

**COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM IAAP BOARD MEMBERS  
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF THE INTERNATIONAL DECLARATION  
ON CORE COMPETENCES IN PSYCHOLOGY  
DATED “JUNE 2015”**

**Comments from José Maria Peiró**

Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, Preamble: I CONSIDER THAT THE EMPHASIS PUT ON THE COMPETENCES AS THE SOURCE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY IS UNDERVALUING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS AND THE IDENTITY OF PSYCHOLOGY AS AN INTEGRATION OF SCIENCE AND PROFESSION.

Page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

- IMPORTANT TO CLARIFY IF THE DOCUMENT REFERS TO COMPETENCES OR COMPETENCIES.
- IN MY VIEW, THE CONCEPT OF COMPETENCE ENCOMPASSES THE CONCEPT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS. THUS, IT IS NOT VERY COHERENT TO INCLUDE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS AS A DOMAIN OF COMPETENCES.

Page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

- THE FUNCTIONS OF THIS COMPETENCES MODEL ARE NOT CLEAR... NEITHER IS THE RELATION BETWEEN THIS INTERNATIONAL MODEL AND THE REGIONAL OR THE NATIONAL ONES. IS IT INTENDED THAT THIS MODEL SHOULD JUST BE ADAPTED TO FIT THE LOCAL CONTEXT? IS ADAPTATION ENOUGH?
- THE FUNCTIONS OF THIS COMPETENCES MODEL SHOULD BE BETTER ELABORATED. THEY ARE PARTLY MENTIONED HERE BUT NOT DESCRIBED IN A SYSTEMATIC WAY. IN MY VIEW, AS THIS IS A CORE MODEL, NOT ALL THE RELEVANT COMPETENCES FOR CONTEXTUALIZED PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE ARE CONSIDERED. SO THIS MODEL SHOULD NOT ONLY BE ADAPTED FOR WORKING IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS; IT SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND COMPLEMENTED WITH OTHER RELEVANT COMPETENCES IN DIFFERENT REGIONS AND COUNTRIES.

Page 6, CORE COMPETENCE MODEL: THIS LOOKS MORE LIKE A CATALOGUE... MAYBE THE WHOLE RATIONALE AND MENTAL MODEL BEHIND THIS LIST SHOULD BE ELABORATED AND FORMULATED

Page 6, KN1: The word “EVIDENCE” should be added.

Page 6, KN1: COMPETENCE is used as the referent for the knowledge, skills etc. Its meaning is not clear. Does it refer to each of the competences listed below? Does it refer to competent practice in general? Is it intended to refer to competencies in plural? Clarification is needed.

Page 6, SK2: "area of psychological practice" is a concept that should be defined... (not included in the Glossary)

Page 6, PE1: « relevant » or « appropriate »?

Page 6, PE2: not very specific... In some cases, laws are not aligned with ethical principles???

Page 6, AP: ENABLING

Page 6, AP1: the concept of best practice without any contextualization may be really problematic.

Page 7, AP6: too much broad and ambiguous.

Page 7, ER1: CLIENTS ARE NOT THE ONLY A RELEVANT GROUP OF STAKEHOLDERS. IN SOME CASES, CLIENTS ARE NOT THE USERS, OR THE RELEVANT AUDIENCES. A MORE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF STAKEHOLDERS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. "RELEVANT OTHERS" IS TOO AMBIGUOUS.

Page 7, WD1: just understanding? Is this enough?

Page 7, WD4: That all? And so what?

Page 7, WD6: Too generic, maybe there are forms of diversity that should not be included when working....

Page 8, PA1: THE MEANING OF THESE TWO TERMS SHOULD BE CLARIFIED. IS EVALUATION REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVENTION OUTPUTS, OR OUTCOMES?

Page 10, FONDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE:

- IS KNOWLEDGE ON SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE (BE IT EXPERIMENTAL, EMPIRICAL, ETC.) INCLUDED?
- Psychology in general is rather a blurry concept.

Page 10, SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE: the definition refers especially to specialized applied or professional knowledge it does not suit well for basic disciplinary specialities.

Page 10, BASIC SKILLS: Again, the concept of psychology in general is not very clear nor helpful.

Page 10, CLIENT: differentiate from user, audience and other stakeholders

Page 10, COMPETENCES: probably is more appropriate to use and define "competencies" than "competences".

Page 11, CONTINUING EDUCATION:

- Wouldn't it be better to use and define "continuous professional development" instead of "continuing education"?
- all "adults or "professionals", given what follows in the definition.

Page 11, EVALUATION: nothing is said about evaluation of the psychologists' intervention...

Page 11, INTERVENTION (last word): change "changed" for "improved"?

Page 12, PSYCHOLOGIST: just "well-being"! What about competent behaviors, and other relevant outputs?

Page 12, PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION (end of definition): any kind of change?

Page 13, RESEARCH: not only knowledge; development of tools, techniques and so on is also a goal of research.

### **Comments from Marie-Hélène Pelletier**

Hello Janel and Milt,

Thank you for the continued work on this important project and the more than reasonable time frame provided for review. I have read the full document. It is my opinion that this version has benefited from the last round of feedback and is even better. I do not have suggested changes for this version. I find that it covers the right areas in the right ways.

Thank you,

Marie-Helène

**Comments from David Dozois**

Hi Janel:

I think that the document looks good. In my opinion, its utility kind of depends on the end purpose. However, I think that for setting up minimal international aspirational standards, this is nice work.

I did find some things vague, tautological or ill-defined. For example, how are “has the necessary specialized skills” or “applied relevant ethics codes” or “demonstrates cultural competence” operationalized?

Below are a couple of additional examples where I don't believe that competencies are really defined at all:

PA	Conducts psychological assessments and evaluations	PA1	Identifies assessment or evaluation needs in individuals, groups, organizations or situations
PI	Conducts psychological interventions	PI1	Plans and carries out psychological interventions, with individuals, groups or organizations.

How is conducting these a demonstration of competence?

It would be nice to see promotion of more details re evidence-based practice.

I hope that it is helpful.

David

**Comments Fanny Cheung**

Dear Janel,

I am happy with the Second Draft of The International Declaration on Core Competences in Psychology with just two proposed additions:

Under PA: Conduct Psychological Assessments and Evaluations

- In addition to the existing statement in PA2 “Selects, designs or develops assessments or evaluations, using methods appropriate for the goals and purposes of the activity”, add “as well as appropriate for the language and cultural context” at the end of that statement.
- For PA3 “Conducts assessments or evaluations, including delivery, scoring, interpretation, feedback and application of results”, add “taking into account the appropriate norms for the persons being assessed and research on the cross-cultural applications of the methods”.

The proposed additions may be edited as appropriate.

Best,

Fanny

### **Comments from Paul J. Hartung**

Dear Prof./Dr. Janel Gauthier,

I have reviewed the document. Please consider my few comments:

- They document is well-written and clear in its content.
- The preamble offers a well-articulated rationale for and aims of the document.
- The competences seem reasonable and appropriately inclusive and general enough to promote wide adherence and guidelines across psychological specialty areas of practice as well as across nations.
- One minor, yet nonetheless significant detail, I expect the word “Competences” was used deliberately instead of the more often used and familiar “Competencies.”
- The glossary provides a useful resource for definitions of key concepts.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the document and offer my few comments.

Respectfully yours,

Paul Hartung

### **Comments from James Kagaari**

Dear President Prof. Janel Gauthier

I trust you are all well. Please, find attached a third IPCP report on psychology competences. I would indulge on further debates on "Competences" and "competencies" but to acknowledge the universality of "competences".

The comments are not conclusive, they could be accepted, modified or rejected.

Best regards,

James Kagaari

#### **COMMENTS:**

Page 6, PE2: To replace “relevant laws and rules” with “statutory and non-statutory laws”.

Page 6, AP1: To replace “best” with “good”.

Page 6, AP2: To rephrase AP2 as “Provides services to clients competently.”

Page 6, AP3: to rephrase AP3 as “Operates competently within the boundaries of one’s own profession”.

Page 7, WD2: To rephrase WD2 as “Demonstrates a competence of cultural sensitivity”.

### **Comments from Luminita Patras**

Dear Janel,

Thank you for the remainder on commenting on second draft of the declaration. I have not responded on the first call as I found the document very well build, with a clear structure and consistent with its´ objectives.

I am also part of the reference group of the document and I specified there that the document has improved a lot from a version to another and now has a much better consistency and is much clear. I appreciate the clear structure, with the concepts being defined and creating a common ground of understanding. It is broad enough and as specific at it can be, in order to encompass the diversity we are dealing with in psychology.

I only have two observations or doubts:

- In the glossary, on page 10, when defining the basic skills, it is written "Specialized skills are domain-general and refer to psychology in general..." I understand that correct is "Basic skills are domain-general..."
- Why is mentoring defined on page 12 in the glossary, considering that the concept does not appear anywhere before in the document?

Thank you.

My best wishes,  
Luminita

### **Comments from Urte Scholz**

Dear Janel, dear Milton,

First of all please accept my apologies for not responding to your email from August 20, Janel. And thank you for sending the reminder allowing us to still comment on the second draft of the International Declaration on Core Competences in Psychology. I carefully read the document and would like to congratulate everyone involved in this project. I fully endorse this version.

Best wishes,  
Urte

### **Comments from Marino Bonaiuto**

Dear Janel,

I am sorry for my late reply: you can find your original pdf file attached here, where I added 15 small comments to report my suggestions and proposals (using the yellow comment function available in the pdf software).

I hope they can help to improve the doc.

Marino

#### **COMMENTS:**

Page 4, paragraph 1, Preamble: MOVE "travel" BEFORE "communicate"

Page 7, WD1: A COMMA NEEDS TO BE ADDED AFTER "political"  
Page 7, WD3: WD3 ALMOST THE SAME OF WD6  
Page 7, WD4: WD4 ALMOST THE SAME OF SR3  
Page 7, WD6: WD6 ALMOST THE SAME OF WD3  
Page 8, SR3: SR3 ALMOST THE SAME OF WD4  
Page 8, PA1: PA1 ALMOST THE SAME OF PI1  
Page 8, PA1: I WOULD REWRITE PA1 ADDING "communities" AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE (GIVEN ALSO THE DEFINITION OF "CLIENT")  
Page 9, PI1: PI1 ALMOST THE SAME OF PA1  
Page 9, PI1: I WOULD REWRITE PI1 ADDING AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE ALSO "situations, communities" (GIVEN ALSO THE "CLIENT" DEFINITION).  
Page 10, Competences: SHOULDN'T WE ADD "attitudes" HERE?  
Page 11, Culture: I DO NOT AGREEE HERE: I WOULD RATHER REWRITE SOMETHING LIKE "both tangible and intangible elements are important".  
Page 11, Diversity: I WOULD ADD "communities"  
Page 12, Psychologist: I WOULD ADD "organizations".  
Page 13, Stakeholder: I WOULD ADD "community".

### **Comments from Maria Regina Maluf**

Dear Janel, Dear Milton:

I've just read the Draft of the International Declaration so I'd like to express my agreement about it. I am happy about it. There is nothing in it I'd propose to change.

I am planning to attend the ICP2016 as well as our IAAP meeting.

Please count on me for anything I could help.

Maria Regina

\* \* \*