

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PHD PROGRAM  
OREGON HEALTH & SCIENCE UNIVERSITY  
PROGRAM GUIDELINES

LAST UPDATED 4/5/2021, Voting Faculty voted to approve 4/12/2021

These guidelines outline requirements and expectations for faculty members and students and mentors in the OHSU Ph.D. Program in Clinical Psychology. They serve as an addendum to the OHSU SOM By-Laws of the Graduate Council, Academic Regulations for the SOM Graduate Programs and SOM Graduate Studies Handbook.

## GLOSSARY

- **Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC):** The DAC guides and advises a student on research and dissertation preparation. The DAC is composed of at least four OHSU graduate faculty members (at least one a member of the core Clinical Psychology Ph.D. program faculty) with expertise in one or more aspects of the student's project and who are familiar with the requirements of the graduate program. See DAC Formation section for more details
- **Oral Examination (OE):** Exam consisting of a public seminar and oral questioning regarding the dissertation research. See Oral Examination for more details
- **Ph.D. Candidate:** A graduate student who has successfully completed the qualifying examination and other requirements is officially advanced to candidacy. A Ph.D. candidate has completed all required milestones other than completion of the dissertation and is determined to be ready for dissertation research.
- **Qualifying Examination (QE):** A required exam consisting of a presentation and oral questioning. See M5 Qualifying Exam for more details.
- **APC:** Advancement to Ph.D. Candidacy
- **OEC:** Oral Examination Committee
- **QE:** Qualifying Examination
- **QEC:** Qualifying Examination Committee
- **SLO:** Student Learning Objective

### Useful Links to Information and forms (log in may be required)

#### General information

- [Clinical Psychology Program Web Page](https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/clinical-psychology) (<https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/clinical-psychology>)
- [Graduate Studies Forms & Policies](https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/forms-and-policies) (<https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/forms-and-policies>). See also the Graduate Studies Handbook (<https://www.ohsu.edu/sites/default/files/2019-04/Graduate-Studies-Handbook-2018-2019.pdf>) and Academic Regulations for the SOM Graduate Programs (<https://www.ohsu.edu/sites/default/files/202005/Academic%20Regulations%20for%20the%20School%20of%20Medicine%20Graduate%20Programs.pdf>)
- [Registrar's Office](https://www.ohsu.edu/education/office-registrar) (<https://www.ohsu.edu/education/office-registrar>)
- [Graduate Council By-Laws](https://www.ohsu.edu/sites/default/files/2019-04/Graduate-Council-Bylaws-2015.pdf) (<https://www.ohsu.edu/sites/default/files/2019-04/Graduate-Council-Bylaws-2015.pdf>)
- [School of Medicine Graduate Faculty](https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/faculty) (<https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/faculty>)
- School of Medicine Graduate Student Stipend Policy (Search in graduate studies forms and policies page for current year stipend information)
- [Student Portal](https://o2.ohsu.edu/student-central/) (<https://o2.ohsu.edu/student-central/>)

#### Forms: The following can all be found by searching the Graduate Studies forms and policies page (<https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/forms-and-policies>)

- Request for Qualifying Exam Committee
- Request for Dissertation Advisory Committee
- Request for Oral Exam Committee

- [Registrar's Office \(https://www.ohsu.edu/education/office-registrar\)](https://www.ohsu.edu/education/office-registrar) Forms related to the registrar can be found here. The Registrar oversees a broad range of activities to support students, including leaves of absence, enrollment, course registration, academic history and transcript maintenance.

### Program Contacts

Name	Title	Phone	Email
Leeza Maron, PhD	Program Director/ Director of Clinical Training	503-494-6191	<a href="mailto:maronl@ohsu.edu">maronl@ohsu.edu</a>
Susanne Duvall, Ph.D.	Program Associate Director	503-494-2269	<a href="mailto:duvall@ohsu.edu">duvall@ohsu.edu</a>
Jason Chen, PhD	Program Assistant Director	503-220-8262 x54246	<a href="mailto:chenjaso@ohsu.edu">chenjaso@ohsu.edu</a>
Patricia Dickerson	Administrative Coordinator	503-346-3753	<a href="mailto:clinicalphd@ohsu.edu">clinicalphd@ohsu.edu</a> <a href="mailto:dickersp@ohsu.edu">dickersp@ohsu.edu</a>

### PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

**Program Objectives:** Upon completion of the Ph.D., students will be able to identify important scientific and clinical issues that warrant psychological study and conduct independent, scholarly research that advances knowledge about the antecedents, characteristics, structure, development, mechanisms, prevention, and behavioral treatment of psychopathology and mental health problems. Trainees will also be capable of obtaining a professional license to practice psychology to evaluate and intervene with mental health conditions. They will be able to lead innovative clinical intervention and programmatic efforts and evaluate best practices.

**General Program Structure:** The Clinical Psychology Ph.D. requires a minimum of 174 credits. Students obtain credits through a mix of didactic courses, clinical practica, internship, and research including the dissertation. Year 1, 2 and 3 comprise didactic courses, clinical practica, and research. Year 4 is focused on independent guided dissertation research and additional clinical practica with more limited didactic courses. Year 5 is the full-time clinical internship. To graduate with their Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, students must successfully complete all courses, a first-year research project, qualifying examination, an APA-accredited clinical internship, and oral defense of their written dissertation. For the typical student, it is expected that all components will be completed prior to the end of their 5<sup>th</sup> year although some students will require a 6<sup>th</sup> year. The University requires that students complete all requirements within a maximum of 7 years.

#### Summary of Minimum Credit Hour Requirements

Course titles (where appropriate)	Course numbers	Credits
Didactic Psychology Courses	CPSY 610, 620, 613, 623, 611, 621, 614, 631, 615, 616, 640, 626, History	31
Other didactic courses: Statistics, Methodology, and Research Design	NURS 641, 642, 630 & CPSY 632	11
Intra-Professional Practice	IPE601	1
Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	33
Practicum seminar	CPSY 607	8
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	27
Psychology Dissertation Research	CSPY 603	27
Clinical Internship	CPSY 604	36

### Research and Clinical Milestones

Graduating with a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from the SOM at OHSU requires the completion of 6 milestones; some are clinically-focused and others are research-based. In most years, students will engage in elements of more than one milestone, for example, in Year 1 when students will be taking didactic courses and performing research in their mentor's lab. These milestones are:

Table 2: Milestones, tasks, and required forms to be completed and timelines

Milestone/Subtasks	Deadline	Typical/recommended	Date Completed
<b>M1-1st Year project</b>			
M1-A: Mentor assignment form	Y1-winter term day 1	Y1-winter term, day 1	
M1-B: 1 <sup>st</sup> yr. project review committee form	Y1-winter term, final day	Y1- winter term	
M1-C: 1st yr. project proposal outline	Y1- winter term, final day	Y1- winter term	
M1-D: 1 <sup>st</sup> yr. project submission	Y1-summer term, final day (Term B)	Y1-spring term	
M1-E: 1st yr. project completion form	Y2- fall term, final day	Y1-summer term	
<b>M2 Complete Qualifying Exam</b>			
M2-A: QE Committee Request form AKA Scientific Advisory Committee or Pre-Dissertation/Thesis Advisory Committee (DAC/TAC)	Y2-winter term, final day	Y2-early winter term	
M2-B: QE final proposal submission	Y3-fall, first day	Y2-summer, first day	
M2-C: QE defense/completion form	Y3-mid-fall term	Y2-end summer	
M3 Pass required didactic courses	Y5-end of spring term	Y4-end spring term	
M4 Pass required practica/seminars	Y5-end spring term	Y4-end spring term	
<b>M5 Complete dissertation</b>			
M5-A: Advancement to Candidacy	Y3-winter term, final day	Y3-early in fall term	
M5-B: Submit DAC request form	Y3-winter term, final day	Y3-early in fall term	
M5-C: DAC approves proposal	Y3-summer term, final day (Term B)	Y3-winter term	
M5-B: Orals request form	Y7-last day spring term	Y4-end of spring term	
M5-C DAC approves dissertation	Y7-last day of spring term	Y4-end of spring term	

<b>M6 Complete internship</b>			
M6-A: Internship application request	Y5-summer term (Term B)	Y3 summer/end spring term	
M6-B: Match to internship	Y6-winter term	Y4- winter term	
M7-B: Report from internship director	Y7-summer term	Y5 summer term	
M7 Complete all graduation requirements	Y7-end summer term	Y5 end summer term	

Specific courses and a sample recommended Plan of Study are described at the end of these guidelines (Appendix C).

## **DETAILED DESCRIPTION**

### **ADMISSION CRITERIA**

All applicants must meet basic criteria including undergraduate backgrounds that are sufficiently strong to maximize likelihood of success in a PhD Program. We define this as a minimum undergraduate GPA of 3.0 in psychology or a related field, GRE scores (consideration is made regarding the appropriateness of the GRE for applicants of diverse backgrounds), and academic references. Writing and communication skill, applicant interests, research experience, and career aspirations are judged based on essays and the applicant’s professional vita. Written information about research interests and mentor fit are strongly considered. The PhD Program requires research experience and prefers applicants who have some service-related experience as well. We believe that these criteria establish a student’s exposure to the field and academic potential to complete graduate-level work. Further, this review from a broad-spectrum of experiences allows faculty to make reasonable judgements that consider unique experiences and strengths associated with cultural and individual diversity backgrounds, especially as they may compensate for other more traditional indicators of success

Following confirmation of these criteria, applications are reviewed by multiple faculty (at least two) using a rubric system that allows for the quantitative evaluation of: i) overall academic preparation, ii) research preparation, iii) clinical preparation, vi) alignment with program and lab, v) personal statement, and vi) letters of reference. In addition, all applicants invited to interview will meet with at least three faculty members. Following interviews, application and interview ratings are synergized to determine initial offers.

Our program strongly values diversity and embodies this through active efforts to increase representation of members from groups historically marginalized by systemic racism in our student body and faculty. We are actively striving to creating an anti-racist culture, by identifying and remediating systemic racism in our program. To increase our recruitment of students who are historically underrepresented in clinical psychology, we engage in active outreach to Historically Black Colleges and Universities with information about our program. We also send letters to the institutions of strong underrepresented minority candidates from the prior year who applied to our program but did not matriculate. Further, we conduct outreach to undergraduate science education programs focused on increasing diversity. To reduce systemic bias in the interviewing process, our Admissions Committee encourages interview questions that inquire about applicants’ experiences overcoming adversity and ask about their definition of diversity in order to increase equity in our admissions processes.

### **STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES (SLOs)**

Research: CPP SLO 1. Critically evaluate, independently formulate, conduct and disseminate research or other scholarly activities that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.

Ethics: CPP SLO 2. Apply ethical decision-making processes in accordance with relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies; and relevant professional standards and guidelines.

Individual and Cultural Diversity: CPP SLO 3. Engage effectively and respectfully with diverse individuals and groups including an understanding of how their own personal/cultural history, attitudes, and biases may affect how they understand and interact with people different from themselves.

Individual and Cultural Diversity: CPP SLO 4. The ability to integrate awareness and knowledge of individual and cultural differences in the conduct of professional roles (e.g., research, services, and other professional activities).

Professional values and attitudes: CPP SLO 5. Respond and behave professionally and ethically in ways that reflect the values and attitudes of psychology, including integrity, deportment, behavior, professional identity, accountability, lifelong learning, and concern for the welfare of others.

Professional values and attitudes: CPP SLO 6. Engage in self-reflection regarding one's personal and professional functioning and engage in activities to maintain and improve performance, well-being, and professional effectiveness.

Communication and interpersonal skills: CPP SLO 7. Develop and maintain effective relationships with a wide range of individuals through oral, written and nonverbal means in an accurate and effective manner that is sensitive to a range of audiences.

Assessment: CPP SLO 8. Select, apply and interpret appropriate and evidenced-based assessment tools and methods to measure and gather relevant data using multiple sources to gain an understanding of human behavior within its context (e.g., family, social, societal and cultural).

Intervention: CPP SLO 9. Implement evidence-based interventions informed by the current scientific literature, assessment findings, diversity characteristics, and contextual variables by modifying and adapting evidence-based approaches, intervention goals and methods consistent with ongoing evaluation.

Supervision: CPP SLO 10. Demonstrate knowledge of supervision models and practices, consultation and interprofessional/ interdisciplinary skills.

CPP SLO 11. Demonstrates knowledge of consultation models and practices and respect for the roles and perspectives of other professions.

### **MENTOR SELECTION AND ADVISING PLAN**

Upon admission, students are assigned an initial faculty research mentor in whose lab they will conduct their primary research. During the first two quarters, the Program Director or Associate Director will meet with each student at least once to discuss progress. In the event that a student or mentor feel a re-assignment is more appropriate, the Director or Associate Director will bring the matter to the faculty for review and possible re-assignment.

In the winter quarter of Year 1 in the program, this initial research mentor will become the student's mentor, which is formalized when the student completes the "Mentor Assignment Form – Ph.D. Programs." The form is on the [Graduate Studies Forms and Policies](#) page. If a student selects a non-clinical scientist as a research mentor, a clinical secondary mentor will be identified.

Student advising occurs through the primary mentor. In addition, student progress is reviewed annually by the faculty for all students, at which time input is considered both from the research mentor as well as from clinical

supervisors and qualifying exam or dissertation committees (if applicable). The program will share results from the meeting with the student.

In addition to the annual faculty review, advising will occur through a sequence of two advising committees which must meet at minimum every 6 months.

- a) The qualifying exam committee (QEC) takes on this role during the qualifying exam process and approves the final qualifying exam as well as monitoring progress on clinical training.
- b) The dissertation advisory committee (DAC) is formed for the dissertation proposal and sees the student through completion of the remaining degree requirements including advising on the dissertation and the internship applications.

These committees may be identical in that they may have the same members, or partially overlapping members, or may be completely different in composition as suitable to the student's interests and development. SOM guidelines (noted later) specify committee composition, which must include a minimum ratio of members from the graduate school. For the clinical PhD program, it is also required that each committee must include at least one program faculty member who is a licensed clinician who can ensure adequate attention to clinical training progress in addition to the committee's attention to research and academic progress.

In addition to the annual review, students who are early in the program and do not yet have a QEC or DAC, will also have their progress briefly reviewed at a mid-year review at a faculty meeting (e.g., in January). During this meeting, input is considered both from the research mentor as well as from clinical supervisors (as applicable). The program will share a brief summary of results from the meeting with the student.

### **M1: FIRST YEAR RESEARCH PROJECT**

<b>First Year Project Information Summary</b>
---

#### **Timeline:**

- End of winter quarter year 1: Submit detailed outline and complete the 1<sup>st</sup> year project review committee form (which includes a targeted journal, identifying a proposed submission date and 6 potential reviewers)
- End of summer quarter in year 1 (Term B): The first year project must be submitted.
- End of fall quarter in year 2: the first year project must be approved (including addressing all revision requests)

**Overview:** In collaboration with their academic mentor, students will begin to develop their first year project upon matriculation into the program. By the end of winter of year 1 the student will identify the type of paper (empirical or theoretical), the targeted journal, 6 potential reviewers and create the proposal outline. The first year project will be submitted by the end of summer in year 1. Approval (including revision requests) must occur by the end of fall term in year 2 of the program. The goal is to provide a scientific writing exercise that increases exposure to independent writing and literature review and allows for evaluation of the student's strengths and weaknesses to inform training and support in future research projects. Although there is no requirement from the CPP to submit the product for publication, we encourage students to use the approved first year projects to form the basis of a manuscript that will be submitted as a first-author manuscript to a peer-reviewed scientific journal. This opportunity enhances the possibility that students will obtain NIH training awards to move their careers forward.

### **FIRST YEAR PROJECT, FIRST AUTHOR MANUSCRIPT:**

Completion of this milestone requires that students conduct a mentored research project and prepare a written document in the format of a manuscript, this will be either an empirical or theoretical paper. Relevant competencies for this requirement are:

#### **CPP SLOs**

1. Research

## 2. Communication and interpersonal skills

### APA Domain Specific Knowledge:

#### 1. Category 4: *Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics*

### APA Profession Wide Competencies:

#### I. Research:

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

#### V. Communication and interpersonal skills:

- Produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and written communications that are informative and well-integrated; demonstrate a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.
- Appropriate content: Students will select to either complete an empirical or a review manuscript.

**Empirical:** The empirical research project may be fully designed, conducted and analyzed by the student but may be more likely to consist of a novel analysis of previously collected data. If previously collected data is used, this should be structured in a way that the student can contribute to the experimental hypotheses or design. (Notice: Obtaining “positive results” is not a prerequisite for the successful completion of the project.)

**Comprehensive Review:** The theoretical research manuscript is typically an integrative review or research synthesis that is drawn from the empirical literature. This can be accomplished through both qualitative (narrative) and/or quantitative (meta-analytic) processes. The theoretical paper should attempt to summarize past research by creating global conclusions from various separate empirical studies that address related or identical hypotheses.

Formation of the review committee: By the end of winter quarter in year 1, the mentor and student will consult to provide the names of 6 potential review committee members, a provisional submission date, the identified journal, and the proposal outline to the Program Director, or their designee. There are no formal requirements for the outline, each mentor and student will collaborate together to create a document that they feel is detailed enough to guide the final project. Students in collaboration with their mentor are responsible for collecting signatures from the 6 identified potential review committee members prior to submission to the Program Director. The Program Director, or their designee, will then select the final review committee (3 members). The Program Director will form the review committee with 3 members, of whom 1 must be the mentor and 1 of whom must be an additional faculty member of the Clinical Psychology PhD program. All three members may be from the CPP faculty, of note; members of the review committee may include individuals not suggested by the student and mentor. An additional review (a 4<sup>th</sup> review committee member) may be solicited from faculty with appropriate expertise in other programs or institutions when necessary. The review committee is not expected to provide significant input on the final research paper until it is formally submitted and they complete their evaluative review (see limitations below).

Role of the mentor and limits on assistance and documenting assistance: In line with APA’s guidance that the program structure allow for the support of student learning in a way that is sequential, cumulative and graded in complexity, the role of the mentor in this project may vary depending on the needs of the student. Students will come in with different levels of experience in research and since this is to be a writing exercise that allows the program to gather information about student’s competencies, the research project is planned in consultation with the mentor (e.g., the mentor may provide feedback about initial hypotheses, outline and literature to review). It is however expected that the student will have a critical role in designing the research hypothesis or review theme



under investigation. It is also expected that the written document submitted for evaluation for the first year project milestone will substantially reflect the student's research and writing such that student progress and competency can be meaningfully evaluated by the reviewers. Consequently, the student should be listed as the first author on the first year project. The mentor may provide discussion, offer general advice and provide broad feedback and comments on outlines and preliminary drafts of the document, but should not engage in extensive copy-editing or re-writing at any stage nor provide feedback on the final product prior to submission. Students will have other avenues through which they may get detailed feedback on their drafts through informal means (writing groups or research in progress forums) or structured supports (CPSY 632 scientific writing course).

All contributions should be recognized and described briefly in the acknowledgements. Students also must acknowledge and list contributions from all collaborators or other materials included in the research project (e.g., data, statistical consultation, coding systems), as well as any technical assistance (e.g., individuals who assisted in conducted particular coding or statistical analyses), in the cover letter, as described below. Of note, if the first year project is later submitted for publication, additional authors may be added. The mentor should be consulted to determine if the final product is ready for submission before the student submits their first year project to the Program Director. If the review committee determines that revision and resubmissions are required, the mentor and members of the review committee cannot assist with the response or revisions.

### **Submission and evaluation of the research paper**

Submission guidelines: The first year project must be submitted by the last day of summer term in year 1; the first year project must be approved by the last day of fall quarter in year 2.

After approval by the mentor, the student should email two pdf documents to the Program Director and copy the mentor and program administrative support staff. The Program Director, or their designee, will distribute the submission to the review committee.

1. A 1-page cover letter (pdf or docx) containing the date, title of the manuscript, author's name, name of the journal to which the manuscript would be targeted; hyperlink to that journal's instructions for authors; list the style requested by the journal (e.g., APA vs. AMA); statement affirming that the research paper is the student's product. This statement should include all contributing individuals and identify his or her contribution.

2. Manuscript cover page, abstract, text, references, tables and figures (this supersedes any journal request that text and figures should be submitted in separate files; the document can be reformatted when submitted to a journal).

### Review criteria and process for the First Year Project

Members of the review committee and the mentor will conduct a mock review, as though they had received a request to evaluate this paper from a journal. Reviewers have the option to meet to discuss their reviews. Reviewers will be asked to prepare their reviews (and re-reviews), complete the formal rubric (in the following section) and make recommendations to the Program Director concerning the acceptability of the first year project within 2 weeks. The Program Director will collect and synthesize reviews to be sent to the student. Similar to manuscript review, the reviews will be anonymous from the student perspective. A majority of advisory committee members must approve of the manuscript by indicating “**Approve.**” If the majority of reviewers indicate “**Modification Required**” this will require modification of the document and committee reevaluation. Ordinarily a maximum of 2 weeks will be provided to the student for manuscript revisions. The revised document will be submitted and distributed in the same manner as the original submission (see above). One or more revision-and-resubmit cycles may be required before a majority of advisory committee members indicate “**Approve**” to the Program Director.

Oral presentation: After the document is accepted, each student will present a short (up to 15 minutes) colloquium of their research to a meeting of program faculty and students.

**Rubric for First Year Project**

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose:** The purpose of this rubric is to give CPP students a clear understanding of the criteria that will be used to guide the assessment of the quality of their scholarship and to apply the rubric in completing the final assessment of their first year project.

**Application:** This rubric is intended to be shared with students early in the process. Students can use this rubric as a coherent set of criteria that include descriptions of expected levels of performance for the first year project milestone. It is expected that a first year project that is approved by the reviewers would be evaluated as being **at least in the “good performance” category and at or above a “3” level in all areas.**

**Instructions for Reviewers:**

- 1) Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*
- 2) Using the 5-point scale below, only circle one number for each rubric section to indicate your assessment of the candidate’s scholarship. Please rate the student’s performance in the domains listed below, taking into account their developmental level/ year in the program and the amount of time and scope of experiences they have completed thus far in the program.

- 1 = Inadequate Performance (Consistently below expectations)
- 2 = Marginal Performance (Meets minimum expectations at times, but not consistently)
- 3 = Good Performance (Consistently meets minimum expectations for a student of their level)
- 4 = Very Good Performance (Exceeds expectations at times)
- 5 = Outstanding Performance (Exceeds expectations consistently)
- NA= Not applicable, no basis for rating

- 3) Once complete, please return the completed form to the Program Director.

**ABSTRACT**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the problem or findings missing</li> <li>• Statement of the problem, findings, methodology very limited or absent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the problem or findings not developed in a clear way</li> <li>• Findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract has an introduction to the finding</li> <li>• Statement of the problem, findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organized well</li> <li>• States the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise; smoothly draws the reader in</li> <li>• States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance well</li> </ul>

		more further organization		
--	--	---------------------------	--	--

## RESEARCH QUESTION OR THESIS THEME

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is weak, insignificant, uninteresting or unimportant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is not strongly supported or developed</li> <li>• The question needs more development to enhance its originality</li> <li>• The case is not well developed that question is significant, interesting or important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is developed, but not as thoroughly</li> <li>• The question may be original but could be improved</li> <li>• Significance to the field is somewhat supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is well developed</li> <li>• The question is original and innovative</li> <li>• Significance is clear, well-situated to advance existing knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question very well developed</li> <li>• The question is exceptionally original and innovative</li> <li>• Significant in its potential contribution, calls forth new knowledge, obvious potential to address critical issues within the field</li> </ul>

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature review is absent or unrelated to overall research project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete, omissions or unsubstantiated interpretations, may only provide a list of previous findings without being in dialogue with the literature</li> <li>• Little evidence the candidate understands the canonical and current literature within their field, relevance to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an analysis of previous findings; adequate coverage but limited as to viewpoints presented</li> <li>• Reference to and discussion of canonical and current relevant literature but weak connection with their question or thesis</li> <li>• May develop some connection but not a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way</li> <li>• Includes canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop hypotheses</li> <li>• Draws a clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mastery of original and critical engagement with relevant literature in the field</li> <li>• Hypotheses derived from both canonical and current literature review with analysis and summary contributing to the body of research in their field</li> <li>• Demonstrates the gap in the literature</li> </ul>

	<p>research question unclear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not address the gap in the literature</li> </ul>	<p>strong connection to the gap in the literature their project addresses</p>		<p>relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument to addressing the gap</p>
--	--	---	--	--

## FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no theoretical framework or model guiding the research project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theoretical framework is unclear, or misunderstood</li> <li>• Theories not connected to the literature review or research question clearly; little or no discussion of the impact of theory on their research; may reject theory as important or pertinent to their study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to but provide only a minimal framework for the research</li> <li>• The research connects back to theoretical bases in some way; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the research; well-versed in theory</li> <li>• Clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizes multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity and tensions of competing theories</li> <li>• Uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their project will contribute to, support, or change established theory</li> </ul>

## METHODS AND APPROACHES

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology is not appropriate for the main question, data analysis plan or population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a methodology and/or population that does not lend itself well to the study of the question</li> <li>• Is unaware of, or has not identified, the biases and/or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows basic competence in understanding methodology and study design</li> <li>• Study biases and/or limitations within the study design discussed but may not be well developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some quality or innovative methodology and study design</li> <li>• Study biases and/or limitations within the study clearly understood and discussed</li> <li>• Discussion of connection between</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality, innovative study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field</li> <li>• Discusses the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential</li> </ul>

	<p>limitations within the study design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made</li> <li>• The analysis plan may be incomplete and/or poorly organized and/or implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice of methodology, approach and study design acceptable; connection discussed but may not be clearly developed</li> <li>• The analysis plan connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection; aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered</li> </ul>	<p>methodology and data analysis clear and concise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis plan is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework</li> </ul>	<p>biases inherent in study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear explanation of methodological choices, and integration of approaches; iteratively explores questions raised by the data or theoretical analysis; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise</li> <li>• Analysis plan is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--	--

**THEORETICAL ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION and INTERPRETATION**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any part of the theoretical analysis, discussion and interpretation is missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis may be incomplete and/or poorly organized and/or implemented</li> <li>• The findings may not be supported by the analysis; the discussion of the findings may not be well organized and/or not address all of the findings clearly and/or be missing portions such as a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the research</li> <li>• Validity of the findings may not be addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection</li> <li>• Aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered</li> <li>• Validity of the findings are addressed but may lack a thorough approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework</li> <li>• Validity of the findings are addressed rigorously</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent; findings are tied to the research question and theoretical foundations</li> <li>• A rigorous discussion of the validity of the findings are engaged in and compared to previous research in the field</li> </ul>

## CONCLUSIONS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are absent or incorrect based upon presented data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not include a summary of results or summary may not be clear and organized; the connection between the findings and data may not be established in a convincing way</li> <li>• Little or no interpretation is provided or the interpretation may not fully fit the findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion in reference to the literature; the results are situated as to their significance</li> <li>• Little or no discussion of the ‘gap’ in the literature their study addresses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are well-presented and insightful; they return to the larger context to identify future directions and/or discuss how the field needs to change</li> <li>• Accentuates the ‘gap’ in the literature and presents a compelling argument as to how their study fulfills this area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a focused discussion of conclusions, situating them in the literature to draw connections or point to differences with previous research; advances the field(s) of knowledge and raises questions for the future</li> <li>• Makes a compelling and interesting argument as to the importance of their findings and how those findings address the ‘gap’ in the literature originally identified</li> </ul>

## WRITING AND SCHOLARLY VOICE (CPP SLO Communication and Interpersonal Skills)

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing and scholarly voice in not sufficiently professional with excessive spelling, punctuation or formatting errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More development of academic speech and writing skills necessary; Tone is not professional</li> <li>• Syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; writing may be difficult to read or understand; errors of spelling,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing and speech are somewhat developed and professional</li> <li>• Spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; formatting is adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style</li> <li>• Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; formatting is accurate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate’s written ‘voice’ is heard and yields a definitive, clear presence. Speech is professional and commanding</li> <li>• Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and</li> </ul>

	punctuation or formatting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overreliance on jargon or the candidate may not have a command of the field's lexicon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lexicon of the respective field is understood and used properly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined</li> </ul>	format are accurately used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---	---

**DIVERSITY and APPLICATION**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both fails to consider diversity factors and makes inappropriate claims about generalization of findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to address questions of diversity where such considerations are clearly relevant to the current research</li> <li>• Makes claims that are inappropriately universalizing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discusses relevant issues of diversity but could provide greater depth or nuance</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies but does not address these sufficiently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides analysis of some of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a sophisticated, critical, and nuanced analysis of key considerations and debates where relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results</li> </ul>

APA Domain Specific Knowledge:

**Category 4: Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics**

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>APA Profession Wide Competency (i) Research</i>	<u>Global rating 1-5</u>
<b>Element #1:</b> Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.	
<b>Element #2:</b> Conduct research or other scholarly activities.	

**Final Determination of First Year Project Milestone:**

**Approve (Complete next section)/ meets CPP SLO Research standard and APA Profession Wide Competency in Research: MLA of 3's in all ratings of elements and domains have been achieved**

**Modification required; MLA of 3's not obtained across all domains above**

**Suggested date for revision to be completed (Optional)**

**1. Would the reviewer recommend subsequent submission for publication?**

- Yes
- Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)
- No (detail out below)

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Individual Committee Member comments for student concerning performance: Divide by comments pertaining to (1) APA standards and (2) publication**



Confidential Comments to Program Director:

**First Year Project Review Committee Form**

Student Student ID

The Program in ORCID

Provisional Submission Date:

Identified Journal:

Please Select One: Empirical Article  Comprehensive Review

Above student requests the following faculty members to serve as the possible First Year Project Review Committee for the above named student with the proposed project title:

Formation of the Review Committee: By the end of end winter quarter in year 1, the mentor and student will consult to provide the names of 6 potential review committee members, a provisional submission date, the identified journal, and the proposal outline to the Program Director, or their designee. The Program Director, or their designee, will then select the final review committee (3 members). The Program Director will form the review committee with 3 members, of whom 1 must be the mentor and 1 of whom must be an additional core faculty member of the Clinical Psychology PhD program. All three members may be from the CPP faculty, of note; members of the review committee may include individuals not suggested by the student and mentor. An additional review (a 4<sup>th</sup> review committee member) may be solicited from faculty with appropriate expertise in other programs or institutions when necessary. The review committee is not expected to provide significant input on the final research paper until it is formally submitted and they complete their critical review.

Graduate Faculty (Y/N)	Role	Name, Degree Graduate Program	OHSU Administrative Unit (School and Dept.)	Preferred E-mail Address	Signature
	Mentor				
	Member				
	Member				
	Member				
	Member				
	Member				

Leeza Maron, PhD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Director Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Director Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **M2: QUALIFYING EXAMINATION (QE)**

Deadlines. Details around recommended timelines and final deadlines are noted in Table 2.

- Winter quarter year 2: Identify 6 potential Qualifying Exam Committee (QEC) members, the proposal topic and submit to program director, or designee, to form the QEC.
- Spring year 2: Develop annotated outline with advisor and committee input, set oral defense date
- 1<sup>st</sup> day fall year 3, deadline to submit final QE to committee.
- Mid-fall quarter in year 3: deadline for oral presentation and QE defense

The QE is completed after the 1<sup>st</sup> year research project, typically in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the program (see Table 2 for timeline). Note: Per OHSU Graduate Studies Policy, students may not take the Qualifying Examination if they are on academic probation or if an Incomplete (I) grade remains on their transcript.

A student who has passed the Qualifying Exam will be eligible to advance to candidacy, contingent on approval of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The goal of the qualifying exam is to provide a vehicle by which students demonstrate the ability to plan a feasible research project that will make a scientific contribution. This product should be suitable in scope and content for submission to a granting agency. Since grant submissions may have a more condensed literature review section, to demonstrate literature mastery, students will have an accompanying oral exam that demonstrates their depth and breadth of subject expertise and their integrative grasp of the literature.

### **Format, Scope, Grading and Evaluation.**

The qualifying exam will include 3 parts:

1. Written grant proposal
2. Oral presentation
3. Oral examination (conducted immediately following the oral presentation)

A single grading determination will be made based on the collective decision of the QEC, described below.

### **Written grant proposal**

The written product will be a grant proposal for an extramural granting agency following their format (e.g. an NIH F31 NRSA, or an NSF or Koppitz Fellowship, or other as approved by the QEC). The QEC is to be consulted regarding length and scope and they and the mentor may suggest literature to be considered, and the QEC will also consult in construction of an annotated outline. The QEC will also specify for the student the necessary sections and format to ensure it conforms to instructions of the target granting agency. Of note, if the project is a training grant then the focus should be on the research plan only. The submission will also include a biosketch. This is not expected to be a fully independent endeavor and the grant will be developed in collaboration with their mentor to ensure that students get guidance in quality grant writing. However, no plagiarism and no block copying from the grants of others is allowed. Students must have completed their first year research project before they are able to formally initiate their QE project, though some people may begin preparatory activities on the QE before completing their first year project. Of note, a student may have already submitted a grant in their first or second year of the program, it would not be appropriate to use a previously submitted grant for the QE project.

Students are encouraged to submit the QE in advance of the deadlines to allow for time for actual grant submissions early in their program. Students will be encouraged and mentored to submit the QE project proposal as an F-level award to NIH or NSF. Our expectation is that most students in this program will take this step.

### **Qualifying Exam Committee (QEC)**

Formation and process: The mentor and student provide names of 6 potential QEC members, the proposal topic and the identified grant format to the Program Director at least 90 days before the final document is submitted, but

with a deadline of the end of winter quarter in year 2. The Program director, or designee, will determine the final QEC committee within 3 weeks. If a committee is not able to be composed from the 6 potential members that were originally submitted, then the student and mentor will be asked to submit additional options. An oral defense date will be determined and the committee will give feedback on an outline. The written document must be submitted to the committee members at least 4 weeks prior to the oral presentation and defense, but with a deadline of beginning of fall term year 3.

Composition: The QEC comprises at least 3 members and includes the student's mentor. At least one QEC member must be a member of the Core Faculty of the Clinical Psychology Graduate Program. At least one member must be a program faculty member who is a licensed psychologist to ensure a clinical perspective is being adequately incorporated.

Role of Mentor and QEC. The mentor often serves as the QEC Chair and helps with enforcement of deadlines and completion of necessary rubrics and paperwork. It is expected that the student will discuss the QE topic with the mentor and QEC faculty and obtain advice on the topic and its scope, and the committee may suggest relevant literature to consider. The mentor and the student will together make the final decision on the focus or question of the QE. Unlike the first year project, the QE is a project that is often highly mentored and supported. The mentor can assist with all phases of preparation of the document itself including providing editorial help. During the oral presentation and defense, the mentor may observe the oral presentation and oral defense and ask questions of the student. Generally, the research mentor is encouraged to allow the student to answer independently during the questioning by the other members of the committee, and not act as an advocate or interpreter.

Limits on and documenting assistance. The student must write the text of the written portion, and create the slides for the presentation portion of the exam. Students are encouraged to seek input into project design from faculty, students, and colleagues. Students are encouraged to practice their presentation with other students and lab members and to seek advice on logic, order, and style. Students must acknowledge/list contributions from all individuals in Appendix 1 of the written proposal and in an acknowledgement slide during the oral presentation

Assessment: The written product, oral presentation and oral defense will be evaluated based upon the following themes (see rubric for additional details and scoring):

1. Clear communication in writing and speaking
2. Mastery of a relevant literature including integration and historical context
3. Grasp of research design and analytic strategy - research design is logical and feasible.
4. Ability to justify choices made, hypothesize about underlying ideas or theory and identify the implications or significance of the proposed research.

The oral presentation, defense and feedback should be scheduled for a block of 2 hours (30-minute presentation, 1-hour defense, 30 minutes for grading and feedback). The oral presentation consists of a 30-minute PowerPoint lecture that includes the QEC. The QE oral presentation and defense is open to observers, at the discretion of the candidate.

The oral defense, lasting up to an hour, entails committee members asking detailed questions about the document and/or the presentation. The questions will address conceptual background, depth of literature understanding, methodological issues, and reasoning behind decisions made, as well as implications of the conclusions and historical context.

The QE is assessed comprehensively with a determination of **“Approve or Modification Required.”** Deliberation will be made by the QEC at the end of the oral defense in private. A brief written evaluation report (Rubric for Qualifying Exam, see below) summarizing the QEC's evaluation of the student's performance on the written document, oral presentation, and oral exam will occur at this time. The report will include grading and if necessary, recommendations from the QEC committee on portions of the exam for which **“Modification Required”** was assigned with a timeline for completion of any modifications. If needed, modification may be suggested for all parts or just for certain parts of the QE. The student will then be invited back in to discuss the results. A written copy

of the results will be submitted to the Program Director, or designee, and a copy will also be provided to the student.

The student is allowed to remediate the exam only once, and must complete and obtain Approval for the remediation according to a QEC-specified deadline. If the grant proposal is the only part requiring modification and if the QEC agrees, then changes to the grant proposal may be submitted electronically to the QEC for approval and no additional meeting would be necessary. If the presentation or the defense were noted as portions that required remediation then an additional presentation and/or defense date will need to be determined and completed by the deadlines set by the QEC. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Program Director may petition the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies on behalf of the student for an additional retake or time extension. This request should be initiated by the student in consultation with their mentor.

#### Advancement to Candidacy

Upon successful completion of the QE, students will become eligible for recommendation for advancement to candidacy. The Graduate Program Director will sign the Qualifying Examination form indicating successful completion of all requirements for advancement to Ph.D. candidacy.

Rubric for Qualifying Exam (QE)

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Defense Date \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 1 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 2 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 3 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Reviewer Names (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose:** The purpose of this rubric is to give CPP students a clear understanding of the criteria that will be used to guide the assessment of the quality of their scholarship and to apply the rubric in completing the final assessment of their QE. This rubric is intended to be shared with students early in the process. Students can use this rubric as a coherent set of criteria that include descriptions of expected levels of performance while developing their scholarship during their program. *It is expected that a qualifying exam grant that is approved by the QEC would be evaluated as being at least in the “good performance” category and at or above a “3” level in all areas.*

**Instructions for QEC:** Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*

- 1) Each reviewer should complete a separate rubric with their initial thoughts and bring this with them to the defense.
- 2) After the oral defense, the *QEC will deliberate together and make final decisions on each rating and the overall evaluation* based upon the written product, oral presentation and oral defense. One complete form and set of ratings will be agreed upon by the QEC and submitted to the program.
- 3) Using the 5-point scale below, only circle one number for each rubric section to indicate evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship. Please rate the student’s performance in the domains listed below, taking into account their developmental level/ year in the program and the amount of time and scope of experiences they have completed thus far in the program.

- 1 = Inadequate Performance (Consistently below expectations)
- 2 = Marginal Performance (Meets minimum expectations at times, but not consistently)
- 3 = Good Performance (Consistently meets minimum expectations for a student of their level)
- 4 = Very Good Performance (Exceeds expectations at times)
- 5 = Outstanding Performance (Exceeds expectations consistently)
- NA = Not applicable, no basis for rating

- 4) Once complete, the final grades and determinations will be shared with the student to conclude their oral defense. The QEC will return this completed form to the Program Director or designee, who will share it with the student.

**RESEARCH QUESTION, INNOVATION AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research question is not strongly supported or developed.</li> <li>● The question needs more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research question is developed, but not as thoroughly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research question is well developed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research question very well developed</li> <li>● Significance is clear, well-situated to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The question is exceptionally original and innovative</li> <li>● Significant in its potential contribution, calls forth new</li> </ul>

development to enhance its originality • The case is not well developed that it is significant, interesting or important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question may be original but could be improved</li> <li>• Significance to the field is somewhat supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is original and innovative</li> </ul>	advance existing knowledge	knowledge, obvious potential to address critical issues within the field.
---	---	---	----------------------------	---

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete, omissions or unsubstantiated interpretations, may only provide a list of previous findings without being in dialogue with the literature</li> <li>• Little evidence the candidate understands the canonical and current literature within their field, relevance to the research question unclear</li> <li>• May not address the gap in the literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an analysis of previous findings; adequate coverage but limited as to viewpoints presented</li> <li>• Reference to and discussion of canonical and current relevant literature but weak connection with their question or thesis</li> <li>• May develop some connection but not a strong connection to the gap in the literature their project addresses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear review that draws connections and integrates literature well</li> <li>• Includes canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop hypotheses</li> <li>• Draws a clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address</li> </ul>	<p>An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes strong canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop clear hypotheses</li> <li>• Draws a very clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mastery of original and critical engagement with relevant literature in the field</li> <li>• Hypotheses derived from both canonical and current literature review with analysis and summary contributing to the body of research in their field</li> <li>• Demonstrates the gap in the literature relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument to addressing the gap</li> </ul>

## USE AND INTEGRATION OF FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theoretical framework is unclear, or misunderstood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to but provide only a minimal framework for the research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to and provide a very clear framework for the research;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizes multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Theories not connected to the literature review or research question clearly; little or no discussion of the impact of theory on their research; may reject theory as important or pertinent to their study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research connects back to theoretical bases in some way; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>research; well-versed in theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>research very well-versed in theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses how project will fit with or impact existing theories</li> </ul>	<p>and tensions of competing theories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their project will contribute to, support, or change established theory</li> </ul>
---	--	---	---	---

**COMMUNICATION, WRITING & SCHOLARLY VOICE** (CPP SLO Communication and Interpersonal Skills)

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More development of academic speech and writing skills necessary; Tone is not professional</li> <li>Syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; writing may be difficult to read or understand; errors of spelling, punctuation or formatting</li> <li>Overreliance on jargon or the candidate may not have a command of the field's lexicon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing and speech are somewhat developed and professional</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; formatting is adequate</li> <li>The lexicon of the respective field is understood and largely used properly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style</li> <li>Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are accurate; formatting is accurate</li> <li>Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate's written 'voice' is professional and clear. Speech is professional and very strong</li> <li>Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>Words are well chosen; and express the intended meaning precisely. Presentation is appropriately formal and information is delivered with fluency. Demonstrates a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate's written 'voice' is heard and yields a definitive, clear presence. Speech is professional and commanding</li> <li>Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>Lexicon of the field is expertly explained and defined</li> <li>Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Listeners gain insights.</li> </ul>

**RESEARCH STRATEGY, METHODS AND APPROACHES :** (APA Domain Specific Knowledge Category

4: *Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics*)

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Uses a methodology and/or population that does not lend itself well to the study of the question</li> <li>● Is unaware of, or has not identified, the biases and/or limitations within the study design</li> <li>● A clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Shows basic competence in understanding methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study design discussed but may not be well developed</li> <li>● Choice of methodology, approach and study design minimally acceptable; connection discussed but may not be clearly developed.</li> <li>● The analysis plan connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection; aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Shows adequate methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are adequately understood and discussed</li> <li>● Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis is adequate.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is complete and connects to the research question and theoretical framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High quality or innovative methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are clearly understood and discussed</li> <li>● Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Very high quality, innovative study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field</li> <li>● Broad discussion of the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential biases inherent in study</li> <li>● Clear explanation of methodological choices, and integration of approaches; iteratively explores questions raised by the data or theoretical analysis; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent.</li> </ul>



APA Domain Specific Knowledge:

**Category 4: *Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics***

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>APA Profession Wide Competency (i) Research</i>	<u>Global rating 1-5</u>
<b>Element #1:</b> Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.	
<b>Element #2:</b> Conduct research or other scholarly activities.	

Qualifying Exam Committee comments for student concerning performance:

**Written Product:**

**Oral Presentation:**

**Defense:**

<b>Final Determination of Qualifying Exam (written grant proposal, oral presentation &amp; oral defense)</b>
--

**Approve (Complete next section)/ meets CPP SLO Research standard and APA Profession Wide Competency in Research: MLA of 3's in all ratings of elements and domains have been achieved**

**Modification required; MLA of 3's not obtained across all domains above**

**Suggested timeline and deliverables:** \_\_\_\_\_

If needed, modification may be suggested for all parts or just for certain parts of the qualifying exam:

**IF APPROVED ABOVE: Complete the next section.**

**2. Would the reviewer recommend subsequent submission to granting agency?**

Yes

Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)

No (detail out below)

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Confidential Comments to Program Director:

### **M3: COMPLETE REQUIRED DIDACTIC COURSES**

The Clinical Psychology Ph.D. currently requires a minimum of 174 credits. All students must exceed the 135 credits required for a PhD at OHSU. Students are required to obtain grades of B or better in each required course for the program. Course requirements are the same for all students regardless of prior academic training (e.g., having taken graduate-level psychology courses in the past). No course credit will be transferred from any prior graduate studies. Of note, graduate credit is granted only for courses in which an A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, or P (Pass) grade is received. Courses graded on a P/NP basis do not contribute to a calculation of the grade point average but grades C- and below will still go into the student's cumulative GPA even if they do not count towards successful course completion for the program. Students are required to maintain a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 in all graduate-level courses.

These credits currently include clinical rotations; a minimum of 69 credits are earned through clinical placements (practica, 33 credits, and internship, 36 credits). For the clinical psychology PHD program, summer term registration is required. Students are to enroll during the summer and continue their graduate studies (practicum and research) during the summer term.

For traditional didactics courses 1 credit is assigned per 1 hour of instruction and is generally expected to require two additional hours of course preparation (e.g., reading, writing, case study or problem assignments) per week per term. Course credit hours are determined per OHSU policy, search O2 for Assignment of Course credit hours.

Full-time status is maintained with a course load of 9 credits per term. Students can register for more than 16 credits ONLY with permission of the Associate Dean. Typically, students register for approximately 9-12 credits/quarter throughout their graduate career.

Year 1 is entirely foundational courses and research; in years 2 and 3, courses are complemented by clinical practica and fulfilling research requirements. Year 4 includes additional clinical practica along with progress on the dissertation. These efforts continue, if needed, in Year 5. The program concludes with a full-time clinical internship, typically in the 5<sup>th</sup> year. Students have the option of taking elective courses (out of program credits) within any OHSU school (e.g. School of Medicine; School of Nursing) as relevant to their training needs throughout their graduate training. Please note that approval from the respective course's instructor and primary research mentor are required prior to registering for any elective course.

### **M4: COMPLETE REQUIRED CLINICAL PRACTICA AND SEMINAR**

Students must complete face-to-face clinical experience, obtained through clinical practicum. This will be a minimum of 33 credits, and students may elect additional practicum hours to achieve their individual training goals. In the second year 12 hours per week of practicum is required, in years 3 and beyond 16 hours per week is required. Prior to application for internship students are expected to obtain approximately 1000 total clinical hours which includes both face to face direct time and indirect time (supervision, note writing, case preparation). The goal is to have 500 face-to-face hours by internship application time (beginning 4<sup>th</sup> year). Practicum placements will be assigned based on student interests and training needs, along with availability of supervisors (please see the Practicum Guidelines for additional information). Students will begin supervised clinical practicum experiences on July 1<sup>st</sup> of their 1st year. For each practicum experience, students will be graded as pass/no pass based on feedback from their clinical supervisors. Students will be evaluated quarterly on continued progress towards clinical competencies including formal evaluations by the clinical site supervisor at the end of every term of practicum. If the student is not making adequate progress towards clinical competencies, the clinical site supervisor is required to inform the Program Director or Associate Director so that a remediation plan can be created. Please see remediation plan section below for additional details.

During the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year, students will also enroll in a practicum seminar. This will provide group supervision, coordinated by the Director or Associate Director of Clinical Training.

## **M5 – DISSERTATION AND ORAL EXAM**

The dissertation and oral exam are completed after the qualifying exam and after the student has advanced to candidacy.

The requirements for advancement to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree are as follows:

- Successful completion of all required didactic courses (grades of B or better),
- Successful completion of the 1st year research project.
- In good standing with clinical practicum training
- Successful completion of the Qualifying Examination

**Students should refer to all policies and forms on the SOM website:** <https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/forms-and-policies>.

An Advancement of Ph.D. Candidacy Form must be sent to the Graduate Studies Office. Students cannot be recommended for advancement to candidacy if they are on academic probation or if an incomplete grade remains on their transcript. Students who are advanced to candidacy are deemed “senior” students in the department.

In accord with the Graduate Council By-Laws, a minimum of six full-time academic terms is required for the Ph.D. degree. In addition, students must be candidates for at least three academic terms prior to the final oral examination for the Ph.D. degree.

The Request for Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC) Form – Ph.D. Programs should be sent to the program director within one term after advancing to Ph.D. candidacy. Detailed instructions can be found on the Graduate Studies Forms & Policies Page – Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC) Guidelines.

**Deadlines.** Details around recommended timelines and final deadlines are noted in Table 2, it is prudent to allow for additional time in deadlines based upon committee travel, need for signatures etc.

- Winter quarter year 3: Form Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC).
- Mid-summer year 3: Propose dissertation to DAC, this must be approved by the DAC by the end of summer year 3.
- Beginning of spring year 4: Set tentative oral exam date. Ideally, students will defend the dissertation with an oral exam before leaving for internship. Some students may choose to defend their dissertation while on internship, but this must occur no later than mid-spring of internship year.
- Submit the application for degree form 1 term prior to graduation
- 8 weeks before oral exam, submit final dissertation to DAC
- 4 weeks before oral exam, submit signed request for oral exam form with oral exam committee listed
- 2 weeks before oral exam submit dissertation to oral exam committee.
- Oral Exam passed: Students must complete the oral exam by mid-spring of the year they are on internship (i.e., mid-spring year 5 for most students, absolute deadline is mid-spring year 7).

### **Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC)**

#### **Composition:**

At least four faculty members (including the student’s advisor) with expertise in one or more aspects of the student’s project and who are familiar with the requirements of the graduate program for completion of a PhD. Students (in consultation with their faculty advisor and program director) may request specific faculty to serve on their DAC.

- A majority of DAC members must be members of the Graduate Faculty. OHSU faculty from

outside the Graduate Faculty may be included.

- One member may be from outside the university, but these require approval by the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies (the Program Director should include a brief CV and short explanation of non OHSU-faculty expertise on the committee to the Associate Dean)
- No more than two DAC members may lack any DAC experience and at least one member must have been on a DAC for a graduated student.
- DAC Chair: One DAC member, not the mentor, with significant experience in mentoring graduate students, and having served on a DAC before.
- DAC members may be added or removed with the approval of the Program Director and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Following the change, the DAC composition will still adhere to the above requirements.

For the CPP program, at least one member must be a program faculty member who is a licensed psychologist to ensure oversight of clinical training progress in addition to research training progress.

#### Formation and process:

The DAC must be established within one term of advancing to candidacy.

Students must meet with their DAC in person (unless they are away on internship, in which case a virtual meeting may be conducted) at least every six months and students will prepare an organized presentation of their recent progress (e.g. as a PowerPoint presentation), including a summary of the goals outlined by the DAC during their previous meeting; a discussion of their accomplishments and any problems encountered; and a summary of the directions they intend to pursue during the following six months. A Dissertation Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Form will be completed and distributed after each meeting. Additional meetings may be scheduled by the student or by the members of a DAC to ensure the student progresses towards his/her Ph.D. degree. *See also [Dissertation Advisory Committee \(DAC\) Guidelines and Dissertation Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Form on the SOM website.](#)*

A written dissertation research proposal must be submitted by the student by mid-summer in year 4 and approved by the DAC by the end of summer term of their 4<sup>th</sup> year. In general, it is expected that the proposal will contain a brief review of the relevant scientific literature, a statement of the rationale or hypothesis for the project, a description of proposed methods including the approach to statistical analysis, a discussion of the expected outcomes and their significance, and references. Although the length and format for this proposal may vary depending on the nature of the project, students are strongly encouraged to adopt the format of the Research Plan in the standard NIH research grant application. A majority of the DAC members must approve the research proposal. DAC members will indicate their approval of the proposal by signing an approval form. The student must submit the signed form to the Program Director.

The student may proceed with their project after the Ph.D. proposal has been approved by the DAC. The DAC committee must meet a minimum of every 6 months. It is *often advisable* that one meeting be a review of the analysis and data to ensure the student is ready to write up results.

Ph.D. candidates are required to register for dissertation credits each semester between completing their QE and the oral defense. These are graded P/NP. Any NP semester triggers placement of the student on a remediation plan which will be determined by the DAC in consultation with the Program Director.

Guidelines for preparation of dissertation and thesis should be consulted on the SOM website. The final written document should be approved by the student's mentor and must be submitted to the dissertation committee members at least 8 weeks prior to the oral presentation and defense, but with an absolute deadline of beginning of spring term year 7 (or beginning of spring term that the student is on internship, whichever is sooner).

## **Request for Oral Examination**

At least eight weeks prior to the proposed oral examination, the student must send a copy of the dissertation document to all members of the DAC. A majority of DAC members must approve of the dissertation document before it can be submitted for the oral examination. DAC members will indicate their approval to move the submitted project and dissertation document on to oral examination by indicating their approval on the OHSU Graduate Studies [Request for Oral Examination](#) electronic form which is then routed to the Graduate Program Director for approval. If the Program Director is the mentor then the Associate Director must give final approval.

## **Oral Examination**

After the dissertation has been approved and the student moves toward the oral examination, the DAC becomes known as the Oral Exam Committee (OEC). Typically, the DAC and OEC will be identical.

Formation and process: Dissertation Defense, Oral Examination Meeting

Students should reference the [Guidelines and Regulations for Completion of Masters and Ph.D. Degrees on the SOM website](#): <https://www.ohsu.edu/school-of-medicine/graduate-studies/forms-and-policies>

## **Preparation**

A Request for Oral Examination form must be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies 8 weeks before the scheduled oral exam date and all signatures must be completed at least 4 weeks before the scheduled oral defense date.

All members of the OEC must receive the following at least two weeks prior to the oral examination:

- An unbound copy of the dissertation from the student.
- A copy of the approved *REQUEST FOR ORAL EXAMINATION* form which will be forwarded to the Chair by the Graduate Studies Office upon approval of the Request for Oral Examination.
- A copy of the “Instructions for Members of the Oral Examination Committee” which will be forwarded to the Chair by the Graduate Studies Office upon approval of the Request for Oral Examination.

Students must be registered for at least one hour of dissertation credit during the term in which the Oral Examination occurs. Students may not take the oral examination if they are on academic probation or if an Incomplete (I) grade remains on their transcript.

## **Composition**

The OEC must (1) include no fewer than four members of the Graduate Faculty who do not all have primary appointments in the same department or institute, (2) include at least one member who is not a member of the student’s DAC, and (3) be chaired by a member of the Graduate Faculty. The student’s mentor should serve on the committee but may not serve as Chair. The Request for Oral Exam form can be found on the [School of Medicine Graduate Studies Forms & Policies](#) page. This signed form should be submitted 4 weeks before the proposed oral exam date to allow time for approval.

Programs may request permission to replace one of the committee members by a recognized scholar who is not a member of Graduate Faculty. Requests to appoint an outside member to the Advisory Committee must be supported by a letter from the Program Director and a copy of the individual’s curriculum vitae.

## **Format, Scope, Grading and Evaluation.**

The dissertation will include 3 parts:

1. Written dissertation document
2. Oral presentation.
3. Oral examination (conducted immediately following the oral presentation).

Each member of the committee evaluates the student's examination performance as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory with their signature on the Oral Exam Certification form. The examination is considered to be satisfactory if a majority of the members record votes of satisfactory. This is described in additional detail in the *Guidelines for preparation of dissertation and thesis* on the SOM website.

Assessment: The written product, oral presentation and oral defense will be evaluated based upon the following themes (see rubric for additional details and scoring):

1. Clear communication in writing and speaking
2. Mastery of a relevant literature including integration and historical context
3. Grasp of research design and analytic strategy
4. Accurate interpretation of results and discussion of finding.
5. Ability to justify choices made, hypothesize about underlying ideas or theory and identify the implications or significance of the research.

The oral examination must be held on campus and shall be open to the public. It is the responsibility of the graduate student to set the date, time, and place of the oral examination and to post notices on campus.

The oral presentation, defense and feedback should be scheduled for a block of 2.5 hours (30-minute presentation, 1-hour defense, 1-hour for deliberation, grading and feedback). The oral presentation consists of a 30-minute PowerPoint lecture that includes the OEC.

The oral defense, lasting up to an hour, entails committee members asking detailed questions about the document and/or the presentation. The questions will address conceptual background, depth of literature understanding, methodological issues, and reasoning behind decisions made, as well as implications of the conclusions and historical context. The deliberation period will be in a closed session.

For APA tracking of competencies, in addition to each member signing the Oral Examination Certification Form, a single rubric will be completed based on the collective decision of the OEC, described below.

The dissertation is assessed comprehensively with a determination of “**Approve or Modification Required.**” Deliberation will be made by the OEC at the end of the oral defense in private. A brief written evaluation report (Rubric for Dissertation, see below) summarizing the OEC's evaluation of the student's performance on the written document, oral presentation, and oral exam will occur at this time. The report will include grading and if necessary, recommendations from the OEC committee on portions of the exam for which “**Modification Required**” was assigned with a timeline for completion of any modifications. If needed, modification may be suggested for all parts or just for certain parts of the dissertation. The student will then be invited back in to discuss the results. A written copy of the results will be submitted to the Program Director, or designee, and a copy will also be provided to the student.

### **Finalizing Ph.D. Requirements**

Reference the *Guidelines and Regulations for Completion of Masters and Ph.D. Degrees* for a full list of requirements. In general, students should plan to make corrections to the dissertation, submit the dissertation to the library, and complete the Survey of Earned Doctorates.



Rubric for Dissertation

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Defense Date \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

DAC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 1 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 2 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer 3 Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Reviewer Names (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this rubric is to give CPP students a clear understanding of the criteria that will be used to guide the assessment of the quality of their scholarship and to apply the rubric in completing the final assessment of their dissertation.

**Application:** This rubric is intended to be shared with students early in the process. Students can use this rubric as a coherent set of criteria that include descriptions of expected levels of performance for the dissertation and oral exam milestone. It is expected that a dissertation that is approved by the reviewers would be evaluated as being **at least in the “good performance” category and at or above a “3” level in all areas.**

**Instructions for OEC:**

- 1) Please fill out the complete form. *Do not leave blanks.*
- 2) Each reviewer should complete a separate rubric with their initial thoughts from their review of the written dissertation document and bring this with them to the defense.
- 3) After the oral defense, the OEC *will deliberate together and make final decisions on each rating and the overall evaluation* based upon the written product, oral presentation and oral defense. One complete form and set of ratings will be agreed upon by the OEC and submitted to the program for competency tracking.
- 4) Using the 5-point scale below, only circle one number for each rubric section to indicate evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship. Please rate the student’s performance in the domains listed below, taking into account their developmental level/ year in the program and the amount of time and scope of experiences they have completed thus far in the program.  
  
1 = Inadequate Performance (Consistently below expectations)  
2 = Marginal Performance (Meets minimum expectations at times, but not consistently)  
3 = Good Performance (Consistently meets minimum expectations for a student of their level)  
4 = Very Good Performance (Exceeds expectations at times)  
5 = Outstanding Performance (Exceeds expectations consistently)  
NA = Not applicable, no basis for rating
- 4) Once complete, the final determinations will be shared verbally with the student to conclude their oral defense. The OEC will return this completed form to the Program Director or designee, who will share it with the student.

## ABSTRACT

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the problem or findings not developed in a clear way</li> <li>• Findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract has an introduction to the finding</li> <li>• Statement of the problem, findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some additional organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organized well</li> <li>• States the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise</li> <li>• States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance very well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise; smoothly draws the reader in</li> <li>• States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance extremely well</li> </ul>

## RESEARCH QUESTION OR THESIS THEME

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is not strongly supported or developed</li> <li>• The question needs more development to enhance its originality</li> <li>• The case is not well developed that question is significant, interesting or important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is developed, but not as thoroughly</li> <li>• The question may be original but could be improved</li> <li>• Significance to the field is somewhat supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is well developed</li> <li>• The question is original and innovative</li> <li>• Significance is clear, well-situated to advance existing knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question very well developed</li> <li>• The question is clear, original and innovative</li> <li>• Significant in its potential contribution, potential to address critical issues within the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question extremely well developed</li> <li>• The question is exceptionally original and innovative</li> <li>• Very significant in its potential contribution, calls forth new knowledge, obvious potential to address critical issues within the field</li> </ul>

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete, omissions or unsubstantiated interpretations, may only provide a list of previous findings without being in dialogue with the literature</li> <li>• Little evidence the candidate understands the canonical and current literature within their field, relevance to the research question unclear</li> <li>• May not address the gap in the literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an analysis of previous findings; adequate coverage but limited as to viewpoints presented</li> <li>• Reference to and discussion of canonical and current relevant literature but weak connection with their question or thesis</li> <li>• May develop some connection but not a strong connection to the gap in the literature their project addresses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear review that draws connections and integrates literature well</li> <li>• Includes canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop hypotheses</li> <li>• Draws a clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An insightful review that draws connections and integrates literature in a new way</li> <li>• Includes strong canonical and current relevant literature and uses the literature to discuss scholarly trends and to develop clear hypotheses</li> <li>• Draws a very clear relationship to the gap in literature their project will address</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mastery of original and critical engagement with relevant literature in the field</li> <li>• Hypotheses derived from both canonical and current literature review with analysis and summary contributing to the body of research in their field</li> <li>• Demonstrates the gap in the literature relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument to addressing the gap</li> </ul>

## FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theoretical framework is unclear, or misunderstood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to but provide only a minimal framework for the research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current theories are connected to and provide a very clear framework for the research;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizes multiple demonstrably relevant theories or models; looks at the complementarity</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Theories not connected to the literature review or research question clearly; little or no discussion of the impact of theory on their research; may reject theory as important or pertinent to their study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research connects back to theoretical bases in some way; little or no discussion of the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>research; well-versed in theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses the impact on existing theories their research implies</li> </ul>	<p>research very well-versed in theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very clear connection between theory and research questions, gaps identified in existing theories; discusses how project will fit with or impact existing theories</li> </ul>	<p>and tensions of competing theories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses theory to generate questions, answers, and considers their implications; addresses how their project will contribute to, support, or change established theory</li> </ul>
---	--	---	---	---

**COMMUNICATION, WRITING AND SCHOLARLY VOICE** (CPP SLO Communication and Interpersonal Skills)

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More development of academic speech and writing skills necessary; Tone is not professional</li> <li>Syntax or vocabulary may not be well developed; writing may be difficult to read or understand; errors of spelling, punctuation or formatting</li> <li>Overreliance on jargon or the candidate may not have a command of the field's lexicon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing and speech are somewhat developed and professional</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation, grammar, in general, meet program and institutional standards; formatting is adequate</li> <li>The lexicon of the respective field is understood and largely used properly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tone of writing and speech is professional; scholarly style</li> <li>Speech and writing are grammatically correct, fluid, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are accurate; formatting is accurate</li> <li>Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate's written 'voice' is professional and clear. Speech is professional and very strong</li> <li>Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>Words are well chosen; and express the intended meaning precisely. Presentation is appropriately formal and information is delivered with fluency. Demonstrates a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate's written 'voice' is heard and yields a definitive, clear presence. Speech is professional and commanding</li> <li>Speech and writing are fluid, precise, and clear; vocabulary and syntax are mature; scholarly style and format are accurately used</li> <li>Lexicon of the field is expertly explained and defined</li> <li>Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Listeners gain insights.</li> </ul>

**RESEARCH STRATEGY, METHODS AND APPROACHES:**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Uses a methodology and/or population that does not lend itself well to the study of the question</li> <li>● Is unaware of, or has not identified, the biases and/or limitations within the study design</li> <li>● A clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis either not discussed or not clearly made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Shows basic competence in understanding methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study design discussed but may not be well developed</li> <li>● Choice of methodology, approach and study design minimally acceptable; connection discussed but may not be clearly developed.</li> <li>● The analysis plan connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection; aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Shows adequate methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are adequately understood and discussed</li> <li>● Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis is adequate.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is complete and connects to the research question and theoretical framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High quality or innovative methodology and study design</li> <li>● Study biases and/or limitations within the study are clearly understood and discussed</li> <li>● Discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Very high quality, innovative study design; design of study manifests a deep understanding of the field</li> <li>● Broad discussion of the limitations of the methodology, study design, and potential biases inherent in study</li> <li>● Clear explanation of methodological choices, and integration of approaches; iteratively explores questions raised by the data or theoretical analysis; discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis clear and concise.</li> <li>● Analysis plan is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent.</li> </ul>

**THEORETICAL ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION and INTERPRETATION**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The analysis may be incomplete and/or poorly organized and/or implemented</li> <li>•The findings may not be supported by the analysis; the discussion of the findings may not be well organized and/or not address all of the findings clearly and/or be missing portions such as a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the research</li> <li>•Validity of the findings may not be addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The analysis connects back to theory but may not establish a clear connection.</li> <li>•Aspects of the data are adequately considered but a more thorough analysis should be considered</li> <li>•Validity of the findings are addressed but may lack a thorough approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The analysis connects back to theory in a clear connection.</li> <li>•The data are adequately considered and validity of the findings are addressed adequately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Analysis is thorough, complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework</li> <li>•Validity of the findings are addressed rigorously.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Analysis is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent; findings are tied to the research question and theoretical foundations.</li> <li>•A rigorous discussion of the validity of the findings are engaged in and compared to previous research in the field.</li> </ul>

**CONCLUSIONS**

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Summary may not be clear and organized; the connection between the findings and data may not be established in a convincing way</li> <li>•little or no interpretation is provided or the interpretation may not fit the findings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion in reference to the literature; the results are situated as to their significance</li> <li>•Little or no discussion of the 'gap' in the literature their study addresses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Summarizes the results and situates findings in reference to the literature and their significance</li> <li>•Some discussion of the 'gap' in the literature their study addresses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Conclusions are well-presented and insightful; they return to the larger context to identify future directions and/or discuss how the field needs to change</li> <li>•Accentuates the 'gap' in the literature the study addresses and presents a compelling argument as to how their study fulfills this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides a focused discussion of conclusions, situating them in the literature to draw connections or point to differences with previous research; advances the field(s) of knowledge and raises questions for the future</li> <li>•Makes a compelling and interesting argument as to the importance of their findings and how those findings address the 'gap' in the literature originally identified.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---	---

## DIVERSITY and APPLICATION

Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to address questions of diversity where such considerations are clearly relevant to the current research</li> <li>• Makes claims that are inappropriately universalizing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discusses relevant issues of diversity but could provide greater depth or nuance</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies but does not address these sufficiently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides analysis of some of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides strong analysis of the diversity considerations and debates that are relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a sophisticated, critical, and nuanced analysis of key considerations and debates where relevant to the topic, methodology, and conclusions</li> <li>• Recognizes the existence of multiple frameworks and epistemologies and avoids inappropriately universalizing results</li> </ul>

APA Domain Specific Knowledge:

**Category 4: *Research Methods, Statistical Analysis, and Psychometrics***

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

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

<i>N/A Does not Apply</i>	Inadequate Performance	Marginal Performance	Good Performance	Very Good Performance	Outstanding Performance
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>APA Profession Wide Competency (i) Research</i>	<u>Global rating 1-5</u>
<b>Element #1:</b> Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.	
<b>Element #2:</b> Conduct research or other scholarly activities.	

DAC comments for student concerning performance:

**Written Product:**

**Oral Presentation:**



Defense:

<b>Final Determination of Dissertation (written dissertation, oral presentation &amp; oral defense)</b>
---

Approve (Complete next section)/ meets CPP SLO Research standard and APA Profession Wide Competency in Research: MLA of 3's in all ratings of elements and domains have been achieved

Modification required; MLA of 3's not obtained across all domains above

Suggested timeline and deliverables: \_\_\_\_\_

If needed, modification may be suggested for all parts or just for certain parts of the dissertation.

**3. Would the reviewers recommend subsequent submission for publication?**

Yes

Yes, with modifications/revisions (detail out below)

No (detail out below)

Chair Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Chair Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Confidential Comments to Program Director:

## **M6: COMPLETION OF THE CLINICAL INTERNSHIP**

In line with APA requirements, a full-time doctoral internship at an APA accredited internship site is required to complete the Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology. Internship placements are full time, and are completed through a national match process. The internship consists of a full-time clinical experience, frequently occurring off-site at a university, VA health care system, or other clinical/medical setting where the student has matched in the national internship match process. Students should request to apply for internship through their annual review (typically in June of their 3<sup>rd</sup> year). Qualified students will be evaluated and granted permission by the Director of Clinical Training to apply for internship as part of the national match process in the fall of their 4<sup>th</sup> year. Transition to the clinical internship is intended to occur during the student's 5<sup>th</sup> year, although students may delay it until the 6<sup>th</sup> year if necessary to ensure sufficient progress on their dissertation. As OHSU requires continuous enrollment for all graduate students, a tuition and fees waiver will be provided by the OHSU School of Medicine during the internship year.

Our policy is to maintain regular and clear communication with internship programs that accept program students. The DCT will email each internship training director shortly after the APPIC Doctoral Internship match day to introduce the program and provide important contact information for ongoing communication, and confirm receipt. During the internship year, we expect to receive evaluation from the site about students' performance at least two time points – the first should occur midway through the training year and the second upon completion of internship training. If we do not receive this information, we will follow-up with the internship program. Every autumn early in the fall term, the faculty will devote meeting time to a review of the internship evaluations, including tracking prior years' data, to evaluate student competencies and to note any needed program adjustments. If there are any gaps in our students' training; that is, if an internship were to raise a concern about a student's performance or lack of knowledge in an area, then we would develop a plan to address that weakness/omission for future students.

### **Application for Degree**

The Office of the Registrar requires that the Application for Degree be completed and is required in the Registrar's Office one term prior to completing degree requirements. The online Application for Degree can be found in the [Student Information System](#).

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### **Course Waivers**

Since we are operating with a curriculum model that has more infusion elements, there is often not a 1:1 match with other courses with a similar course title at other institutions. We have a current position that we will not waive courses. We hope that this will be an opportunity for students to dive deeper into the material, interact with our full faculty and build additional relationships and cohesion within the CPP cohort.

### **Non-Discrimination Policy**

The CPP program, OHSU, and affiliated training sites (e.g., VA Portland Health Care System) are committed to providing a supportive learning environment that is based on mutual courtesy and respect, free from harassment, discrimination, or unfair treatment, and focused on a successful student educational experiences in adherence with OHSU guidelines. Please see <https://www.ohsu.edu/affirmative-action-and-equal-opportunity/responding-concerns> for full information on resources available for reporting and support.

### **Ethical and Professional Behavior**

Graduate students are required to maintain high ethical standards. They are required to be familiar with and conform to the guidelines in the American Psychological Association code of ethics (<https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/>) as well as the OHSU Code of conduct. See the [OHSU Code of Conduct](#) for further information.

Graduate students are required to demonstrate integrity in all aspects of clinical and research activities. In the clinical realm, students must demonstrate understanding and skill in protecting client confidentiality, appropriate documentation, safety and welfare, and other aspects of clinical care that involve ethical considerations. In the scientific realm, students are expected to understand and avoid sources of error in scientific research. It is essential that students do not misrepresent scientific findings or misappropriate credit. All graduate students are required to take courses concerning ethics and science (see Training in the Responsible Conduct of Research section). Students are expected to show cooperation, responsibility, and respect in interactions with other students and faculty. Consideration of and sensitivity to the cultural and individual diversity of all individuals is expected.

Students who are involved in unethical or unprofessional conduct such as cheating, misrepresentation of research findings, plagiarism (failure to credit the original author), or disruption of the learning process are subject to disciplinary action including dismissal from the program.

It should also be noted that students observing unethical behavior by students, faculty, or others on campus are obligated to bring these transgressions to the attention of the appropriate person.

### Training in the Responsible Conduct of Research

The National Institutes of Health requires continued ethics training for all trainees, fellows, participants, and scholars receiving support through any NIH training, career development, research education, and dissertation research grant ([NOT-OD-10-019](#)). To meet this requirement, all graduate students are required to:

- Complete IPE 601 (**IPE - Foundations of Patient Safety and Interprofessional Practice**) during their first year. This course is designed for early health care learners from all OHSU schools and programs to introduce them to the importance of best practices for professionalism, roles and responsibilities, teamwork, communication, ethics, and collaborative practice as a means to improve the quality and safety of patient care.
- The Clinical Psychology Program will offer a 1 credit Ethics course every two years. All students are required to take this course when it is offered, after their first year in the program.

### Academic Grading and Progress

The School of Medicine requires that graduate students maintain an overall 3.0 grade point average in graduate level courses. Graduate credit is granted only for courses in which an A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, or P (Pass) grade is received. Students are required to obtain grades of B or better in each required course for the Clinical Psychology PhD program. Courses graded on a P/NP basis do not contribute to a calculation of the grade point average. Students are recommended to review the [Graduate Council By-Laws](#) for more information regarding GPA and academic probation.

### Student Records Retention and Security

Education records for all students that have been accepted and matriculated are kept and maintained by the Office of the Registrar and the [CPP program](#). The education record contains information including but not limited to, copies of application materials, records of grades earned, assignments, faculty evaluation of student performance, information concerning discipline and counseling for academic and/or professionalism issues and clinical performance in accordance with the Family Educational Records and Privacy Act (FERPA). [All files stored in a FERPA-compliant, electronic records keeping system that can only be accessed by CPP leadership or the Office of the Registrar.](#)

### Annual Review of Progress

Each graduate student in the program is required to submit an annual written progress report to the Program Director no later than the end of July of each year. **(See Appendix A for the template for the Annual Review Form)**. This report will be added to the student's departmental file. The information contained in these reports may

also be used when preparing training grant progress reports or responding to other requests about the department's program. The report should include the following information:

- A summary of the courses completed, with a focus on the previous 12 months,
- Accomplishments related to program advancement (for example, dissertation proposal, oral defense, qualifying examination, etc.),
- Papers written, submitted, and published,
- Attendance/presentations at scientific meetings,
- Honors or awards (for example, grants, travel awards),
- Plans/goals for the coming year,
- Timeline of planned activity toward graduation

Program faculty will meet each year in summer to review progress for all students. Either the Director or Associate Director will compile input from clinical practicum supervisors for inclusion. The student's progress report along with a progress evaluation from the mentor, review of course transcripts, input from course directors, and practicum supervisor evaluations (when applicable), will guide that review. The student will not be present for the discussion but will be given a verbal summary by the mentor or the Program Director as soon as feasible and a written evaluation by the end of summer of that year. The Administrative Coordinator will send a checklist to the student outlining progress made and indicating program milestone expectations for the upcoming academic year. If adequate progress is not made, the Program Director will follow up with the student and mentor and develop a documented performance plan with a planned timeline and expected outcomes for improvement. If challenges to making adequate progress continue, the Program Director or Associate Director shall bring the matter to the clinical faculty for possible intervention. At any time during the year, students are encouraged to schedule meetings with the Program Director to discuss any concerns with their academic progress or the program including informal and formal grievances (see Grievances section below for full details).

### Program Participation and Feedback

Collaboration with our students for tailoring our program to their needs is a core value of our faculty. Every January, students will select a representative to attend faculty meetings to convey student concerns and provide feedback. Each representative will serve for no more than one calendar year. Students may be asked to recuse themselves from select faculty meetings as needed for maintaining privacy (e.g., discussing other students' academic performance, admissions).

All students are given the opportunity to provide feedback on the program and its subcomponents annually through a formal evaluation form (Appendix D). This will be a part of the annual program evaluation conducted each fall. All responses will be aggregated and fully anonymous. If a student has a concern about a violation of OHSU policy or information impacted by mandated reporting, they are encouraged to e-mail the Program Director.

### Graduate Student Stipends

*“The stipends provided to students offset the cost-of-living during the period of training and are not consider equivalent to salaries or other forms of compensation provided to individuals supported on research grants.”*

All full-time, active, graduate students can expect to receive a stipend in accordance with the [School of Medicine Graduate Student Stipend Policy](#).

### International Travel

All OHSU graduate students are required to submit an [International Away Elective Form & Graduate Student International Travel Waiver of Liability](#) form before they travel outside the U.S. on OHSU-related business.

### Teaching, Employment and Educational Outreach Activities

Students are not required to participate in teaching in order to meet degree requirements. Given the program's emphasis on coursework and research training during the first few years, the program does not permit students to

serve as course instructors during that time. Accordingly, prior to advancing to Ph.D. candidacy, students interested in teaching should, in consultation with their faculty mentors, limit such activities to occasional guest lectures and classroom or laboratory demonstrations. Upon advancing to candidacy, students interested in obtaining more formal or extensive teaching experience may wish to seek such opportunities at one or more of the local colleges and universities. The Program Director and other program faculty can provide information and assistance in identifying such opportunities.

All students must consult their faculty mentors before making any commitment to outside teaching or employment activities. Agreement of the faculty mentor will be documented in completion of forms required by the Provost's Office. Decisions to participate in such activities must always be tempered by the need to meet formal program requirements in a timely manner, to achieve excellence in research (e.g., publications), and to complete the Ph.D. dissertation.

Clinical hours can only be counted if they are obtained through formal practicum placements with CPP program supervision contracts.

### Time-to-Degree Constraints

The time period from matriculation to granting the Ph.D. degree is limited to 28 consecutive terms (seven academic years) unless waived for a leave of absence or family leave policy. Please consult the Graduate Council By-Laws for further information. Note that all training occurs in person, with the exception of several electronically mediated training experiences that may be required by OHSU.

### Sick Leave, Vacation, and Leave of Absence

Please consult the [Vacation & Sick Leave Policy for Graduate Students Receiving a Stipend](#) located on the [Office of Graduate Studies forms page](#).

Students are entitled to the normal holidays and up to 20 days of paid leave each academic year (July 1 – June 30). Paid normal holidays include: New Year's Day, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Day, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Day After thanksgiving, Christmas Day (dates can be found at <https://o2.ohsu.edu/human-resources/benefits/time-away-from-work/holidays.cfm>). Leave days may be used for any purpose including illness or vacation and accrue at 5 days/ quarter. All days off need to be approved by the mentor ahead of time, unexpected time out due to illness counts in the 20 days and should be conveyed as soon as possible to your mentor.

Even though classes are not in session in between academic quarters, students are expected to continue their educational and research experiences all year long unless they take vacation leave or are on extended leave without pay as outlined in the OGS leave policy (see above).

### Accommodation

Our program is committed to all students achieving their potential. If you have a disability or think you may have a disability (physical, learning, hearing, vision, psychological) which may need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Office for Student Access at (503) 494-0082 to discuss your needs. Because accommodations can take time to implement, it is important to have this discussion as soon as possible. Please note that per ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, accommodations are not retroactive and can only be implemented once students are determined to be qualified by the Office for Student Access. All information regarding a student's disability is kept confidential in accordance with relevant state and federal laws.

## REMEDIATION, TERMINATION, AND FAILURE TO COMPLETE TRAINING PROGRAM

The following possibilities may occur when inadequate and/or problematic performance is identified:

1) Meeting between the mentor and student that results in an informal plan of action for addressing areas of deficit.

- 2) Development of a formal Remediation Plan (see below), facilitated by the Program Director in consultation with the program faculty and mentor and student.
- 3) Probation (see below)
- 4) Dismissal (see below)

The emphasis in graduate school is on the development of independent scholarship and research expertise. This is in contrast to the typical undergraduate focus primarily on coursework and grades. Although grades still serve an evaluative function in graduate school, they tend to be of much less importance, particularly as the student advances past the early required curriculum.

The goal of the Clinical Psychology PhD program and faculty members is that all individuals selected to participate in the PhD program do so successfully by meeting at least minimal level of competence in all core areas. While review efforts and practices focus on ensuring success of students, instances may arise in which performance is judged as sufficiently impaired and/or problematic in one or more critical areas of functioning to raise concerns that an individual may not successfully complete the training program. In these situations, faculty take active steps to collectively identify specific area(s) of deficit, develop specific goals for remediation, and identify strategies for remediation.

Determination of inadequate and/or problematic performance by a student is typically established at the annual performance review, but can arise earlier if the situation warrants by means of a faculty member, mentor or practicum supervisor bringing the matter to the program director's attention. Program Faculty will meet each year in summer to review progress for all students. The student's annual progress report, which includes progress evaluation from the mentor, and practicum supervisor evaluations (when applicable), will guide that review. The student will not be present for the discussion but will be given a verbal summary by the mentor or the Program Director as soon as feasible and a written evaluation by the end of summer of that year. In addition to information provided in each student's annual report, transcripts are reviewed and comments may be offered by course directors, clinical supervisors, and other faculty members. The administrative coordinator will send a checklist to the student outlining progress made and indicating program milestone expectations for the upcoming academic year.

If adequate progress is not made, the Program Director will follow up with the student and mentor and develop a documented performance plan (AKA informal remediation plan) with a planned timeline and expected outcomes for improvement. (If the program director is the mentor, this role will be taken on by the Associate Director or other faculty member assigned by the Clinical Program faculty). If challenges to making adequate progress continue, the Program Director (or proxy) shall bring the matter to the program faculty for review and possible change of mentor assignment or further action including possible suspension. At any time during the year, students are encouraged to schedule meetings with the Program Director to discuss any concerns with their academic progress or the program including informal and formal grievances (see Grievances section below for full details).

Insufficient performance can include failure to achieve adequate grades (Pass or B) in a course or practicum assignment, unethical conduct or conduct unbecoming, lack of timely progress or quality on research requirements. Practicum supervisors can contact the program director to request a remediation plan at any point. If a student receives a rating of 1 on any of the items, or a mean profession wide competency score below 2, then a formal written remediation plan will be created with the program and placed in the student's file to describe the activities that the student will engage in to achieve a rating of 3 or higher on future assessments. Supervisors will provide information to the Associate Director and/or Program Director (or designee), as soon as possible if the trainee is not meeting expectations or if any ethical or professional concerns arise involving the practicum student. Not reaching Minimum Levels of Achievement (MLA) by the end of their practicum year will also trigger a remediation plan.

Students should receive feedback from their advising committees during evaluation meetings. In addition, students are strongly encouraged to request feedback whenever they feel it will help with their timely and successful progress through the program. It is important that faculty provide timely feedback to graduate students, especially when it is required on major requirements that students must complete in order to progress through the program. Timely

feedback is considered part of good mentorship. It is also important that graduate students provide faculty with ample time to provide this feedback and plan ahead to provide them with this time. When a graduate student submits a completed draft of a major requirement for his/her degree (first year project, QE, dissertation proposal) to the relevant committee, the student should let the academic coordinator know that the draft has been submitted to the committee members. The academic coordinator will e-mail the committee members, alerting them that the draft has been submitted and that either any feedback on the draft should be provided to the student within 4 weeks of the date of submission or that the committee should make every effort to meet and discuss the status of the requirement within 4 weeks of submission. If the faculty member cannot make the 4-week deadline, then s/he should let the academic coordinator and the student know the date by which s/he can provide feedback to the graduate student or attend the committee meeting. Students who do not receive feedback from a faculty member after the agreed upon date should either contact the faculty member again to remind him or her, or have the academic coordinator send the reminder. If getting feedback becomes problematic, the student should consult the committee chair or program director.

## **REMEDIATION PLAN**

### **(See Appendix B for the template for the Competency Remediation Plan)**

Based on the aforementioned evaluation processes, if a concern is raised with a student, the Program Director has the option of developing an informal plan or remediation plan. If informal plans do not result in needed improvements, then a formal remediation plan is developed in collaboration with the Program Director, the student, and any necessary faculty. The remediation plan details the specific identified concerns of the student, targets of remediation, and a detailed plan for remediation, including behavioral indices of improvement. Ideally, the student and Program Director agree to the program-level remediation plan; however, if necessary, the Program Director can implement a program-level remediation plan without the student's agreement. If the student is able to complete the remediation plan successfully, as agreed upon by the student and the Program Director, the remediation plan will be removed from the student's file, and no additional action will be taken. A copy will be kept in the Program Director's personal files for purposes of accreditation or administrative review. If the student does not successfully complete the remediation plan within the agreed-upon timeframe specified in the remediation plan, the Program Director has the option to request probationary status or dismissal from the program.

If/when a formal Remediation Plan is warranted, the plan will include the following components individualized to the specific student issues:

- 1) Indication of observed strengths/capacities of intern.
- 2) Specification of areas of concern regarding inadequate, insufficient, and/or problematic performance. This will include observable, behavioral examples of the concern(s).
- 3) Specification of steps that must be taken by the student. This will include specific activities that must be completed as well as strategies that will be used by mentors to assist with remediation, as appropriate.
- 4) Specification of procedures to be used to evaluate progress toward remediation, as well as specific feedback mechanisms and timelines.
- 5) A date for re-evaluation of performance and determination of whether performance warrants:
  - a) Removal of remediation plan,
  - b) Revision and/or extension of remediation plan, or
  - c) Probationary status or dismissal from the program.

### **Probationary Status**

If a remediation plan has been unsuccessful in addressing the concerns then the student may be placed on probationary status, which will be part of their permanent student record. Probationary status is reserved for students with difficulties sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of eventual dismissal. Probation can occur for clinical and nonclinical reasons, such as failure to meet academic deadlines, research incompetence, and ethical and professional shortcomings. The problems that may warrant probation and even dismissal include but are not limited to failure to correct identified deficits in meeting administrative requirements (attendance, charting), failure to



respond to supervision, and other difficulties interfering with either clinical functioning that puts patient well-being in jeopardy, or research functioning that jeopardizes the responsible and ethical conduct of research.

The Program Director, in consultation with the faculty, must specify the specific contingencies for probation and retention in the program including the behavioral change necessary, the criteria and process to be used in evaluating progress, and the dates by which change must be evidenced. The Program Director will be responsible for monitoring the retention program and bringing information back to the faculty within the guidelines and timelines established. Although probationary status shall usually be resolved favorably by the end of practicum or the academic year, it can, if necessary, be extended into future practica or academic years until remediated. No student on probation can move to the next milestone (e.g., attain candidacy, progress to internship or defend their dissertation). Failure to satisfactorily remediate the probation status and complete the contingencies of the probationary period will result in a vote for dismissal from the program.

### Dismissal

Students may be suspended or dismissed from the graduate program for insufficient progress, conduct unbecoming, ethical violations, or violations of policies. If at all possible, a remediation plan and probation period would be put in place, to provide the student with an opportunity to correct the concern. In the event that the probation and remediation plan was unsuccessful or that the violation was too substantial to enable adequate remediation, then either the mentor or the Program Director would bring a recommendation for dismissal to the Program Faculty for a vote. A two-thirds vote at a meeting in which a faculty quorum is present would then result in a dismissal.

This decision would be forwarded to the student with a rationale in writing. If the dismissal was for violation of the Code of Conduct then no appeal is allowed under the School of Medicine Bylaws. If the dismissal is for other reasons, such as lack of progress, the student would have one opportunity to appeal this decision back to the clinical faculty with a response letter to the Program Director, detailing what information the student believes was not adequately considered. The Program Director would forward this appeal to the program faculty for reconsideration and final vote.

If that final vote was for dismissal, then the student would be notified and the Program Director would forward the dismissal recommendation to the Dean of the School of Medicine for final action as detailed in Article X, Section B of the [Graduate Council By-Laws](#).

### Grievances

The Psychology Department is committed to supporting graduate students and working to resolve any problems and/or conflicts that may arise. Students are encouraged to address situations proactively. It is recommended that you attempt to resolve any problems or conflicts informally. Depending upon the nature of your concern, the appropriate avenue for addressing the situation may vary. Within the department it may be best to confer with your mentor first. If this is not appropriate, or you do not reach a satisfactory resolution, you may wish to consult with another faculty member or the Associate Program Director, and finally the Program Director.

According to OHSU Policy 02-30-055, student grievances are defined as, “a concern initiated by the student related to the student’s role, the student’s activities within a school or college, or related to decisions made on the basis of any policies or procedures thought by the student to be unfair.”

Students have the right to grieve matters related but not restricted to the following areas: rights of authorship on scientific publication, student-mentor relationships, laboratory safety concerns, and grading policies. Students may not grieve disciplinary action, grades (including failure of the qualifying exam or failure of the oral thesis/dissertation exam), dismissal or other action taken under the Professional Conduct Policy.

### Informal Resolutions

In alignment with Policy 02-30-055, students are encouraged to pursue informal resolution with the other party. However, if the student should feel uncomfortable with direct informal resolution, the student may discuss the

grievance with the Program Director. The Program Director will meet with all parties to attempt an informal resolution.

### **Grievance Process and Remediation within the Clinical Program**

If an informal resolution cannot be achieved, the student may appeal formally to the Clinical Psychology Faculty. If necessary, a formal complaint may be made in writing. Once a statement is put in writing it becomes part of the record and at that point is available to anyone with a legitimate interest in the subject, including those involved in the situation. The program faculty will then initiate a review procedure in which a committee of three faculty uninformed with the grievance will obtain further information from the parties, will hold an open meeting of the parties if necessary, and will arrive at a recommendation to the program faculty. The program faculty will then vote on a resolution to the dispute (e.g., authorship or other matter), which requires a two-thirds vote at a meeting in which a faculty quorum is present.

If the student is not comfortable discussing the matter within the graduate program or department, or is dissatisfied with the outcome of the program vote, they may also discuss with the appropriate Associate Dean (Policy 02-30-055). The Associate Dean will then meet with all involved parties to attempt an informal resolution. A third-party mediator may be involved if appropriate. In addition, students may request graduate student union representation.

### **Formal Grievances to the University**

If the student is not satisfied with the resolution occurring through the above procedures, he or she may grieve formally to the University. Per Graduate Program Policy 02-30-055, “if the student is unable to resolve the grievance informally, the student may file a written grievance with the appropriate associate dean within 10 business days after the termination of the informal resolution phase. The written grievance should describe the nature of the grievance, circumstances surrounding the grievance, previous efforts to resolve, and the requested remedial action.” It is requested that the student also inform the Program Director to facilitate communication and transparency as well as discuss interim management strategies (e.g. temporary leave of absence from clinical practicum). Within 10 business days, the Dean will institute formal grievance procedures including appointment of a grievance panel which will evaluate the issue at hand, review relevant considerations, and prepare a report with recommendations to the Dean. Upon conclusion of the grievance panel, the Program Director will collaborate with the student and the Dean regarding how to best implement any recommendations. Students have the right to appear any decisions from the formal grievance process in writing within 10 business days of the written grievance panel decision. Please see Policy 02-30-055 for full details.

See [Article XI of the Graduate Council By-Laws and](#) the Graduate Student Handbook for additional relevant information.

### **Exceptions**

Individual student requests for waiver of a requirement specified by the program guidelines must be approved by two thirds vote of the Voting Faculty (Core or Affiliate) and the Program Director. In the case of requirements specified in the Graduate Council By-Laws, it may also be necessary to obtain approval from the Graduate Council and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.

**CPP ANNUAL STUDENT REVIEW**

**Academic Year: [XXXX-XXXX]**

Instructions to STUDENTS: Please UPDATE this form well BEFORE\* every annual student review and progress report meeting. Please complete your sections (highlighted yellow) and send this form to your mentor. Your mentor will then complete their evaluation (highlighted green). You and your mentor will review this form together and both sign it. Send a signed copy of this form and supplemental documents (your CV, a recent copy of your degree audit\*\*, documentation of research products and DAC/TAC Meetings summaries, if applicable) at least 10-business days prior to the meeting to:

1. The Administrative Coordinator ([clinicalphd@ohsu.edu](mailto:clinicalphd@ohsu.edu)) and also
2. cc: the Program Director

NOTE: Items in **Bolded Red** overlap with the Graduate Student PhD/Master’s Thesis Annual Progress Report Form, please leave these in red and maintain highlighting throughout the document.

**[Yellow highlights]** indicates items that should be reviewed annually, edited by the student below and may require additional detail. Ensure you have completed all relevant sections and keep the **yellow highlight** and **[ ]** symbol around your edited answers. You can search (Control + F) for the [ symbol to facilitate navigation through the document.

**{Green highlight}**: The mentor will complete their evaluation **after** the student has completed the form. You can search (Control + F) for the { symbol to facilitate navigation through the document.

**{Purple}**: DCT/ADCT/ Program director or designee to complete. Clinical practicum supervisor ratings will be compiled by the program and entered into this form after it is received by the mentor and prior to the official annual review day. The program will also update this form to **include documentation of formal faculty votes after the meeting**.

\*NOTE: *this form is a living document that students will need to update as they progress in their program.*

\*\*to generate and download a degree audit, visit the [Student Information System \(SIS\) portal](#).

<https://www.ohsu.edu/education/student-self-service>

Routing: Once complete (post-meeting) and signed by the Program Director, please route to the CPP Administrative Coordinator ([clinicalphd@ohsu.edu](mailto:clinicalphd@ohsu.edu)) and the student. The coordinator will compile the signed forms and send to Graduate Studies at ([somgrad@ohsu.edu](mailto:somgrad@ohsu.edu)) within 5-business days.

Section 1: Student Information

**Meeting Date:** [ ] **Student Name:** [ ]

**Matriculation Year and Term (e.g. Fall 2019):** [ ]

**Mentor(s):** [ ]

**UID:** [ ] **ORCID:** [ ]

**Program:** Clinical Psychology **Degree:** PhD

General questions for the current academic year (please answer yes or no)

General questions for the current academic year	Yes* or No
<b>Academic Probation and/or a Remediation Plan?</b>	[ ]

\*If yes, please include a brief explanation here and attach any supporting documents (remediation plans):

**Proposed Timeline to Graduate:** [ ]

Section 2: Student Progression

From CPP Program Guidelines, Table 2: Milestones, tasks, and required forms to be completed and timelines

<u>Milestone/Subtasks</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Typical/ recommended</u>	<u>Date Completed</u>	<u>Documentation Submitted to CPP* (Y/N)</u>
<b>M1-1st Year project</b>				
<b>M1-A: Mentor assignment form</b>	Y1-winter term day 1	Y1-winter term, day 1	[ ]	[ ]*
M1-B: 1 <sup>st</sup> year project review committee form	Y1-winter term, final day	Y1- winter term	[ ]	[ ]
M1-C: 1st yr. project proposal outline	Y1- winter term, final day	Y1- winter term	[ ]	[ ]
M1-D: 1 <sup>st</sup> yr. project submission	Y1-summer term, final day (Term B)	Y1-spring term	[ ]	[ ]
M1-E: 1st yr. project completion form	Y2- fall term, final day	Y1-summer term	[ ]	[ ]*
<b>M2 Complete Qualifying Exam</b>				
<b>M2-A: QE Committee Request AKA Scientific Advisory Committee or Pre-Dissertation/Thesis Advisory Committee (DAC/TAC)</b>	Y2-winter term, final day	Y2-early winter term	[ ]	[ ]*
M2-B: QE final proposal submit	Y3-fall, first day	Y2-summer, first day	[ ]	[ ]
<b>M2-C: QE defense/completion form</b>	Y3-mid-fall term	Y2-end summer	[ ]	[ ]*
M3: Pass required didactic courses	Y5-end of spring term	Y4-end spring term	[ ]	[ ]
M4: Pass req practica/seminars	Y5-end spring term	Y4-end spring term	[ ]	[ ]
<b>M5 Complete dissertation</b>				

<b>M5-A: Advancement to Candidacy</b>	Y3-winter term, final day	Y3-early in fall term	[ ]	[ ]*
<b>M5-B: Submit DAC request form</b>	Y3-winter term, final day	Y3-early in fall term	[ ]	[ ]*
M5-C: DAC approves proposal	Y3-summer term final day (Term B)	Y3-winter term	[ ]	[ ]
M5-B: Orals request form	Y7-last day spring term	Y4-end of spring term	[ ]	[ ]
<b>M5-C: DAC approves dissertation</b>	Y7-last day of spring term	Y4-end of spring term	[ ]	[ ]*
<b>M6 Complete internship</b>				
M6-A: Internship application request	Y5-summer term (Term B)	Y3 summer/end spring term	[ ]	[ ]
M6-B: Match to internship	Y6-winter term	Y4- winter term	[ ]	[ ]
M7-B: Report from internship director	Y7-summer term	Y5 summer term	[ ]	[ ]
M7: Complete all graduation requirements	Y7-end summer term	Y5 end summer term	[ ]	[ ]

**\*Documentation of this milestone must also be submitted to graduate studies and/or the registrar**

[Degree Requirements: Milestone Details](#), please maintain highlighting below

<i>Items to be evaluated</i>	<b>Annual Review Mentor Determinations</b>	<i>Dates</i>	<b>Approved Milestone</b>
<b>Research, milestones and products</b>			
<i>During their <b>entire time</b> in the CPP program, has the student...</i>			
A. Completed a primary author scientific research product (peer reviewed publication or poster/oral presentation at a conference) that is disseminated at the local, regional or national level that is deemed by the mentor to be of sufficient quality <b>(student needs to attach documentation of product (e.g., conference booklet or PDF of published article). Also, note citation</b>	{Yes or No}	N/A	N/A

<b>for this product here:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
B. Successfully completed the first year project milestone (manuscript preparation)	<input type="checkbox"/> {Yes or No}	N/A	N/A
C. Successfully completed the qualifying exam milestone (grant proposal)	<input type="checkbox"/> {Yes or No}	N/A	N/A
D. Successfully completed the dissertation milestone	<input type="checkbox"/> {Yes or No}	N/A	N/A
<b>Research Items B-D, additional details</b>			
Item B (First Year Project) Details	<b>Details and Narrative [edit below]</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Approved /completed (Yes or No)</b>
<b>First Year Project</b>			
Title/Topic: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Type (empirical or theoretical): <input type="checkbox"/>			
Targeted journal: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Committee Proposed	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Committee Finalized	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Written outline	<input type="checkbox"/> [Provide brief narrative: approved by mentor, submitted, in progress etc...]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Initial Results	<b>***Approve (<input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b> <b>Modification Required <input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b>  [If majority was <b>Modification Required</b> , list reasons in comment section below: ]  Add additional rows if more submission cycles are completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Results	<b>***Approve (<input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b> <b>***Modification Required <input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manuscript completed and submitted to journal (recommended, not required)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item C (QE) Details	<b>Details and Narrative [edit below]</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Approved /completed (Yes or No)</b>
<b>Qualifying Exam (QE)</b>			
Title/Topic: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Targeted agency/ institution: <input type="checkbox"/>			

Committee Proposed	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here, identify chair in bold]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>QE Committee (QEC) Finalized AKA</b> <b>Scientific Advisory Committee or Pre-Dissertation/Thesis Advisory Committee (DAC/TAC)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here, identify chair in bold]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of Previous QEC/Pre-dissertation Meetings (attach summaries):</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> [List all previous meeting dates here]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Written outline	<input type="checkbox"/> [Provide brief update: Approved by committee, submitted, in progress etc...]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oral Presentation and defense date set	<input type="checkbox"/> [Date: ]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
QEC Initial Result	<p><b>***Approve</b> (<input type="checkbox"/> <b>## out of ##</b>)</p> <p><b>***Modification Required</b> (<input type="checkbox"/> <b>## out of ##</b>)</p> <p>[If majority was <b>Modification Required</b>, list reasons in comment section below: ]</p> <p>Add additional rows if more submission cycles are completed</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>QEC Final Result</b>	<p><b>*** Approve</b> (<input type="checkbox"/> <b> out of <input type="checkbox"/></b>)</p> <p><b>Modification Required</b> (<input type="checkbox"/> <b> out of <input type="checkbox"/></b>)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grant proposal completed and submitted to agency (recommended, not required)	[ ]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item D (Dissertation) Details	<b>Details and Narrative [edit below]</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Approved /completed (Yes or No)</b>

<b>Dissertation</b>			
<b>Proposed Title:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>Abstract (background, hypothesis or goal: 200-500 words):</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>Progress (2-3 Sentences):</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
Committee Proposed	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here, identify chair in bold]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Committee Finalized</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> [List names here, identify chair in bold]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of Previous DAC/TAC Meetings (attach summaries):</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> [List all previous meeting dates here]		
Written Dissertation proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> [Provide brief update: Approved by committee, submitted, in progress etc...] If not approved list committee recommendations in comments below	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data Collected	[add notes <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oral Presentation and defense date set	<input type="checkbox"/> [Date set: ] List Oral exam committee (identify chair in <b>bold</b> ): <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Initial Result	<b>***Approve (<input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b> <b>***Modification Required <input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b> If majority was <b>Modification Required</b> , list reasons in comment section below: <input type="checkbox"/>  Add additional rows if more submission cycles are completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dissertation Final Result	<b>***Approve (<input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b> <b>***Modification Required <input type="checkbox"/> [## out of ##]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*\*\*Note total number of reviewers assigning which status (e.g., Approve ([YES] [3 out of 4] Modification Required [NO] [1 out of 4])). For graduate studies: Approve = pass, Modification required = no pass

**Milestone and Research Product Comments:**

**Profession Wide Competency Evaluation**, please maintain highlighting below

*Student will complete items highlighted in Yellow: course grades*

**Mentor evaluation (items in green):** In considering the student's performance across the curriculum, coursework and clinical experiences the mentor has summarized the evidence and evaluated the student's knowledge, competencies and skills relative to the student's level in the program. Mentors will consider the student's level in the program and will evaluate them based upon expectations for their level. **Sections in Green must be completed and verified annually by the mentor after the student has submitted their completed form.**



**Practicum Supervisor evaluation, completed by the DCT/ADCT, marked with { }:** Supervisors rate the trainee's performance in the profession wide competencies listed below, taking into account their developmental level/ year in the program and the amount of time and scope of experiences they have completed in the current practicum placement.

**Practicum and mentor evaluations will be completed with the following scale: The minimum level of achievement is a “3” (meets minimum expectations for level)**

- 1 = Inadequate Performance (Consistently below expectations), remediation plan required
- 2 = Marginal Performance (Meets minimum expectations at times, but not consistently), informal support
- 3 = Good Performance (Consistently meets minimum expectations for a student of their level)
- 4 = Very Good Performance (Exceeds expectations at times)
- 5 = Outstanding Performance (Exceeds expectations consistently)
- NA= Not applicable, no basis for rating (refrain from use unless absolutely needed)

<i>Profession Wide Competencies (PWC)</i>			
<i>Items to be evaluated</i>	<i>Annual Review Mentor Rating</i> 1-5, * If below MLA (3) add comments	<i>End Practicum supervisor rating</i> 1-5, * If below MLA (3) add comments	<i>Required Coursework,</i> list grade, Term and Year <i>Complete **</i>
<i>PWC 1. Research</i>	Mean rating: { } (calculated from elements)	N/A	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #1:</b> Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.</li> <li>• <b>Element #2:</b> Conduct research or other scholarly activities.</li> <li>• <b>Element #3:</b> Critically evaluate and disseminate research or other scholarly activity via professional publication and presentation at the local (including the host institution), regional, or national level.</li> </ul>	<b>Element #1:</b> { } <b>Element #2:</b> { } <b>Element #3:</b> { }	N/A	N/A
<i>PWC 2. Ethical and legal standards</i>	Mean rating: { } (calculated from elements)	Mean rating: { } (calculated from elements)	<b>CPSY 614 Grade:</b>  _  <b>Term and Year:</b>    _
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Element #1: Be knowledgeable of and act in accordance with each of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>the current version of the APA Ethical</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Element #1:</b> { } <b>Element #2:</b> { } <b>Element #3:</b> { }	<b>Element #1:</b> { } <b>Element #2:</b> { }	N/A

<p><i>Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies governing health service psychology at the organizational, local, state, regional, and federal levels; and</i></li> <li>○ <i>Relevant professional standards and guidelines.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Element #2: Recognize ethical dilemmas as they arise, and apply ethical decision-making processes in order to resolve the dilemmas.</i></li> <li>● <i>Element #3: Conduct self in an ethical manner in all professional activities.</i></li> </ul>		<p>{} Element #3: {}</p>	
<p><b>PWC 3. Individual and cultural diversity</b></p>	<p>Mean rating: {} (calculated from elements)</p>	<p>Mean rating: {} (calculated from elements)</p>	<p><b>CPSY 615</b> Grade: {} Term and Year: {}</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Element #1: An understanding of how their own personal/cultural history, attitudes, and biases may affect how they understand and interact with people different from themselves.</i></li> <li>● <i>Element #2: Knowledge of the current theoretical and empirical knowledge base as it relates to addressing diversity in all professional activities including research, training, supervision/consultation, and service.</i></li> <li>● <i>Element #3: The ability to integrate awareness and knowledge of individual and cultural differences in the conduct of professional roles (e.g., research, services, and other professional activities). This includes the ability apply a framework for working effectively with areas of individual and cultural diversity not previously encountered over the course of their careers. Also included is the ability to work effectively with individuals whose group membership, demographic characteristics, or worldviews create conflict with their own.</i></li> <li>● <i>Element #4: Demonstrate the requisite knowledge base, ability to articulate an approach to working effectively with diverse individuals and groups, and apply this approach effectively in their professional duties.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Element #1: {} Element #2: {} Element #3: {} Element #4: {}</p>	<p>Element #1: {} {} Element #2: {} {} Element #3: {} {} Element #4: {} {}</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>PWC 4. Professional values, attitudes, and behaviors</b></p>	<p>Mean rating: {} (calculated from elements)</p>	<p>Mean rating: {} (calculated from elements)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Element #1:</b> Behave in ways that reflect the values and attitudes of psychology, including integrity, deportment, professional identity, accountability, lifelong learning, and concern for the welfare of others</li> </ul>	<p>Element #1: {} Element #2: {} Element #3: {} Element #4: {}</p>	<p>Element #1: {} {} Element #2: {} {} Element #3: {}</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #2:</b> Engage in self-reflection regarding one’s personal and professional functioning; engage in activities to maintain and improve performance, well-being, and professional effectiveness.</li> <li>• <b>Element #3:</b> Actively seek and demonstrate openness and responsiveness to feedback and supervision.</li> <li>• <b>Element #4:</b> Respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence as they progress across levels of training.</li> </ul>		<p>{ }  <b>Element #4:</b>  { }</p>	
<p><i>PWC 5. Communication and interpersonal skills</i></p>	<p>Mean rating: { }  (calculated from elements)</p>	<p>Mean rating: { }  (calculated from elements)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #1:</b> Develop and maintain effective relationships with a wide range of individuals, including colleagues, communities, organizations, supervisors, supervisees, and those receiving professional services.</li> <li>• <b>Element #2:</b> Produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and written communications that are informative and well-integrated; demonstrate a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.</li> <li>• <b>Element #3:</b> Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills and the ability to manage difficult communication well.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Element #1:</b> { }  <b>Element #2:</b> { }  <b>Element #3:</b> { }</p>	<p><b>Element #1:</b>  { }  <b>Element #2:</b>{ }  <b>Element #3:</b>{ }</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>PWC 6. Assessment</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Mean rating: { }  (calculated from elements)</p>	<p><b>CPSY 613</b>  <b>Grade:</b> [ ] [ ]  Term and Year: [ ] [ ]  <b>CPSY 623</b>  <b>Grade:</b> [ ] [ ]  Term and Year: [ ] [ ]</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #1:</b> Demonstrate current knowledge of diagnostic classification systems, functional and dysfunctional behaviors, including consideration of client strengths and psychopathology.</li> <li>• <b>Element #2:</b> Demonstrate understanding of human behavior within its context (e.g., family, social, societal and cultural).</li> <li>• <b>Element #3:</b> Demonstrate the ability to apply the knowledge of functional and dysfunctional behaviors including context to the assessment and/or diagnostic process.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><b>Element #1:</b>  _{ }  <b>Element #2:</b>{ }  <b>Element #3:</b>{ }  <b>Element #4:</b>{ }  <b>Element #5:</b>{ }  <b>Element #6:</b>{ }</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #4:</b> Select and apply assessment methods that draw from the best available empirical literature and that reflect the science of measurement and psychometrics; collect relevant data using multiple sources and methods appropriate to the identified goals and questions of the assessment as well as relevant diversity characteristics of the service recipient.</li> <li>• <b>Element # 5:</b> Interpret assessment results, following current research and professional standards and guidelines, to inform case conceptualization, classification, and recommendations, while guarding against decision-making biases, distinguishing the aspects of assessment that are subjective from those that are objective.</li> <li>• <b>Element #6:</b> Communicate orally and in written documents the findings and implications of the assessment in an accurate and effective manner sensitive to a range of audiences.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>PWC 7. Intervention</i></p>	-	<p>Mean rating: { } { } (calculated from elements)</p>	<p><b>CPSY 621</b> Grade: [ ] [ ] Term and Year: [ ] [ ] <b>CPSY 631</b> Grade: [ ] [ ] Term and Year: [ ] [ ]</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element #1:</b> Establish and maintain effective relationships with the recipients of psychological services.</li> <li>• <b>Element #2:</b> Develop evidence-based intervention plans specific to the service delivery goals.</li> <li>• <b>Element #3:</b> Implement interventions informed by the current scientific literature, assessment findings, diversity characteristics, and contextual variables.</li> <li>• <b>Element #4:</b> Demonstrate the ability to apply the relevant research literature to clinical decision making.</li> <li>• <b>Element #5:</b> Modify and adapt evidence-based approaches effectively when a clear evidence-base is lacking.</li> <li>• <b>Element #6:</b> Evaluate intervention effectiveness, and adapt intervention goals</li> </ul>	N/A	<p><b>Element #1:</b> { } <b>Element #2:</b> { } <b>Element #3:</b> { } <b>Element #4:</b> { } <b>Element #5:</b> { } <b>Element #6:</b> { }</p>	N/A

and methods consistent with ongoing evaluation.			
<i>PWC 8. Supervision</i>	N/A	N/A	CPSY 640 Grade: [ ] [ ] Term and Year: [ ] [ ]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Element #1: Demonstrate knowledge of supervision models.</li> <li>• Element #2: Demonstrate knowledge of supervision practices.</li> </ul>	N/A-	N/A	N/A
PWC 9. Consultation and interprofessional/interdisciplinary skills	Mean rating:: { [ ] } (calculated from elements)	N/A	CPSY 640 Grade: [ ] [ ] Term and Year: [ ] [ ]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Element #1: Demonstrate knowledge and respect for the roles and perspectives of other professions.</li> <li>• Element #2: Demonstrates knowledge of consultation models and practices.</li> </ul>	Element #1: { [ ] } Element #2: { [ ] }	N/A	N/A

\*If below 3 (not meeting standard for level) include comments and informal or formal plan to ensure the student ends up meeting the MLA (e.g., include remediation plan, if developed) by program completion.

\*\*Of note, depending on student level, they may not yet have a grade for some courses. As applicable, IP (In progress) can be listed or “future” should be noted in this table.

\*\*\*Note total number of reviewers assigning which status (e.g., Approve ([YES] [3 out of 4]

Modification Required [NO] [1 out of 4]), For graduate studies: Approve = pass, Modification required = no pass

## COMMENTS:

### Section 3: Research and Academic Productivity

Please list all items in total from your time in the CPP program below and **BOLD** items from the last academic year

Please cite journal articles using The National Library of Medicine (NLM) format and include the PMID. Below is a sample citation:

*Freedman SB, Adler M, Seshadri R, Powell EC. Oral ondansetron for gastroenteritis in a pediatric emergency department. N Engl J Med. 2006 Apr 20;354(16):1698-705. PubMed PMID: 16625009.*

#### 1) Books/ Book Chapters

a. Accepted/Completed : [ ] [ ]

b. Submitted: [ ] [ ]

#### 2) Review Articles

a. Accepted/Completed : [ ] [ ]

b. Submitted : [ ] [ ]

#### 3) Peer Reviewed articles in professional or scientific journals

a. Accepted/Completed : [ ] [ ]

b. Submitted : [ ] [ ]

#### 4) Non-Peer Reviewed

a. Accepted/Completed: [ ] [ ]

b. Submitted: [ ] [ ]

#### 5) Scientific, Career and/or Professional Development Conferences

a. Attended (name, location, date(s) attended) : [ ] [ ]

- b. **Participated as author/coauthor of paper or workshop (name, location, date(s) attended)** note if an award was received :
- c. **Participated as author/coauthor of poster (name, location, date(s) attended)** note if an award was received :
- d. **Anticipated (name, location, anticipated date(s) of attendance) :**

6) Manuscripts in preparation:

7) Short description of other studies for which data collection is in progress; number and list separately (e.g. 1. XXX study: [description]):

8) Grants submitted (list the granting agency, year, and the amount):

9) Fellowships:

10) University or departmental awards received:

#### Section 4: Additional Responsibilities and/or Activities

1) **Scientific Collaborations:**

2) **Teaching/Mentoring Activities:**

3) **Professional/Career Development:**

4) **Additional responsibilities and/or activities (committees, organization, community service, etc.):**

5) Are you a member of a professional or research society? If yes, please list names

#### Section 5: Additional Information

1) **Funding (departmental, grants, fellowships, etc.):**

2) Are you involved in grant-supported research?

3) **Please list any updates and/or special circumstances you wish to make known (if applicable):**

#### Section 6: Additional Coursework, not already described

You do not need to add courses already noted in the PWC section above. Please list additional coursework you have completed or that is in progress below (attach a current copy of your transcript from Degree Works), list IP under grade column if the course is currently in progress. If the course has been taken multiple times please note all the times and grade outcomes (e.g., CPSY 610 “3 credits, Fall 2020 (C-), Fall 2021 (A-)). For courses taken multiple times by design (serial courses, like research credits or practicum) note total number of credits completed and list all terms completed/in progress and the pass/fail outcome (e.g., CPSY 603 Dissertation: “12 credits, Winter 2020 (3 credits, Pass), Spring 2020 (3 credits, Pass), Summer 2020 (3 credits, Pass), Fall 2020 (3 credits, Pass)”)

#### **REQUIRED CPP COURSES**

Course	Title	Total Credit Hours Completed with passing grade	Term, Year (Grade obtained)

IPE 601	Foundations of Patient Safety and Interprofessional Practice	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 601	Psychology Graduate Research	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 603	Psychology Research Dissertation	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 604	Psychology Internship	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 607	Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 609	Psychology Clinical Practicum	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 610	Affect, Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology I	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 611	Psychological Intervention I - Clinical Interview, Ethics and Professional Issues	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 616	Cognitive Neuroscience and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology I	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 620	Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology II – Advanced Issues	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 626	Health, Social, and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology II	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 630	Advanced Measurement	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 632	Psychology Research Seminar: Research Design and Scientific Writing	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 641	Applied Health Statistics I	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 642	Applied Health Statistics II	[ ]	[ ]
CPSY 643	History and Systems of Psychology	[ ]	[ ]

**Additional Coursework**

List any additional courses (including nano course) completed outside of the program.

Course	Title	Total Credit Hours Completed	Term, Year and Grade
[ ]			

--	--	--	--

**Incomplete or Audit Coursework**

List any courses that are incomplete or audited.

Course	Title	Instructor	Credit Hours
<input type="checkbox"/>			

**Section 7: Clinical Training and Internship**

**PRACTICUM SUMMARY:** note all in progress and previously completed placements, add additional rows as needed

Practicum placement	Dates of placement	Site, population, days and hours in clinic	Supervisor name, phone and email	MLA met in all areas on supervisor evaluations (Yes or *No)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\* If no, add comments below

Comments:

**SUMMARY OF CLINICAL HOURS: (APPI format)**

*For Additional Information about Assessment or Intervention Hours Documentation, Please See AAPI materials:*

[https://help.liaisonedu.com/Time2Track\\_Help\\_Center/Trainee/AAPI\\_Psychology\\_Training\\_Experiences/01\\_Quick\\_Start\\_Guide](https://help.liaisonedu.com/Time2Track_Help_Center/Trainee/AAPI_Psychology_Training_Experiences/01_Quick_Start_Guide)

**Assessment:** [https://portal.appicas.org/applicants2012/instruction/ins\\_psya\\_exp.htm](https://portal.appicas.org/applicants2012/instruction/ins_psya_exp.htm)

**Intervention:** [https://portal.appicas.org/applicants2012/instruction/ins\\_exp\\_intervention.htm](https://portal.appicas.org/applicants2012/instruction/ins_exp_intervention.htm)

Please only include direct Face to Face (F2F) hours here for assessment and intervention. Indirect hours such as support and other supplementary hours can be included in the next section

Intervention Hours (F2F)		Assessment hours (F2F)		Supervision hours	
Doctoral hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	Doctoral hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	Doctoral hours	<input type="checkbox"/>



Terminal masters hours	<input type="text"/>	Terminal masters hours	<input type="text"/>	Terminal masters hours	<input type="text"/>
Total completed hours	<input type="text"/>	Total completed hours	<input type="text"/>	Total completed hours	<input type="text"/>

**Total Number of Completed Integrated Reports for Children:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Number of Completed Integrated Reports for Adults:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Anticipated Practicum Experience* for next year (provide information regarding the placement, anticipated dates, supervisor information, clinical hours expected and a brief description of activities):

**If needed**, please complete the following table noting additional Doctoral level hours not included in summary of clinical hours above, such as observation or support hours (e.g., note writing, chart review, preparation):

Types of Hours	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	<input type="text"/> XXXX-XXXX Academic Year	TOTAL
Type 1: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Type 2: <input type="text"/>							
Type 3: <input type="text"/>							
Support							
TOTAL PhD Program hours	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

## INTERNSHIP

When do you plan to apply to internship (year)?

The expectation is for our students to apply to APA or CPA accredited sites. All of our clinical students are expected to complete an accredited APPIC member internship as the capstone of their training prior to granting the doctoral degree.

Internship Application Process Questions	Yes* or No
Are you requesting permission and clinical readiness determination to apply for internship for the next academic year (must be approved each year you apply)?	<input type="text"/>
Have you previously been approved by the CPP faculty to apply for internship?	<input type="text"/>
Have you applied to internship before?	<input type="text"/>
Have you ever reneged on an APPIC internship match agreement (i.e., refused to attend or left an internship program that was obtained through the APPIC Match or Clearinghouse) without prior approval from APPIC and the internship site?	<input type="text"/>

\*If yes, describe your request, situation and/or list outcome (e.g., date faculty approved you to apply for internship, # of sites applied to and # interviews received, note that break down by APA approved internships etc...)

Internship Outcome	Yes* or No
Have you secured (been matched to) an internship, are currently in the process of completing internship?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have you completed an internship?	<input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, complete the following:

Date started or to be started:  Date completed or to be completed:

APA accredited (yes or no):

CPA accredited: (yes or no):

Setting : community mental health centers, health maintenance organizations, medical centers, military medical centers, private general hospitals, general hospitals, VA medical centers, private psychiatric hospitals, state or county hospitals, correctional facilities, school district or system, university counseling centers, medical school, consortium, multiple internship setting.

Site name:

Supervisor(s):

Training Director/ Supervisor Contact (phone/email):

Location (city, state, country):

### Section 8 Approvals and Signatures

#### Faculty Mentor

This form has been prepared by the student and the mentor has reviewed this form and completed the mentor assessment sections.

Student's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty mentor signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CPP Annual Student Progress Report: Faculty Voting Statement
--

After reviewing this completed form in the annual faculty progress meeting, the faculty will formally vote and the results will be recorded here by the program leadership (DCT/ADCT/or designee).

Final Annual Progress Determinations	VOTE: Yes or *No
Does the faculty agree with the faculty mentor's assessment above?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is this student in good standing (making appropriate progress) and achieving MLAs (ratings of 3) in all PWC domains on both mentor and practicum supervisor ratings?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current or Past Concerns	VOTE: *Yes or No
Is this student currently on probation or does the program wish to pursue probation?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are any complaints currently pending against this student, or were any filed in the past and found to be legitimate?	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Internship Readiness Review and Determination to be made today?</b>	<b>{Yes or No}, if Yes complete</b>

	determination section below
<b>Internship Readiness Review and Determination: faculty voting</b>	<b>VOTE: Yes or No*</b>
<b>Criteria met:</b>	
We have ensured that this student has meet the following criteria <i>before applying</i> to internship: (a) successful completion of a first year project, qualifying examination and dissertation proposal; (b) successful completion of a set of organized, sequential practicum experiences spanning across several different settings and resulting in the acquisition of a wide range of assessment and intervention skills as well as an introduction to skills in supervising others; (c) contributing to the science of clinical psychology through publication and/or presentation of empirical research in professional outlets; (d) demonstration of consistent professional and ethical behavior with a diverse group of people across a range of professional settings	{ }
We expect that this student will meet the following criteria <i>before attending internship</i> (e) completion of required academic coursework (excluding dissertation and internship hours)	{ }
<b>Evaluation of student:</b>	
This student possesses the emotional stability and maturity to handle the challenges of graduate training to this point	{ }
This student possesses the theoretical / academic foundation necessary for effective counseling / clinical engagement	{ }
This student possesses the skills necessary for translating theory into integrated practice.	{ }
This student demonstrates awareness of, and practices according to, the current ethical guidelines for psychologists.	{ }
This student demonstrates the capacity to participate in supervision constructively and can modify his / her behavior in response to feedback.	{ }
FINAL FACULTY STATEMENT: Does the faculty agree that the student has obtained the MLA for all PWCs and achieved competency for an advanced practicum level student and that the student is ready to apply for internship with their current skillset?	{ }

\*Explain any No votes in comments

Faculty Voting Comments: { }

**Annual Review Summary:**

Optional notes from the annual review meeting: { }

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, all must be Completed before program completion:**

Cohort year: \_\_\_\_ Year in program \_\_\_\_

Section	Completed/ No Concerns/ MLA met	On Track/ In Progress	Concerns
Section 1 (academic probation, remediation, concerns)			

Section 2 (student milestones progression)			
First year project			
QE			
Dissertation			
Annual PWC ratings by mentor all above MLA			
Practicum supervisor PWC ratings all above MLA			
Completed all required coursework			
Completed all DSKs, all above MLA			
Completed APA/CPA accredited internship			

**Program Director/DCT/ADCT/or designee names:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Director/DCT/ADCT/or designee signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Competency Remediation Plan

**Date of Competency Remediation Plan Meeting:**

**Name of Trainee:**

**Primary Supervisor/Mentor:**

**Names of All Persons Present at the Meeting:**

**All Additional Pertinent Supervisors/Faculty:**

**Date for Follow-up Meeting(s):**

Circle all competency domains in which the trainee's performance does not meet the benchmark:

Foundational Competencies: Professionalism, Reflective Practice/Self-Assessment/Self-care, Scientific Knowledge and Methods, Relationships, Individual and Cultural Diversity, Ethical Legal Standards and Policy, Interdisciplinary Systems

Functional Competencies: Assessment, Intervention, Consultation, Research/evaluation, Supervision, Teaching, Management-Administration, Advocacy

Description of the problem(s) in each competency domain circled above:

Date(s) the problem(s) was brought to the trainee's attention and by whom:

Steps already taken by the trainee to rectify the problem(s) that was identified:

Steps already taken by the supervisor(s)/faculty to address the problem(s):

## Competency Remediation Plan

<u>Competency Domain/ Essential Components</u>	<u>Problem Behavior</u>	<u>Expectations for Acceptable Performance</u>	<u>Trainee's Responsibilities or Actions</u>	<u>Supervisors' or Faculty Responsibilities or Actions</u>	<u>Timeframe for Acceptable Performance</u>	<u>Assessment Methods</u>	<u>Dates of Eval</u>	<u>Consequences for Unsuccessful Remediation</u>

I, \_\_\_\_\_, have reviewed the above competency remediation plan with my primary supervisor/mentor, any additional supervisors/faculty, and the director of training. My signature below indicates that I fully understand the above. I agree/disagree with the above decision (please circle one). My comments, if any, are below (*PLEASE NOTE: If trainee disagrees, comments, including a detailed description of the trainee's rationale for disagreement, are REQUIRED*).

_____	_____	_____	_____
Trainee Name	Date	Program Director	Date

Trainee's comments (Feel free to use additional pages):

All supervisors/ faculty with responsibilities or actions described in the above competency remediation plan agree to participate in the plan as outlined above. Please sign and date below to indicate your agreement with the plan.

Competency Remediation Plan Continued

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF COMPETENCY REMEDIATION PLAN

Follow-up Meeting(s):

Date (s):

In Attendance (\*Table format)

<u>Competency Domain/ Essential Components</u>	<u>Expectations for Acceptable Performance</u>	<u>Outcomes Related to Expected Benchmarks</u> (met, partially met, not met)	<u>Next Steps</u> (e.g., remediation concluded, remediation continued and plan modified, probation or dismissal recommended)	<u>Next Evaluation Date (if needed)</u>

I, \_\_\_\_\_, have reviewed the above summative evaluation of my competency remediation plan with my primary supervisor(s)/faculty, any additional supervisors/faculty, and the director of training. My signature below indicates that I fully understand the above. I agree/disagree with the above outcome assessments and next steps (please circle one). My comments, if any, are below. (PLEASE NOTE: If trainee disagrees with the outcomes and next steps, comments, including a detailed description of the trainee's rationale for disagreement, are REQUIRED).



---

Trainee Date

---

Program Director      Date

Trainee's comments (Feel free to use additional pages):

## OHSU Clinical Psychology Course Descriptions: for Banner SIS

- CPSY 601 - Psychology Graduate Research:** Research in clinical psychology under supervision of individual faculty members. 1 – 9 credits
- CPSY 603 - Psychology Research Dissertation:** Mentored research on dissertation literature review, design, methods, data collection, statistical analysis, and write up. 1 - 9credits
- CPSY 604 - Psychology Internship:** Intensive clinical immersion training, full-time professional experience. 9 credits
- CPSY 607 - Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar :** Group supervision and clinical forum to discuss practice central to clinical care, professional development, and individual differences. Core psychology discipline specific knowledge areas will be infused throughout in foundational and applied ways with respect to clinical activities. 1 credit
- CPSY 609 - Psychology Clinical Practicum:** A supervised practicum in clinical psychology, clinical field training. 1 -9 credits
- CPSY 610 – Affect, Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology I:** Models and theory of affect, psychopathology, history of abnormal psychology, and psychological disorders including the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) and other classification approaches. 3 credits
- CPSY 611 - Psychological Intervention I – Clinical Interview, Ethics and Professional Issues** Topics to be discussed include clinical interviewing, principles of psychotherapy, models of psychotherapy, ethics and methods of evaluating outcomes in clinical contexts. 3 credits
- CPSY 613 - Psychological Assessment I – Adult:** The course examines methods used to assess domains of psychological functions in adults. This includes assessment of cognition, behavior, emotions, and personality, with focus on diagnostic assessment and developmental factors. 3 credits
- CPSY 614 - Ethical and Legal Consideration in Psychology:** Ethical and legal principles in psychology and their application to clinical and research practices. 1 credit
- CPSY 615 - Cultural Considerations and Diversity:** Focuses on the sociocultural contexts and cultural practices that impact and reflect the human experience, with a focus on equity in the practice of psychology with individuals from diverse backgrounds and experiences. 1 credit
- CPSY 616 - Cognitive Neuroscience and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology I:** Integration of neuroscience, biological bases of behavior, and cognitive psychology topics will be covered. 3 credits
- CPSY 620 - Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology II- Advanced Issues:** Complex differential diagnosis, personality, and theory of psychopathology development. 3 credits
- CPSY 621 - Psychological Intervention EBT II- Adult:** This course will cover therapeutic interventions and prepare students to utilize evidence based and empirically supported treatments to identify, implement, and maintain effective interventions with adults. 3 credits
- CPSY 623 - Psychological Assessment II – Child:** Focus on assessment of domains of psychological functions in children, including evaluation of cognition, behavior, emotions, and personality. The course focuses on diagnostic assessment and developmental factors. 3 credits
- CPSY 626 – Health, Social, and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology II:** Understanding how psychological, biological, behavioral, social, developmental, and cultural factors contribute to health and illness.

Social psychology perspectives are applied to health psychology and issues surrounding wellness, pain, illness, and medical care. 3 credits

**CPSY 630 - Advanced Measurement:** Selected advanced topics in quantitative methods in psychology including psychometrics, research methods and design. 3 credits

**CPSY 631 - Psychological Intervention EBT III- Child:** This course focuses on specific evidence-based strategies for child and adolescent disorders. The course will prepare students to utilize empirically based treatments to identify, implement, and maintain effective interventions in children and families. 3 credits

**CPSY 632 - Psychology Research Seminar: Research Design and Scientific Writing:** Applied training related to the design, execution, and analysis of psychology experiments and writing. 1 credit

**CPSY 640 – Supervision and Consultation in Psychology:** Theories and methods regarding the provision of supervision and consultation, including a focus on consultation within interprofessional teams. 1 credit

**CPSY 641- Applied Health Statistics I: Descriptive, Associative and Comparative Statistics** Includes training on research methods and design. The focus is on the application and interpretation of basic statistics. 4 credits

**CPSY 642 - Applied Health Statistics II: Generalized Linear Modeling** Students will develop skills in the performance and interpretation of techniques such as multivariate linear, logistic, gamma and negative binomial regression, and develop an understanding of when particular approaches should be employed. 3 credits

**CPSY 643 History and Systems of Psychology:** Topics including the origins and development of major ideas in the discipline of psychology 1 credit

---

#### Non-CPP University Required Courses

**IPE 601 - Foundations of Patient Safety and Interprofessional Practice:** This 1 credit course is designed for early health care learners from all OHSU schools and programs to introduce them to the importance of best practices for professionalism, roles and responsibilities, teamwork, communication, ethics, and collaborative practice as a means to improve the quality and safety of patient care. 1 credit

***Note: The following degree timeline is an example only. Instructors may change and some courses are only offered every other year, thus students may take the courses in a different order or year in the program from the example below.***

Proposed Program Name: Clinical Psychology PhD		School/Unit: School of Medicine	
Proposed Start Term: Fall			
Fall Quarter Year 1		CPSY	
Title	No.	Faculty	Credits
Psychological Intervention I-Ethics, Foundations and Clinical Interview	CPSY 611	Huckans/O'Neil	3 Graded
Affect, Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology I	CPSY 610	Clark	3 Graded
Foundations of Patient Safety and Interprofessional Practice	IPE 601		1 (P/NP)
Applied Health Statistics I: Descriptive, Associative and Comparative Statistics	CPSY 641	Dieckmann	4 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Fall Y1 = 14</i>			
Winter Quarter Year 1			
Title	No.	Faculty	Credits
Psychological Intervention III- EBT Child	CPSY 631	Duke	3 Graded
Psychological Assessment I – Adult	CPSY 613	Mackiewicz-Seghete/Maron	3 Graded
Applied Health Statistics II: Generalized Linear Modeling	CPSY 642	Dieckmann	3 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
<i>Total credits Winter Y1 =12</i>			
Spring Quarter Year 1			
Title	No.	Faculty	Credits
Psychological Intervention II- EBT Adult	CPSY 621	Kobus	3 Graded
Psychological Assessment II – Child	CPSY 623	Shahabuddin/Stellway Beard	3 Graded
Psychology Research Seminar: Research Design and Scientific writing	CPSY 632	Wilson/Holley	1 Graded
Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology II- Advanced Issues	CPSY 620	Nigg	3 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Spring Y1=13</i>			
Summer Quarter Year 1			
Title	No.	Faculty	Credits
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	9(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Summer Y1=13</i>			
Fall Quarter Year 2			
Title	No.	Faculty	Credits

Advanced Measurement	CPSY 630	Dieckmann	3 Graded
Ethical and Legal Consideration in Psychology	CPSY 614	Walker	1 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Fall Y2 = 11</i>			
<b>Winter Quarter Year 2</b>			
<b>Title</b>		<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Cognitive Neuroscience and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology-I	CPSY 616	Mitchell/Loftis	3 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Winter Y2= 10</i>			
<b>Spring Quarter Year 2</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
Cultural Considerations and Diversity	CPSY 615	Walker	1 Graded
<i>Total Credits Spring Y2 = 11</i>			
<b>Summer Term Year 2</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
History and Systems of Psychology	CPSY 643	Greaves	1 Graded
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Summer Y2 = 11</i>			
<b>Fall Quarter Year 3</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Health, Social, and Advanced Integrative Knowledge in Psychology-II	CPSY 626	Gustaffson/Sullivan	3 Graded
Psychology Graduate Research	CPSY 601	Faculty Mentor	3(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Fall Y3= 10</i>			
<b>Winter Quarter Year 3</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Supervision and Consultation	CPSY 640	Wagner	1 Graded
Psychology Research Dissertation	CPSY 603	Faculty Mentor	4(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)

Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Winter Y3 =9</i>			
<b>Spring Quarter Year 3</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	CPSY 603	Faculty Mentor	5(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar	CPSY 607	Duvall	1(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Spring Y3 = 9</i>			
<b>Summer Term Year 3</b>			
<b>Title.</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	CPSY 603	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Summer Y3 = 9</i>			
<b>Fall Quarter Year 4</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	CPSY 603	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Fall Y4 = 9</i>			
<b>Winter Quarter Year 4</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	CPSY 603	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	CPSY 609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Winter Y4 = 9</i>			
<b>Spring Quarter Year 4</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	603	Faculty Mentor	6(P/NP)
Psychology Clinical Practicum	609	Duvall	3(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Spring Y4 = 9</i>			
<b>Summer Term Year 4</b>			
<b>Title.</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Research Dissertation	603	Faculty Mentor	9(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Summer Y4 = 9</i>			
<b>Fall Quarter Year 5</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Internship	604	Maron	9(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Fall Y5 = 9</i>			
<b>Winter Quarter Year 5</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Internship	604	Maron	9(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Winter Y5 =9</i>			
<b>Spring Quarter Year 5</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Internship	604	Maron	9(P/NP)
<i>Total Credits Spring Y5 = 9</i>			

<b>Summer Term Year 5</b>			
<b>Title</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Credits</b>
Psychology Internship	604	Maron	9(P/NP)

**Minimum TOTALS:**

36 credits Internship (CPSY 604)

33 credits Practicum (CPSY 609, 36 this example)

8 credits practicum seminar (CPSY 607)

27 credits dissertation (CPSY 603, 42 in this example)

27 credits Psychology Graduate Research (CPSY 601, 39 in this example) Note: No “dissertation” credits until the quarter you propose your dissertation)

11 credits statistics (NURS 641, 642, 630 & CPSY 632)

31 credits other psychology courses (CPSY 610, 620, 613, 623, 611, 621, 614, 631, 615, 616, 640, 626 and History and Systems)

1 credit IPE601

**174 credits total**

## OHSU Clinical Psychology Annual Program Review

Dear CPP Students,

Thank you for your continued collaboration as we work together to improve our program! We would appreciate your feedback on the below domains of our program, defined by the American Psychological Association as key competencies for the practice of psychology. We ask that you consider how well you were supported in your growth and development in these areas.

All responses will be fully anonymous. After receiving your evaluations, the Teaching and Learning Center will aggregate the responses and create a report to be sent to our program. Neither the OHSU Teaching and Learning Center nor CPP faculty will be able to identify the identity of a given student.

If you would like the CPP leadership team to respond to you regarding your responses, please send the Director of Clinical Training an e-mail: Leeza Maron, PhD at [maronl@ohsu.edu](mailto:maronl@ohsu.edu).

For the following, please provide ratings where indicated. You are welcome to use N/A as needed. We encourage comments, though they are not required. If you are unsure which domain your comment fits under, feel free to write it under any domain.

Thank you,

Your CPP Leadership Team

### **DEFINITIONS**

**INDIVIDUAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY:** Awareness, sensitivity and skill in working professionally with diverse individuals, groups and communities who represent various cultural and personal background and characteristics defined broadly and consistent with APA policy.

**INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:** Form and maintain productive and respectful relationships with clients, peers/colleagues, supervisors and professionals from other disciplines.

**COMMUNICATION:** Communicate clearly using verbal, nonverbal, and written skills in a professional context; demonstrate clear understanding and use of professional language.

**ETHICS:** Apply ethical concepts and awareness of legal issues regarding professional activities with individuals, groups, and organizations.

**PROFESSIONAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES:** Demonstrate integrity, professional conduct, responsiveness to feedback, show caring, and display accountability.

**REFLECTIVE PRACTICE:** Conduct work with personal and professional self-awareness and reflection; with awareness of competencies; with appropriate self-care.

**SCIENCE:** Understand research, research methodology, techniques of data collection and analysis, biological bases of behavior, cognitive-affective bases of behavior, and development across the lifespan. Respect for scientifically derived knowledge.

**EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AND ASSESSMENT:** Integrate research and clinical expertise in the context of patient factors.



**TEACHING:** Demonstrate knowledge of didactic learning strategies and how to accommodate developmental and individual differences.

RATING SCALE					
Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	NA

**OVERALL PROGRAM**

**Overall Rating:** \_\_\_\_

**Strengths:**

**Growth Areas:**

**How well has the program supported you in your attainment of APA competencies in:**

**INDIVIDUAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**COMMUNICATION:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**ETHICS:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**PROFESSIONAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**REFLECTIVE PRACTICE:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**SCIENCE:** \_\_\_\_

Comments:

**EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AND ASSESSMENT: \_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

**TEACHING: \_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

**RESEARCH MENTORSHIP**

This may include your primary research mentor in addition to other faculty members from whom you have sought research mentorship.

**Overall Rating:**

**Strengths:**

**Growth Areas:**

**COURSEWORK**

Overall rating for coursework should indicate how well the content and structure of the course promoted knowledge growth in that area.

Many of our courses have multiple lecturers. For the following, please provide an overall rating for the course. Please feel free to provide comments about the overall course as well as those regarding specific guest lecturers and lecture topics.

*CPSY 607: Developmental, Social Psychology and Practicum Seminar*

**OVERALL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

*CPSY 610: Affect, Abnormal Psychology & Psychopathology I*

**OVERALL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

*CPSY 611: Psychological Intervention I - Clinical Interview, Ethics and Professional Issues*

**OVERALL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

CPSY 613: Psychological Assessment I - Adult

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 620: Abnormal Psychology and Psychopathology II – Advanced Issues

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 621: Psychological Intervention EBT II - Adult

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 623: Psychological Assessment II - Child

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 631: Psychological Intervention EBT III- Child

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 641: Applied Health Statistics I

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

CPSY 642: Applied Health Statistics II

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

**PRACTICUM: CPP PROGRAM (i.e. coordination and support from CPP and the practicum committee)**

For the following, please provide an overall rating for the practicum program. More detailed evaluations about your specific site and clinical supervisor will be conducted separately.

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: