profession by defining a common core
7. A Snapshot of the day's discussion: De-railers/Concerns
- 1) Not having an inclusive process
 - 2) The science-practice relationship
 - 3) Do not get fixated on qualifications for practice
 - 4) Local/regional/national association pressures on the process
 - 5) Reducing competencies to minimal statements will not differentiate competence by level of practice (e.g. Psychologist vs. mental health worker)
 - 6) Language issues/difference – can the document be translated and understood
 - 7) Fear of losing national standards
8. A Snapshot of the day's discussion: Suggestions for Next Steps
- 1) Take this meeting on the road to different regions
 - 2) Keep the process institution free
 - 3) Produce competency" framework", not "standards"
 - 4) Develop a comprehensive document with clear definitions about what it means to be a psychologist. Have clear terms.
 - 5) Use existing documents as resources (e.g. Europsy)
 - 6) We will work on this framework during the coming year, seeking your comment

4. Evaluation of the congress

A few weeks after the congress an evaluation survey (SurveyMonkey) was issued to 70 of the participants. The five directly involved in the running of the congress were left out. When the survey was terminated at the end of August the response rate was 70%. On a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 as best, the total average score was 3,98, ranging from 3,79 to 4,48.

The question; “Would you be willing to participate in the work of this project going forward by commenting on written products and reports, and reviewing proposals for future presentations/meetings?» was answered with 62,5% “Definitively yes” ,14,6% “Very likely”. Only 4.2 answered “Unlikely”. No one answered “Definitively no”.

The question; “What do you think is the likelihood of your attending future meetings related to this project?” was answered with 35.6% “Definitively yes” and 41,7% “Very likely”. No one answered “Unlikely” or “Definitively no”.

5. Continuation of the project

At the end of the congress there was a general support for the continuation of the congress as an independent international project. It was also very gratifying to receive the support and endorsement of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) and the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) for the proposal to continue this project in the years ahead.

The project co-chairs and organizers selected the name “International Project on Competence in Psychology” – IPCP to reflect independent and international context for continued work on this project.

See appendix 12 for the model of the project work plan.

Both ASPPB and NPA will sponsor the project with personnel, Steve DeMers, member of the Work Group, and Amy Hilson, administrative support, and Sverre L. Nielsen as coordinator.

See appendix 13 for complete list of the members of the Work Group.

The Reference Group is in the process of being established. The IPCP Reference Group will be assembled from volunteers who have expressed an interest in staying involved with this project. Invitations to become part of the IPCP Reference Group will be extended to relevant stakeholders who can contribute to the work towards our achieving our purpose. The goal is to create a reference group that is representative of the global community of professional psychologists. Reference Group members will be informed about activities and progress of the Working Group, provided with documents or proposals to comment on, and informed about future meetings of the Work Group as well as presentations at international or regional psychology conferences.

Once this report from the Stockholm congress is finalized, the Work Group will proceed to continue the process. Some members of the IPCP Work Group will most likely attend some international regional conferences to “reach out” and involve more National and Regional Psychology Associations to participate in the work towards the development of “A global agreement on identifying the benchmark competencies that define professional psychology”.

6. Appendixes

- 6.1 Organizing Committee members
- 6.2 The Foundation Document
- 6.3 The Statement
- 6.4 Doc 1 "Definitions of Competence"
- 6.5 Doc 2 "Questions to Address"
- 6.6 Doc 3 "Summary Models v2"
- 6.7 Doc 4 "International Competency Comparisons v2"
- 6.8 The Program
- 6.9 Notes from the Closing Session
- 6.10 List of participants
- 6.11 Definitions of competencies from each group
- 6.12 Model of The International Project on Competence in Psychology - IPCP
- 6.13 Work Group members of the IPCP