

## Minutes of EuroPsy (S)NAC Chairs meeting March 4, 2016

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/wc8jow9ue6z6f1l/AAB0ozuh-EaqOd0GRB\\_rPnoya?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/wc8jow9ue6z6f1l/AAB0ozuh-EaqOd0GRB_rPnoya?dl=0)

### Attending from member associations

Belgium: Gregory Collet

Czech Republic: Michal Walter

Czech Republic: Lenka Šulová

Croatia: Ivanka Živčić Bećirević

Cyprus: Anthi Loutsiou

Estonia: Merle Parmak

Finland: Juha Holma

Finland: Teemu Ollikainen

Finland: Saija Mauno

France: Francine Corman

Italy: Cristiano Violani

Italy: Alessandro de Carlo

Lithuania: Goda Kaniušonytė

Netherlands: Helen Bakker

Netherlands: Paulyne Berding-Oldersma

Norway: Per A Straumsheim

Norway: Camilla Hanneli Batalden

Portugal: Teresa Espassandim

Russia: Aleksander Veraksa

Slovenia: Anja Podlesek

Slovenia: Gregor Žvelc

Spain: José Ramos

Turkey: Pinar Özbek

United Kingdom: Mark Forshaw

### Attending from EAC, S\_EAC Psychotherapy, SEAC Work & Organisational Psychology and EFPA

EAC: Ingrid Lunt, Ype Poortinga, Vlasta Zabukovec, Rosaleen McElvaney, Salvatore Zappala

EFPA: Eleni Karayianni, Telmo Mourinho Baptista, Ivana Marinovic, Valerie Boni

#### 1. Welcome, introductions and confirmation of the agenda

Ingrid Lunt (IL) opened the meeting, and welcomed participants. Before starting the meeting she acknowledged the enormous contribution of Robert Roe, Past President of EFPA, both to EFPA and to the development of the *EuroPsy*, and to psychology in Europe more widely. She requested the meeting to be quiet for a short while to remember Robert who had passed away in late February.

Telmo Mourinho Baptista (TMB), President of EFPA said a few words in support of *EuroPsy* and described how the development of *EuroPsy* had assisted psychology in Portugal at a critical time when the government was attempting to reduce the standards for psychology in Portugal.

The current membership of the EAC and S-EACs was presented.

## **2. State of Affairs EuroPsy**

IL gave an overview of the current state of affairs of *EuroPsy*. NACs have now been approved in 21 countries. Portugal was welcomed as the latest NAC approved. A further 6 countries are expected to submit applications within the near future. S-NACs have been approved in Psychotherapy in three countries, with a further 5 expected; three have been approved in Work and Organizational Psychology with a further one expected. A total of 5542 Basic certificates have been awarded, with 2983 specialist certificates awarded in psychotherapy and 12 specialist certificates awarded in work and organizational psychology. Questions were raised about marketing and the need for a central core marketing message to be agreed so that NACs can draw on this in developing their own local strategies.

## **3. Issues arising from the Annual reports**

IL introduced the discussion by saying that the EAC had welcomed the reports and discussed them individually the previous day. There were a number of general issues in the reports which would be helpful to discuss. The following issues were discussed:

### **3.1 CPD and revalidation**

IL reminded colleagues that it was important that every NAC introduce arrangements for CPD, since the date for revalidation of the early *EuroPsy* holders would be 2017 (a 7 year period after *EuroPsy* award). However this was not the only reason, since CPD was good practice for all psychologists and ensured maintenance of current competence. There was some concern expressed about the level of CPD required for EFPA certification and revalidation and how this could be a deterrent to current holders of the certificate. IL emphasised the need for flexibility in implementing CPD procedures, the importance of NACs having it on the agenda and encouraging CPD as good practice for all psychologists. IL informed the meeting that the issue of how far CPD should be associated with Basic *EuroPsy* or how far with Specialist competences will be addressed in written form by the EAC and recommendations shared with NACs.

### **3.2 Transitional arrangements**

A number of countries had requested an extension to the end date for the period of transitional arrangements. IL clarified that EAC appreciated the needs of different countries for extensions. She noted that the EAC would look favourably on requests for extensions, provided that the request includes the rationale for seeking the extension and a plan for when the extension period should end. A number of reasons have been given for requests for extension. These include: the time taken to implement *EuroPsy* procedures had taken longer than expected; the attempt to maximise numbers of psychologists applying for *EuroPsy* had meant that NACs required more time to publicise and disseminate the information. (S)NAC Chairs were reminded that the launch of the specialist certificate allows

the NAC to extend the transitional arrangement period for the Basic certificate. There was a query as to whether it was possible to re-open transitional arrangements following a marketing campaign; the meeting was advised that it would be better to seek an extension rather than close the transitional period and seek to re-open it. Some ideas for marketing were shared – inviting administrators from EU or government to attend local events. Feedback from a survey conducted in Turkey as to why people were not applying was presented.

### **3.3 Recognition of university programmes**

IL clarified that the role of NACs is not to accredit university programmes. Rather, NACs are requested to give information in the annual report about the programmes in their country which the NAC recognises as meeting the *EuroPsy* standard. Most countries have a formal national system for recognition of programmes, and NACs should be aware of this, and the extent to which there may be a correspondence with the *EuroPsy* standard. There is no intention for *EuroPsy* to replace national systems. However, it is necessary for the NACs/S-NACs to check which programmes meet the *EuroPsy* criteria. It was noted that in some countries, programmes have been developed/adapted to meet the *EuroPsy* criteria. It was suggested that EFPA might engage with other organisations that accredit programmes (e.g. APA, ISPA) to establish how far their accreditation process would fulfill the *EuroPsy* criteria, and whether any form of co-operation is appropriate.

### **3.4 Fields of practice**

There are three fields of practice recognised in the *EuroPsy* certificate and Register: clinical and health; work and organisational psychology; and educational psychology. However, a number of countries have additional fields in which psychologists practise, and which individual psychologists would like to have recognised on the *EuroPsy* Register, e.g. traffic psychology, sports psychology, community psychology. This issue had been discussed at the 2015 General Assembly which had voted to retain the three fields and not extend the number of fields. This is a challenge for *EuroPsy*: a number of individual psychologists who practise outside the three traditional fields wish to have their field of practice acknowledged on the *EuroPsy* Register; this is currently not possible. EAC has agreed to write a paper on this and ask EFPA EC how best to progress this. In discussion it was suggested that Member Associations may wish to be more strategic in supporting their members, sharing concerns at S/NAC Chairs meetings, the EFPA Presidents Council, and then the 2017 General Assembly. Discussion as to potential criteria for recognition of additional fields took place: a recognised research base/ training programme/recognised competencies (e.g. MA programme). It was noted that the field of practice needs to be distinctive from other fields of practice, and that this should inform future decisions.

### **3.5 Training of supervisors**

It was noted that this continues to be a challenge for many countries, and that it is important that EFPA finds ways to share good practice. The topic was discussed later in the meeting

### 3.6 Value of *EuroPsy*

The value of the *EuroPsy* was discussed. In addition to the value that it may have for individual psychologists who are holders of the *EuroPsy* Certificate, it has an important value in terms of setting a European standard and setting expectations, for example in supervised practice, ethical commitment, continuing professional development; improving quality; value for organisations. It may also help to promote greater European integration and understanding. The goal continues to be that *EuroPsy* may help to enhance mobility, and be linked to initiatives by EU and wider European level. EFPA continues to monitor EU directives and other initiatives such as European platforms and EuroPass etc , and further developments of Bologna. An important guiding principle of EU and the European project is that of facilitating mobility (though we need to remember the issue of quality and protection of clients). The focus of the marketing strategy currently may be on the value of *EuroPsy* for individual psychologists, which is captured in its marketing strategy; 'working at European level' – psychologists are committed not just at a national level but also at European level. IL noted that as a body of psychologists, we can contribute to European solutions if we are united as a body, emphasising our 'Europeanness'. Thus, *EuroPsy* has a value for individuals, for the profession, for EU, and for wider society. For many it may not have individual value so much as value at another level, for example providing a network for psychologists; being part of a bigger network (e.g. facebook page). It was clarified that having the *EuroPsy* does not provide a ticket to work in other countries though it may facilitate this process. TMB gave an example of having to use an external body 'Solve it' to resolve an issue of the mobility of a psychologist: *EuroPsy* might serve such a function in the future. Several examples of how the *EuroPsy* has helped to improve the quality of education in individual countries were noted. This is important information to share in order help NACs promote the *EuroPsy* both at national and European levels.

### 3.7 Fees

Following a request at the (S)NAC Chairs meeting of 2015, a document was circulated outlining the level of fees in a number of EFPA countries. Ivana is still awaiting data from other countries.

### 3.8 NAC websites

All S/NAC chairs were asked to ensure that NAC websites are kept up to date.

### 3.9 Use of Facebook

It was noted from the Annual Reports that some countries are using this method of communication. S/NAC chairs were encouraged to consider this as a means of promoting the *EuroPsy* and communicating progress. This was also discussed as a positive feature of *EuroPsy* as a means of connecting individual psychologists.

#### **4. CPD – Mark Forshaw**

Mark Forshaw (MF) from UK gave a presentation on how the BPS has developed a CPD system for its members. It was noted that there is a consensus among all professionals that it is important to update knowledge in order to maintain competence; the issue is how to do this.

Discussion ensued. Suggestions were shared as to how to encourage members – offering free workshops that attract CPD recognition to start people off; service providers can be encouraged to apply to professional bodies for recognition of CPD events; employers can require members to attend a certain number of events; MAs can give competitive rates to members over non-members. MF emphasised that the BPS experience showed that it is straightforward to develop procedures for individual psychologists to record their CPD, and that it was important for this recording to be on-going and to include reflection and evidence of learning as well as participation in CPD events.

#### **5. Supervised practice**

IL noted that EPFA embraces a competency-based model of supervised practice. Many NAC reports referred to the challenge of developing a framework of supervised practice. The importance of S/NAC chairs sharing their experiences was noted. The following suggestions were offered:

1. *EuroPsy* could promote training of supervisors as part of members' CPD.
2. The need to work towards a system of supervisor training in each country.
3. Making materials available online.
4. Other models of developing training capacity could be used. The example of the development of supervision capacity in Spain was cited, that is, by training students and supervisors in the EFPA competency model. Materials are available in different countries. One initiative could be a small working group examining materials and developing recommendations for making them available more widely. The use of technology to support learning was highlighted - training for supervisors that could be accessed online. The model used in the joint project between Norway and Slovenia which involved a cascade model, by training supervisors with view to them training others was used as an example.

#### **6. Re-approval of S/NACs**

It was noted that the re-approval process provides an opportunity for S/NACs to reflect on developments in their country and to re-examine the standards and how far they have been

met. In the case of countries where standards have still not been met, applications need to reflect on this and the reasons, and present plans to address this, and how the EAC might assist S/NACs with this.

## **7. Break-out session: Workshop 'How to start a NAC- step by step'**

Some delegates left the general meeting to attend this event.

## **8. S-EAC Work and Organisational Psychology**

Salvatore Zappala outlined the progress made to date on developing the Specialist Certificate in Work and Organisational Psychology. A query was raised about applying for different S-NACs in countries with limited resources. It was clarified that some countries use one committee that represents both basic and specialist certificates; as work expands, it may be important to develop distinct committees. Integrated committees can facilitate integrated systems; ensuring that arrangements for basic are aligned with arrangements for specialist certificates. It was noted that if there is any change to membership of S/NACs, EAC must be informed and the changes approved by the EAC. It was noted that in Norway, while a lot of work focused in the first 1-2 years on processing applications, the process is now more streamlined and the MA can now focus on the S-NAC W & O. It was noted that having experts in the field helps with decision making on competences.

## **9. S-EAC Psychotherapy**

Rosaleen McElvaney outlined the progress made to date on developing the Specialist Certificate in Psychotherapy. Some suggestions were raised as to how to promote the specialist certificate; a Facebook page outlining what distinguishes our practice in psychotherapy from our non-psychology colleagues. It was clarified that in countries where national regulations already exist for the specialism of psychotherapy, and national requirements align with EFPA requirements, it is possible to use a 'shortened form' of the application form. One such form was developed by the Finnish S-NAC. Some delegates noted that energy was being focused on developing NAC before considering S-NACs. It was clarified that it may be a more efficient use of resources to set up these committees in parallel – drawing on those with expertise in specialist areas in addition to those who would adjudicate on the Basic certificates, but ensuring that applicants would not be disadvantaged and getting the right balance between academics and practitioners.

## **10. Other issues**

(i) A query was raised as to the distinction between health and clinical psychologists. This distinction varies from country to country. In the UK, these specialisms are legally separate and protected. However, BPS takes the view that the emphasis should be more on individual competencies than on job titles: if you have the certified competency to perform the job, you should be able to work in this area. It was noted that in Slovenia, someone can get a *EuroPsy* with a year of supervised practice in the field of clinical psychology although it is a 4 year specialism in Slovenia. It is important to be clear about the distinction between 'field of practice' and 'specialisation'. In some countries basic training is for 'psychologist', while in other countries basic training is already differentiated as 'clinical psychologist'. It emphasised

that different models of training operate in different countries and that clinical field of practice does not equate to specialism of clinical psychology. In developing the *EuroPsy*, a compromise was reached on a basic framework with the three fields of practice and a specialist framework with the two specialisms of psychotherapy and work and organisational psychology.

(ii) A query was raised as to whether there is a wide interest in developing a specialism in educational psychology. This will be discussed, and, if appropriate, a proposal developed. The example of the collaboration with EAWOP to develop the Specialist Certificate in Work and Organisational Psychology was mentioned.

(iii) It was clarified that a NAC cannot apply higher standards in issuing the *EuroPsy* than those of EFPA. A NAC cannot exclude applicants who are eligible according to EFPA but not national criteria. It was clarified that this pertains to the *EuroPsy* certification process and does not refer to a national licence to practice.

(iv) A query was raised as to who deals with complaints about a psychologist who obtained a *EuroPsy* in one country but practises in another. It was clarified that complaints should go to the country of practice as this is where the infringement is alleged to have taken place. If the psychologist is not a member of the national association, this can be difficult to address. It was clarified that the *EuroPsy* regulations require holders of the certificate to be bound by the ethics code in the country of practice.

In closing, IL thanked the S/NACs chairs for their attendance and rich discussion of progress and challenges in each country. She emphasised the importance of MAs sharing their experiences both with each other and with the EAC. The EAC liaison members will be writing to each S/NAC in response to their annual report. She encouraged members in particular to consider setting up a Facebook page in their country for the *EuroPsy* and setting up a CPD system in each country.

IL thanked the EFPA Office staff for their excellent support.

Notes prepared by Rosaleen McElvaney

Pictures are available and can be downloaded [here](#).



All pictures taken at the meeting can be found [here](#).