

**Report on the Content Analysis of Comments
by The Association for Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) Members
on the Proposed Certification Mark of Certified Mental Performance Consultant
(CMPC)**

Prepared for

**The AASP Certification Council
The AASP Interim Certification Council**

Prepared by

**Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt, Ph.D.
Justin Jones, M.S. Candidate
Quinn Pearson, M.S. Candidate
Austin Rettke, M.S. Candidate
John Schroeder, M.S. Candidate**

**Industrial-Organizational Psychology Graduate Program
Western Kentucky University**

September 15, 2017

**Report on the Content Analysis of Comments
by The Association for Applied Sport Psychology Members
on the Proposed Certification Mark of Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC)**

This report details the methodology and results of a content analysis of comments made by members of The Association for Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) about the proposed new certification mark of Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC).

Background

In July 2017, the AASP Interim Certification Council (ICC) sent an email to all AASP members indicating that the current certification mark of Certified Consultant – AASP (CC-AASP) would expire October 1, 2017 with the launch of the new certification program and would be replaced by a new certification mark, Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC; see Appendix A). There was some “pushback” from the AASP membership about the new CMPC certification mark. Although the AASP Interim Certification Council (ICC) and the AASP Certification Council (CC) are empowered to make an autonomous decision about the certification mark, the ICC and CC thought it would be informative to collect comments from AASP members regarding the proposed CMPC mark. Accordingly, on August 23, 2017, the ICC sent an email to the membership explaining the process by which they arrived at the CMPC mark (see Appendix B). On August 24, the ICC and CC emailed a Call for Comments on the CMPC Mark to the membership (see Appendix C), with a hard deadline for receiving comments of Close of Business (i.e., 5:00 EDT) Thursday, September 7, 2017. This provided a full two weeks for AASP members to send comments.

Procedure

The Call for Comments instructed AASP members to email comments to Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt and to indicate whether each comment they sent was either PRO or CON regarding the CMPC mark. AASP members were asked to indicate if they were currently a Certified Consultant-AASP, licensed, and their specialty area. Four Industrial-Organizational graduate students at Western Kentucky University served as research assistants (RAs). The following steps were completed to conduct the content analysis of the comments.

Step 1: Extracting Comments and Building Preliminary Excel File

1. Dr. Shoenfelt converted each email to a text file and provided a copy of the email to the RAs.
2. An RA extracted the comments listed in each email by copying the exact wording and pasting it into an Excel file. To the extent possible, only one issue was included in each “comment statement” that was extracted from the email. However, a number of comments include more than one issue combined into a single comment statement. The exact wording provided in the email was retained when RAs copied each comment into the Excel file.
 - a. The RA also entered the demographic information into the record for each comment provided by an individual. The RA then checked the AASP membership list to confirm whether the respondent is an AASP member and entered membership status into the Excel file.

- b. A second RA independently verified that all comments from each email had been correctly entered into the Excel File.
- c. A total of 306 comments were extracted from emails from 70 AASP members (including two non-members) and a single letter from 11 AASP Past Presidents (17 of the total 306 comments were extracted from the Past President's letter). Note that the 11 Past Presidents' comments are integrated into the rest of the comments; should an ICC or CC member wish to see these comments separated, they may refer to the August 4, 2017 letter from these 11 Past Presidents that was distributed to the ICC and CC.

Step 2: Categorizing Comments

1. Dr. Shoenfelt reviewed the comments and identified ten themes that would become the categories for a Q-Sort on the comments. These categories are identified and defined in Table 1 below. Note that the final category is labeled "Other" and includes comments that are NOT related to the CMPC mark.
2. The RAs had previous experience conducting a Q-sort in another context (i.e., categorizing comments from a university satisfaction survey). Dr. Shoenfelt met with the RAs and explained the definition of each of the ten categories, provided examples of which comments should be sorted into each category, and answered questions from the RAs on the process.
3. Each RA independently (in separate copies of the Excel file) assigned one of the ten categories to each of the 306 comments.
4. The four sets of RA categorizations were combined into a single Excel file. A consensus category was assigned to each comment for which three or more RAs agreed on the category (~80% of the comments met this criterion). Dr. Shoenfelt made the final categorization for any comment that did not meet the 3-RA agreement criterion.

Step 3. Creating a Final Excel File with the Comments Categorized

1. The combined Excel file (from Step 2.4) was sorted by category as the first level. The second level of sorting was PRO or CON for each comment. This resulted in all comments about a given theme/category being grouped together and, within category, PRO comments and CON Comments were clustered together.
2. A Final Excel file was created with a separate Sheet/Tab for each category of comments. This Excel file, labeled "CMPC Comments Sorted by Category Sept 15 2017," accompanies this report.
 - a. Whether PRO or CON comments were presented first for a category was alternated across the ten categories to balance the presentation of favorable and unfavorable comments.
 - b. The first Sheet/Tab of the Final Excel file contains the codes for the demographic items included with each comment.
 - c. The Final Excel file readily enables a count of the comments in each issue category. These counts are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of Comments per Comment Category

Category	Pros	Cons	Total Comments
Term “Certified” – comments related to the term “Certified” in the new (CMPC) or old mark (CC-AASP)	2	4	6
Term “Mental Performance” - comments specifically related to the term “Mental,” “Performance,” or “Mental Performance” in the new mark; includes comments indicating that Mental Performance does/does not describe or capture what I/we do	25	29	54
Term “Consultant” - comments specifically related to the term “Consultant” in the new or old mark	15	5	20
AASP, Sport, Psychology - inclusion or not of AASP, Sport, or Psychology in the certification mark.	14	42	56
Other Comments About the Mark – comments about the mark not included in other categories	43	41	84
Legal or Licensing Concerns – comments about legality of titles or practice	5	5	10
Suggestions for Marks other than CMPC	5	13	18
Procedure Comments - comments or recommendations about the procedure that should be followed to decide on a certification mark	5	15	20
What One Calls Self - comments about what one or others calls him-/herself in practice	6	0	6
Other – comments NOT about the CMPC mark, including changing certification process, changing the requirements or cost of the new certification process, rushing the process, that AASP should better market sport psychology or sport psychologists; etc.	11	21	32
Total Comments	131	175	306

Summary

A content analysis was performed on 306 comments from 70 AASP members and 11 Past Presidents. The comments were categorized into ten themes apparent across the comments. Some comments contained more than one point. A decision was made to place the comment in a single category based on the category definition that best represented the comment. All 306 comments, with complete demographic data for each comment, may be found in the accompanying Excel file. The comments by category and sorted by PRO or CON may be found in Appendix D.

Appendix A:
ICC July 24, 2017 Email Announcing CMPC Mark

AASP CERTIFICATION PROGRAM UPDATE

Dear AASP Members:

The Interim Certification Council (ICC) and AASP Executive Board (E-Board) would like to inform members of another important upgrade to our certification program - this one in the area of professional titling. When the new program is officially launched on October 1, 2017, the title used by all those who are certified by AASP will be changed to "**Certified Mental Performance Consultant**" or "**CMPC**". The current title "Certified Consultant - Association for Applied Sport Psychology" or "CC-AASP" will no longer be used or recognized. While a significant change, both the ICC and AASP E-Board believe that it is a necessary step to help the Certification Council and the organization as a whole market the certification program. Below, please find a brief overview of the process and rationale for the new title.

At the AASP Spring E-Board Meeting in April, the E-Board conducted a lengthy discussion about the lack of clear professional titling in the field, including how to best market our certification so that consumers would better understand what certified practitioners do. The Mental Performance Consultant (MPC) title has been used by the Canadian Sport Psychology Association (CSPA) since 2008, and has been well-received in the sporting community at all levels in that country. The E-Board unanimously approved a motion recommending that the ICC consider changing the certification program title to "Mental Performance Consultant".

Following were the perceived benefits and rationale for utilizing the 'Mental Performance Consultant' title:

The term "**Mental**" captures the essence of what practitioners in the field of sport psychology do without infringing upon legally protected "psychology" terms (e.g., psychology, psychological, psychologist).

The term "**Performance**" captures the necessity of addressing performance when working in the field of sport psychology.

The term "**Consultant**" captures the nature of the relationship and collaborative work between practitioners and clients in this field. Further, the term "consultant" does not encroach on the role of other members of integrated support teams/staff in sport including head and assistant coaches, strength trainers, etc.

The ICC carefully discussed the pros and cons of a title change via phone conference calls and email for several weeks. In the long run, it was the belief of the ICC members that it would make it easier for potential consumers of these services to understand the role of Mental Performance Consultants, which would help the Certification Council and organization market the certification and those certified more effectively. The ICC decided to retain the word "Certified" in the title, so the approved version was "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" or "CMPC". AASP has since filed trademark applications for both the new title and acronym.

What Does It Mean If I'm Currently Certified?

All active certified consultants (CC-AASPs) should begin preparing to utilize "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" or "CMPC" when listing your designation in professional and promotional materials, such as your website and social media, business cards, email signatures, brochures and letterhead. This will officially transition when the new certification program is launched on October 1, 2017.

As always, members of the ICC are available to answer your questions and respond to your concerns. Please feel free to reach out to any of the members below at the contact information provided.

Sarah Castillo (scastillo@nu.edu)

Stephany Coakley (stephccoakley@gmail.com)

Jack Watson (jack.watson@mail.wvu.edu)

Sincerely,
Interim Certification Council

Association for Applied Sport Psychology
8365 Keystone Crossing Suite 107 | Indianapolis, IN 46240
(317) 205-9225 | www.appliedsportpsych.org

Appendix B:
ICC August 23, 2017 Email Explaining CMPC Mark

Greetings AASP Members:

As part of the plan to address questions about the recently announced Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) credential and certification mark, we have prepared a more detailed explanation and rationale outlining the process followed and issues discussed by the Interim Certification Council (ICC) when deciding to select CMPC as the credential and certification mark for the updated certification program. First, a brief summary of the Job Task Analysis (JTA) will be outlined to provide the context for how the JTA was utilized by the ICC when making decisions related to the certification program, including the selection of CMPC as the new credential and certification mark. Second, definitions will be provided for the terms *certification credential* and *certification mark* to draw a clearer distinction from the professional title one may choose to use. Third, details regarding the process followed by the ICC will be explained to provide a more complete understanding of the decisions made by the ICC. Finally, the rationale and perceived benefits of the adoption and use of CMPC by certificants will be summarized. We have made significant efforts to outline the scope of this process and discussion in the most parsimonious manner possible.

Brief Summary and Utility of the Job Task Analysis

In 2015, AASP completed a JTA with a group 13 Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) with diverse personal and professional backgrounds who were working in sport and other performance settings to identify the domains of practice, tasks performed, and knowledge required for effective performance as a professional in sport psychology (for a complete summary, see the [JTA Final Report](#) prepared by Rosen & Lipkins, 2016). For the purposes of the JTA, the job of a sport psychology professional was defined as follows: *Applied sport psychology professionals help clients develop and use mental, life, and self-regulatory skills to optimize involvement, enjoyment, performance, and personal development.* Through a formal process known as role delineation, the SMEs identified 6 domains of practice (e.g., Goals, Outcome, and Planning), 21 tasks/discrete work activities (e.g., identify personal and systematic resources and barriers related to the achievement of goals and desired outcomes), and 38 underlying knowledge statements (e.g., intervention research and its application) related to the competent and effective practice of certification-level professionals in sport psychology. The results of the JTA established the specifications to be used for the item writing and examination construction phrases of the new certification exam. The JTA also guided the ICC's identification of the 8 Knowledge Areas (i.e., Sport Psychology Professional Ethics and Standards, Sport Psychology, Sport Science, Psychopathology, Helping Relationships, Research Methods and Statistics, Psychological Foundations of Behavior, and Diversity & Culture) within which applicants must complete the required coursework/educational experiences in the updated certification program. Thus, the JTA forms the foundation for the eligibility requirements that certificants must successfully complete to earn the new certification credential.

Definitions of Certification Credential and Certification Mark

A *certification credential* is a qualification or achievement earned by someone that indicates that the person is suitable for something. A *certification mark* is created by the owner of the mark and used only by authorized persons to signify that they have met the standards for certification. In the updated certification program, the ICC made the decision that "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" would be the certification credential earned by all certificants upon successfully completing all of the eligibility requirements as outlined in the Certification Program Policy Manual (to be released soon). The ICC now is working alongside the Certification Council to determine if the name of the certification credential needs to be revisited before the roll-out of the updated certification program. For this certification program, AASP would be the owner of the certification mark and would authorize certificants who successfully completed the eligibility requirements to use the mark to signify that they have done so. As outlined in the Policy Manual, certificants would be authorized to use "CMPC" and/or "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" as certification marks to display their certification credential. Certificants would be free to use the Certified Mental

Performance Consultant credential as their professional title or choose another title that is legally and ethically appropriate based upon their training, knowledge, and experiences (e.g., Sport Psychologist, Mental Conditioning Coach, Mental Training Specialist).

Explanation of Decision-Making Process for New Certification Credential

During AASP's Spring 2017 Executive Board (E-Board) meeting this past April, members of the E-Board engaged in a discussion of the future of the sport psychology profession, strategic plan objectives related to refining/clarifying the professional identity of AASP members, and present and future positioning of the AASP brand. A portion of this discussion focused on the potential of the new certification program to impact the profession, address long-standing professional titling issues, and position AASP certification in the marketplace. The E-Board inquired about the ICC's plans to retain the CC-AASP credential or change to a different credential name in the updated certification program. To that point, the ICC had not engaged in any significant discussions about the certification credential, as the focus of discussions had been on enacting new policies for the certification program. There was general agreement by the E-Board that if a change to the certification credential was advantageous and warranted then it would make sense from a marketing and branding perspective for this to occur with the roll-out of the updated certification program.

During the discussion, Natalie Durand-Bush, AASP's Publications/Information Division Head, provided the E-Board with details regarding the adoption of the title "Mental Performance Consultant" (MPC) by the Canadian Sport Psychology Association (CSPA) to address use of title issues by its members. The CSPA adopted the MPC title in 2008 in response to the College of Psychologists of Ontario request for differentiation between members who met the CSPA membership requirements with those members who also were registered psychologists and clinically trained to diagnose and treat mental health issues. CSPA professional members and members of the sporting community (e.g., coaches, athletes) engaged in lengthy discussion regarding the selection of an appropriate title that did not infringe upon legally protected psychology-related terms and potentially confounding coaching-related terms. Natalie highlighted the extent to which the MPC title has been used and well-received in the sporting community at all levels in Canada for nearly 10 years. The E-Board debated the pros and cons of the MPC title and its use by certificants of the updated certification program. Given the successful impact of the use of the MPC title in the Canadian sporting community, the E-Board became enthusiastic about the possibility for the MPC title to have a similar impact in the U.S. and the potential for MPC to be a unifying title for those in North America who practice applied sport psychology as defined by the JTA. Based on this discussion and the belief that the MPC title could help resolve concerns sport psychology professionals have faced in the past regarding designation, the E-Board unanimously approved a recommendation to the ICC to consider adopting "Mental Performance Consultant" as the name for the certification credential in the updated certification program.

The ICC received the E-Board's recommendation in May and began discussing the pros and cons of changing the certification credential name and weighing the merits of MPC as the new credential. It is important to note that the ICC is well-versed in issues related to certification and professional titling given that it is composed of four former or current members/Chairs of the Certification Review Committee with over 20 years of combined service on the committee, four Fellows, both licensed and non-licensed professionals, a range of early to late career professionals, and an equal mix of academics and practitioners, many of whom have been reading about and discussing issues of certification as part of the initial Future of Certification Ad Hoc Committee (FCAHC) or the ICC for the better part of 6 years. Over a five-week period, the ICC engaged in a lengthy debate regarding the E-Board's recommendation during weekly conference calls and email correspondence, researched certification credentials used by other organizations (e.g., National Athletic Trainers' Association, National Board of Certified Counselors), sought legal counsel regarding the credential name and trademarking, requested feedback from and vetted the credential name with current APA Division 47 and CSPA leadership, received informal feedback from a small group of sport psychology practitioners, and reached back out to the E-Board for additional insight and input related to its MPC

recommendation. The ICC examined several derivatives of the E-Board's MPC recommendation, considering the length of the credential name, "stickiness" of the credential, the extent to which the acronym "rolls off the tongue," etc. Ultimately, the ICC decided to unanimously approve "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" as the new certification credential and the use of "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" and "CMPC" as the certification marks. Prior to the ICC announcing the credential name change to the membership, the ICC followed the advice of current AASP President Angus Mugford and first announced the new certification credential to the Fellows to allow for their input given the historical significance of this potential change. After receiving overall positive support and feedback from the Fellows, the ICC announced the certification credential name change to the membership at the end of July.

Rationale and Benefits for Selection of New Certification Credential

The rationale for the ICC selecting "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" as the new certification credential is based largely on the rationale and perceived benefits provided by the CSPA related to its adoption of MPC:

- The term "**Certified**" captures a certain level of significance and prominence and denotes that there is a certification process in place to distinguish the credential from others in the marketplace (e.g., Performance Enhancement Consultant, Mental Skills Trainer, Mental Coach).
- The term "**Mental**" captures the essence of what professionals in the field of sport/performance psychology do and the focus of their work without infringing upon legally protected "psychology" terms (e.g., psychology, psychological, psychologist). The discussion about the legal use of "psychology" as a descriptor for this certification or what practitioners call themselves to clients goes far beyond the scope of the charge given to the ICC/CC by the AASP membership at the 2016 Business Meeting in Phoenix.
- The term "**Performance**" captures the necessity of addressing performance-related aspects when working as a professional in the field of sport/performance psychology. This term conveys the requirement that professionals need training in performance aspects and the ability to attend to these elements to work effectively in sport and other performance domains (e.g., performing arts, military). In addition, as previously mentioned SMEs from sport and other performance domains were selected by the FCAHC to complete the JTA to accurately reflect the work done by a full spectrum of professionals in our field. Thus, the use of the umbrella term "performance," which certainly includes sport (see Aoyagi et al., 2012 for a more complete discussion), is consistent with the scope of the JTA and broadens the work setting to include the domains where many AASP members and practitioners are already working. Further, the term reflects the fast-growing market for practitioners who work in settings other than sport and would help to position this certification and AASP as leaders in this profession into the future.
- The term "**Consultant**" captures the nature of the relationship and collaborative work between professionals in the field of sport/performance psychology and their clients (e.g., athletes, performing artists, military personnel). Further, this term does not encroach on the role of other members of integrated support teams/staff such as the Head Coach, Strength Coach, Athletic Trainer, etc. The term also distinguishes certificants from "life coaches," whose training and certification typically differs from that of professionals in our field.

An added benefit of the new certification credential is the ability to trademark the use of the credential, entitling AASP for the first time to be able to exercise legitimate control over the use of its certification mark in the marketplace. Thus, only those individuals who have been certified through the updated certification program would be able to legally use the trademarked professional title of "Certified Mental Performance Consultant," "CMPC," or "Mental Performance Consultant." AASP would be in the position to legally challenge non-certified individuals who chose to refer to themselves with any of these professional titles. Not only is this perceived to be strong benefit for those who earn this certification, trademarking the new certification credential also will strengthen the standing of the certification program with organizations such as the NCAA as well as professional

leagues and teams who will now be able to easily identify certified professionals and have a good understanding of their training, knowledge, and experiences.

It is genuinely hoped that the above explanation and rationale provides greater context, promotes a clearer understanding, and provides additional transparency of the process followed and decisions made by the ICC with regard to the recently announced CMPC credential and certification mark. Next, AASP members will be invited to submit written feedback regarding the CMPC credential and certification mark. The call for comments will be announced in a separate email tomorrow.

Sincerely,

Interim Certification Council (ICC)

Association for Applied Sport Psychology
8365 Keystone Crossing Suite 107 | Indianapolis, IN 46240
(317) 205-9225 | www.appliedsportpsych.org

Appendix C:
August 24, 2017 Email Call for Comments on the CMPC Mark

Greetings AASP Members:

As indicated in the August 23, 2017 letter from the Interim Certification Council (ICC), we are seeking your input regarding the proposed **credential and certification mark (i.e., Certified Mental Performance Consultant / CMPC) for the updated certification program. Please note that the credential and certification mark may or may not be what one uses to identify themselves to potential clients.** That is, the CMPC credential and certification mark would be used to identify certificants of this specific certification program, and may (or may not) be different from what people call themselves professionally.

The letter from the ICC explained the rationale behind the name of the credential and certification mark (i.e., Certified Mental Performance Consultant and CMPC) as well as the process that was followed to arrive at the decision to implement these changes in credential and certification mark.

This letter is a call for your feedback on the proposed CMPC credential and certification mark. We recognize there are other aspects of the new certification process that are of interest to AASP members. Likewise, we recognize there are concerns with respect to how practitioners may legally refer to themselves in the workplace, and a number of ideas about how AASP might address these issues. These concerns are important, but are not within the purview of the ICC/CC, nor are they applicable to the name of the credential. This call and **your email responses should focus exclusively on the CMPC certification mark.** Your responses to this call, both support and concerns, will be used by the ICC and CC to inform their decision about finalizing the credential and certification mark.

Responses will be content analyzed to identify themes and the frequency with which each theme is present across responses. NOTE: no individual names or identifying information will be reported to the ICC or CC; only aggregated comments will be reported. However, de-identified comments in aggregate will be reported using the exact wording that was submitted.

October 1, 2017 has been identified as the implementation date for the new certification program process. In order to meet this deadline, we are providing a two-week window in which members can provide valuable feedback. Please follow these guidelines to help ensure we accurately represent the membership's perceptions.

1. We have a **hard deadline** for accepting comments. No additional comments will be accepted after **close of business (5:00 EDT) Thursday, September 7, 2017.**
2. Please consolidate your comments into one email. That is, you may submit as many comments as you are so inclined, but please send only one email.
 - o Please clearly indicate whether each comment within your email is a PRO (supportive of the CMPC credential and mark) or CON (non-supportive of the CMPC credential and mark).
3. Please indicate whether or not you are currently a Certified Consultant - AASP (CC-AASP).
4. Please indicate your specialty area (e.g., Clinical/Counseling, Sport Psychology, Sport/Exercise Science, Exercise Psychology, Performance Psychology, etc.).
5. Please send your comments via email (no attachments, please) with the subject line "CMPC Comments" to Certification Council member Betsy Shoenfelt at betsy.shoenfelt@wku.edu

Based on member responses and the initial work conducted by the ICC, the ICC/CC will make the final decision on the certification credential and mark together. The ICC/CC is the autonomous governing body (as mandated by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies, or NCCA, and noted in the AASP Constitution Article IX) for the AASP certification program and is solely responsible for establishing, reviewing, and overseeing the implementation of all policies and decisions related to the certification program. Thus, the final decision will be made by this group after considering the feedback received from the membership.

Thank you for providing your input on the CMPC certification mark by Thursday, September 7, 2017.

Sincerely,

Certification Council (CC) and Interim Certification Council (ICC)

Association for Applied Sport Psychology
8365 Keystone Crossing Suite 107 | Indianapolis, IN 46240
(317) 205-9225 | www.appliedsportpsych.org

Appendix D:
AASP Member Comment about the CMPC Mark
By Category and Pro/Con¹

¹ Note: Approximately five individuals submitted the same comments written in the exact same wording or very similar wording with only minor differences. This resulted in the inclusion of these same statements multiple times.

Term “Certified” – comments related to the term “Certified” in the new (CMPC) or old mark (CC-AASP)

“Certified” - Fine, though it could be put at the end, as with ATCs.	Pro
I like "certified"	Pro
I am concerned that the name for the certification mark misses the mark and am troubled that it could (inadvertently?) imply that the Mental Performance Consultant (MPC) mark of the CSPA is less than - adding the term Certified to AASP's suggested name would/could certainly do that. Quite frankly, if I were involved with CSPA, I'd be filing trademark paperwork yesterday to try to prevent AASP from using CMPC.	Con
Just because AASP is offering a certification doesn't mean you have to use the term “certified” in the title, you can merely say “Mental Performance Consultant” although this would not be a good title at all.	Con
I would like to drop the term “certified” from CMPC so we can be aligned with Canada. They use MPC for the exact same professional certification.	Con
From the Aug. 23 email, how can Canada's “MPC” and AASP's “CMPC” be a unifying title when they are not the same? The essence of obtaining any ‘certification’ is to set oneself apart from those that are not certified. How is it unifying when AASP is inherently setting the CMPC apart from MPC by specifically pointing out and emphasizing the “Certified” portion? I don't have a problem with the ‘certified’ portion actually, but the reasoning here provided by AASP seems fundamentally flawed and that is highly concerning with such a substantial change. Moreover, I also wish to see the data that led to the conclusion stated in the Aug. 23 email that the adoption of MPC in Canada was “successful”. At present, the only evidence seems to stem from an argument presented by Natalie Durand-Bush and that evidence was never shared publicly.	Con

Term “Mental Performance” - comments specifically related to the term “Mental,” “Performance,” or “Mental Performance” in the new mark; includes comments indicating that Mental Performance does/does not describe or capture what I/we do

Here’s where things get sticky. I get that one of the key outcomes of what we do is to improve performance. But as the title reads, ‘mental’ and ‘performance’ aren’t processed (at least by me) as separate concepts, but rather as ‘mental performance.’ That is a phrase that is not commonly used in our field. Also, an internet search reveals all kinds of different and unrelated uses of the phrases. Also, even if you keep them separate, performance isn’t what we do related to mental. What we do is mental training (and, yes, much more, but we can’t list everything we do), so that should be highlighted. I believe ‘mental training’ is the best designation. It is a phrase that the athletic community understands and, again, is highly descriptive of what we do, so it has validity and recognition inward and outward facing.	Con
As to the reference to performance psychology and the benefits of staying broad in scope, again, performance psychology isn’t what AASP does and AASP shouldn’t assume such a role until it has gone through a very deliberate process that results in a vision and goal to shift from Association for Applied Sport Psychology to Association for Sport & Performance Psychology. As any business owner knows (and I learned the hard way), staying focused on what you do well is good business and entering a new field without a lot of consideration and preparation is a recipe for failure.	Con
I believe it is a fundamental mistake to try to describe what we do as "mental performance." This term is only part of what we do. A sport psychology consultant also deals with issues of communication, relationships, rehabilitation, and social and cultural factors.	Con
In addition, “Mental Performance” is potentially confusing (we help athletes with a variety of performative and non-performative issues), and arguably problematic (sometimes deemphasizing performance is best for client well-being).	Con
the name is non-descript in type of performance; I see this as an issue because while many ‘practice’ in other areas like business, arts, etc. the required training is in the study of sport (e.g. applied sport psychology as a required course); and the knowledge base in the discipline is research in sport psychology and counseling psychology	Con
Personally, when hearing the full title, the words "certified" and "consultant" are not nearly as relevant as the domain/expertise of the professional, which our title would imply is "mental performance"	Con
"Mental Performance" - Im concerned this may further deter those athletes already skeptical about working with a sport psychology or "performance enhancement" specialist.	Con
"Mental Performance" - The mind and body are very connected, and the phrase "Mental Performance" does not reflect this important concept	Con
"Mental Performance" leaves out the behavioral aspect of performance, which is key and also part of what performance enhancement professionals help athletes with	Con
The new Certified Mental Performance Coach (CMPC) title focuses on mental and performance but seems to leave out work related to athletes' emotions and relationships.	Con
The new title "captures the necessity of addressing performance when working in the field of sport psychology." However, it is so narrow that it fails to capture athletes coming to meet when they have issues other than performance concerns	Con

The use of the term “Mental Performance” is vague, too narrow and restrictive. Many important and commonly used interventions, (e.g., team building/cohesion, leadership development, communication enhancement, exercise motivation and adherence, physical relaxation, injury prevention and rehabilitation) do not fall under the rubric “Mental Performance”, but do fall under Sport Psychology	Con
Mental Performance does not accurately describe a competent practitioner's education and training in the field of sport psychology. The majority, if not overwhelming majority, of practitioners are educated by graduate programs focused on sport psychology coursework while obtaining supporting coursework if needed. The certification credential and mark should reflect this appropriately and ethically without overgeneralizing the service that the majority of practitioners are competently capable of providing.	Con
I do think the word "mental" is essential to include (until we can use psychology or psychologist).	Con
Many commonly used interventions, (e.g., injury prevention and rehabilitation team building/cohesion, leadership development, communication enhancement, exercise motivation and adherence, physical relaxation,) do not fall under the rubric “Mental Performance”, but do fall under CC-AASP.	Con
Mental Performance Coach is too vague, not clearly defining our expertise.	Con
The words "mental performance" put together is an uncommon phrase and does not fully reflect what us practitioners do. If the rationale in changing the title is to create less confusion and to fully reflect what we do, I would say that we are moving even further away from what we intend to achieve.	Con
I can't speak for the rest of Asia but the word "mental" has an even more negative connotation than the word "psychology" in Hong Kong, where my practice is established. Changing the title would mean creating an even greater barrier between local consultants and potential clients, meaning less practice/ business.	Con
When taken together, I do not entirely know what 'mental performance' is. It perhaps implies that we work on one's mental performance, rather than on their performance using a variety of mental strategies. It's a nuanced, but I feel important, issue.	CON
Even though I prefer performance to sport, currently this is inconsistent with the certifying body's marketing efforts (AASP is about sport and has yet to expand to performance in name).	CON
I feel this title does not fully encompass all of the facets that are integral to many consulting programs. By labeling as "Mental Performance" we are restricting our focus and limiting and/or downplaying the importance of techniques that are paramount to many Sport Psychology consulting programs (communication, physical relaxation, team building, etc).	Con
The term Mental Performance is too broad and vague. While some individuals are working in ancillary areas (e.g., performing arts), that is not the majority of consulting work that is done. Instead of fostering the growth that AASP has made in establishing its identity and improving marketing and branding, I believe this could be detrimental. I strongly support the certification credential/mark of Certified Sport Psychology Consultant.	CON
In the CMPC Credential and Mark Rationale email sent on August 23rd, the phrase ‘sport and performance psychology’ is used several times. Throughout my training, sport and exercise psychology were referenced, but not performance psychology. And when I look around my office at all of my academic texts/resources they all reference sport and/or exercise, but not performance psychology.	CON

In my opinion the field of Sport Psychology (and the words themselves) need to be represented in any certification title. It is the field of Sport Psychology that provides the research, knowledge base, and historical accuracy and it is what consultants trained in Sport Psychology are practicing. The words mental and performance are commonplace while Sport Psychology provides greater clarification, specificity, validity, and respect in the internal and external community.	Con
Additionally, we are not simply performance psychology, nor should we want this exclusivity or claim. Sport Psychology has faced the struggle of certification and 'naming' for several years already. We've conducted research for nearly a century to bolster the knowledge base and awareness of Sport Psychology. I'm concerned that aligning with performance psychology actually mitigates and suppresses the impact and development of the field.	Con
CMPC does not fully describe what we as practitioners may focus on in sport which are: performance (athlete, coach and referee), youth sport development, athlete and coach wellbeing, athlete lifestyle and parent education.	Con
I understand that many people use their education and training in areas that are not directly related to sport (e.g. business or the military) but these areas are not the root or foundation of the field and thus there seems to be an overemphasis on the word "performance". Please note a proposed compromise between sport psych vs performance psych toward the end of this email.	Con
<i>Exactly What is Mental Performance?</i> Mental performance can apply to virtually any task. While some members may provide consultation to various areas of performance, performance psychology is not a developed or established practicing profession. Performance psychology is a convenient and all-encompassing term but a performance psychology profession does not exist. In addition, Sport Psychology Consultants provide services in social areas such as team cohesion leadership, and conflict resolution to name a few. Selecting a global title that tries to please many diverse factions will not work. As noted, the title of the association indicates that the primary focus of AASP is applied sport psychology.	Con
1) The use of the term "Mental Performance" is vague, too narrow and restrictive. Many important and commonly used interventions, (e.g., team building/cohesion, leadership development, communication enhancement, exercise motivation and adherence, physical relaxation, injury prevention and rehabilitation) do not fall under the rubric "Mental Performance", but do fall under SPC or CC-AASP.	Con
Performance is a word that covers many different settings so I think it strengthens our credentials to have the word "performance" instead of sport in our title.	Pro
"Mental" In total agreement. Because 'psychology' is protected, we need to have something that designates what we do as related to the mind. Suggestions such as Sport Performance Consultant, lacking 'mental,' could mean conditioning coach, nutritionist, biomechanist, or any other area related to sport performance.	Pro
Having "performance" in the title is inclusive of sport and alternative applications. Many practitioners make their entire livelihood working outside of sport populations (e.g., circus artists, dancers, gamers, surgeons, etc.). To keep ourselves relevant, we have to expand our scope of practice. This includes relevant training in sport psychology programs on how to adapt interventions to meet the cultures of these other performing populations. Using the title "sport" may deter certain populations from seeking services (for example, circus artists find the use of terms like "athlete" and "sport" offensive and not relevant to their performance/art).	Pro
The words "mental" and "performance" do not infringe on important state laws set forth by licensing boards. The purpose of protecting the word "psychology" is to avoid misleading the public. Attempting to fight licensing boards would be very costly and time consuming.	Pro
The term "performance" accurately reflects all applications of our knowledge base.	Pro

The term "performance" reflects the direction and promising future of the field.	Pro
The term "mental" distinguishes us from others in the sport sciences.	Pro
The term "Mental Performance" accurately describes competencies of SP program graduates	Pro
Sport psychologist is nice, but I honestly don't think it makes a big difference from mental performance consultant. In fact, I think that mental performance consultant carries less stigma than the sport psychologist (e.g., being for crazy people or problem athletes). It is always an effort to explain to clients that I'm not a licensed psychologist and having a title of sport psychologist would make it even more difficult.	Pro
I think that the broad umbrella of the term performance is great although it can be argued that our training may need to catch up for supporting performance in domains outside of sport, exercise, and the military (i.e. performing arts, high risk populations, business settings, etc.)	Pro
Our field is no longer united under sport, alone. Despite calls from some members who would have us "return to our roots," the reality is that work in the sport sector, alone, is unsustainable--we do not currently have the infrastructure for each of us to work exclusively, full-time in the sport setting at this time. We need to be looking toward the future, not fixate on the past. We need to take a big gulp of our own kool-aid and recognize that progress is not achieved by walking back to where we started, setting up shop, and hoping things will work this time because perhaps we were ahead of our time then. We can appreciate from where we have come, but the refusal to welcome growth and change is the reason why we have been passed by athletic trainers and strength and conditioning coaches. When we refuse to move, we cannot grow and evolve, and will continue to suffer the same arguments and debates that have plagued us for the last thirty years. "Mental Performance," rather than "Sport Performance" allows us to do just that by being more inclusive to our members, rather than exclusive.	Pro
Despite public arguments to the "vagueness" of "mental performance" and that the name is insufficient and confusing both "inwardly" to the membership and "outwardly" to the potential clientele, the reality is, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure it out. "Mental performance" is not jargon. "Mental performance" is not vague. "Mental performance" means exactly what it says, that the focus of our work is on the mental aspects of performance; that we work with clients to improve their mental performance. Again, this is inclusive in that we can identify areas in many industries (not just sport) that could benefit from our work to improve mental performance. It also means that we could be talking about using traditional sport psychology techniques, as well as newer euro/biofeedback techniques, other assistive technologies like vision boards, and those techniques and technologies that have yet to be developed.	Pro
I love that the title focuses on performance and not sport - what we do is performance enhancement, sport is simply a venue in which that work is done.	Pro
I love that the title focuses on performance and not sport - what we do is performance enhancement, sport is simply a venue in which that work is done.	Pro
The new title also represents what our credential qualifies us to do well (mental performance consulting)	Pro
The performance focus is an inclusive umbrella that allows for the unity of members within our field rather than splintering of factions	Pro
I like that the title focuses on performance and not sport - what we do is performance enhancement, sport is simply a venue in which that work is done.	PRO
I appreciate that the title focuses on performance and not just sport - I believe that this encompasses that what we do is performance enhancement, sport is simply a venue in which that	Pro

work can done. However, the work we do can be applicable to other performance populations outside of sport.	
With the formal shift to “performance,” graduate programs will need to shift their applied experiences and course content to reflect more diverse populations (which could be a challenge with varied access to these populations and contextual knowledge of current faculty).	Pro
I believe the term 'performance' encompasses a much wider range of services that 'sport psychology' (we work with many more people than simply athletes and others in the sporting environment).	Pro
I also view the term 'mental' as being far more recognizable, less stigmatizing, and easier to understand for lay people than the term 'psychology' as used in 'sport psychology' (and we all know that we cannot trademark a term with the word psychology in it!!).	Pro
I love that the title focuses on performance and not just sport - what we do is performance enhancement, sport is simply a venue in which that work is done.	Pro
I love that the title focuses on performance - what we do is performance enhancement. It allows us to work in many different domains.	Pro
As noted by Portenga, Aoyagi, and Cohen (2016), “The principles of applied sport psychology are applicable to other performance contexts. Currently, the largest employer of people with applied sport psychology training is the U.S. Army Comprehensive Soldier and Family Fitness Program. Sport psychology professionals have written about working with other types of performers (e.g., Fletcher, 2010; Hays, 2002, 2006, 2009, 2012; Jones, 2002; Nordin-Bates, 2012; Taylor & Taylor, 1995), and the general idea of referring to the field as performance psychology has intuitive appeal for many practitioners. Indeed, Division 47 of the American Psychological Association recently changed its name from Exercise and Sport Psychology to the Society for Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology. Emphasizing the focus on performance delineates the unique core of this profession and facilitates a consensus around a common identity that distinguishes performance psychology from other similar professions. Using sport in the profession’s title implicitly limits where and with whom practitioners work”.	Pro
I think mental performance is a large component of what we do	Pro

Term “Consultant” - comments specifically related to the term “Consultant” in the new or old mark

consultant is the most legally accurate term for this type of certification	Pro
"Consultant" is the most appropriate "title" we can hold. In my work over the last eight years, I have "coached" the mental game; I do it every time I teach an athlete a cardinal skill and remind that client to use it while I watch them practice or compete. In my work over the last eight years, I have also "counseled" my clients; I do it when I identify reasons for necessary referral and used my skills and background in counseling to gather the necessary information while continuing to build rapport to make a successful referral. I have "consulted" with my coaches and my athletes when I have laid out options and observations and allowed them to do with that information what they deemed appropriate. Other (licensed) consultants also provide therapy over the course of their work. The reality is, though, that we aren't talking about the individual job title each of us can/will hold. We are talking about a certification mark. Which should be inclusive to the work any of us who are certified will perform under that certification. The most inclusive of those terms is "consultant." It is most indicative of what we do--we consult, we train, we counsel, we coach, we show up. It does not interfere with other job titles (e.g., coach, psychologist, trainer), yet might include those, if the practitioner is competent and permitted to do so.	Pro
Using consultant instead of coach saves from much hassle with NCAA hours restrictions	Pro
Using consultant creates a needed separation between technical instruction (coach) versus mental skills trainers (CMPC)	Pro
Using consultant instead of coach saves from much hassle with NCAA hours restrictions	Pro
Using consultant creates a needed separation between technical instruction (coach) versus mental skills trainers (CMPC)	Pro
The phrase consultant provides a distinction between our services and general coaching (sport coaching, life coaching, etc.)	Pro
Using consultant instead of coach saves from much hassle with NCAA hours restrictions	Pro
Using consultant creates a needed separation between technical instruction (coach) versus mental skills trainers (CMPC)	Pro
Using consultant instead of coach saves from potential issues with NCAA hours restrictions. I support the notion that using the title consultant prevents infringement on other professionals in the performance setting.	Pro
Using consultant creates a needed separation between technical/tactical instruction (coach) versus mental skills professionals (CMPC)	Pro
I agree with many that consultant is the best bet given the issues with coach (NCAA regulations, role confusion, etc) and trainer (ATCs, personal trainers, etc).	Pro
I recognize the issues with consultant – but besides specialist (also not perfect) - I'm not sure what term we could use.	Pro
Using consultant instead of coach saves from much hassle with NCAA hours restrictions	Pro
Using consultant creates a needed separation between technical instruction (coach) versus mental skills trainers (CMPC)	Pro

<p>"Consultant" I'm mixed on this one. Yes, I call myself a consultant, but it does carry baggage (to paraphrase Dilbert, "I love control and I love to insult, so I'll...consult!"). Also, an esteemed colleague emailed me the other day with this: "On a related note, the word "consultant" is defined by Dictionary.com as "consultant a person who gives professional or expert advice: This term does NOT capture the approach that I take to working with athletes, teams, and coaches. I take a collaborative approach and am not an advice giver." I agree that, according to this strict definition, consulting is only a part of what I do. I accept that 'coach' is a problem in some settings, such as NCAA, so I will pass on that. I've come to like 'specialist' because it is used by CSCS and it communicates being special and having a specialty.</p>	Con
<p>"Consultant" - For some reason this word makes me think of "us" as being separated from the team, as opposed to part of it. I just think a word like "Specialist" may reduce the power differential between the client and "us", which may make the client feel more comfortable talking to "us"</p>	Con
<p>The term consultant is holding the field back as it creates the impression that this is what we do the majority of the time. While many people work as consultants the majority of the time currently, this is problematic and should not be the goal of our field.</p>	Con
<p>The term consultant devalues the profession.</p>	Con
<p>The only con would be if the term "Consultant" could be interchangeable with the word "Coach" based on the certified's needs. It would not change the acronym. I know in the athletic world the word "coach" is received by other coaches and athletes with greater strength than consultant. The word consultant may conjugate thoughts of simply advising. The word coach stands out with an athlete as something they have been around throughout their career (aiding in the trust and relationship factors). This would reflect the trust already in their Strength and Conditioning Coach. When one becomes certified through AASP, based on their area of focus, can designate with Consultant or Coach as the final "C" in the CMPC.</p>	Con

AASP, Sport, Psychology - inclusion or not of AASP, Sport, or Psychology in the certification mark.

Very important word that is missing: Sport. AASP is about sport psychology, not dance, military, business, or any other type of psychology. Though many in our field work outside of sport, the reality is that only a small percentage of consultants have education, training, and experience outside of sport. And, though there is a push to train for performance psychology (to provide for more job opportunities), that's not AASP's core business right now. AASP only has legitimate authority to certify within sport. So, I believe strongly that 'sport' must be in the title.	Con
In the medical profession, "board certified" only has meaning if the organization granting it is known (Orthopedics, Neuro-surgery, Psychiatry, Pediatrics, etc). The term does not attempt to describe what each physician does.	Con
The area known as sport psychology is included in the name of the organization AASP (cc-aasp). It helps clarify who is doing the certifying.	Con
"Certified mental performance consultant" says nothing about sport psychology, and for the reasons stated is not a good choice.	Con
AASP is the Association for Applied Sport Psychology - it is not the American Association for ASP, but endeavors to be worldwide. As such, the name has to make sense outside of just the U.S. In addition, we are the Association for Applied Sport Psychology - surely one or more of those terms should be in our certification title? It would be incredibly weird for Strength and Conditioning Coaches or Athletic Trainers to not have their roles (CSCS and ATC) in their titles.	Con
I am not opposed to dumping CC-AASP - it's cumbersome and not terribly descriptive. But CMPC is equally cumbersome and non-descriptive. Surely we can come up with something better.	Con
As a certified consultant and clinical psychologist in private practice, I am very concerned about the vagueness of the CMPC designation. Unlike CC-AASP, CMPC is completely disconnected from the two essential words - sport and psychology- that define our work. Untethered from "sport" and "psychology," I am not sure that the credential maintains sufficient meaning	Con
If CMPC is not changed, a partial solution would be for certified consultants to combine CMPC with the AASP logo. This solution is cumbersome, however, and some certified consultants who are clinical psychologists and greatly value AASP might nonetheless decide that it is better not to use CMPC alongside their PhD or PsyD titles.	Con
I feel the AASP Sport Psychology should stand. We have all worked hard to achieve this recognition.	Con
In considering AASP's brand (sport and exercise), the organization's name ("Applied Sport Psychology"), environments and populations in which our professionals serve (pro and youth sport, military, recreation, university athletics, academia) we really don't want to remove the term "sport" from the title. It actually makes our	Con
one of the reasons we push to have a more credible certification process is to set boundaries around our discipline, which is the study of the mental components of sport performance... even though people use those elements in other domains, we argue that the sport setting is unique and thus someone who just has a background in counseling shouldn't be able to do performance training with an athlete without understanding the context (thus the needs for training and certification in sport psychology). I think this is also true for other disciplines...people who want to do performance enhancement or mental training in business should get a degree and certification in Industrial/Organizational Psychology	Con
It is odd that our very Association title is "Applied Sport Psychology" yet the new certification does not reflect this at all or incorporate any of these words	Con

Iso like others, I am bewildered by the omission of "sport" from the certification. If it's no longer in the certification, why have it in the title of the organization that offers it?	Con
Based on the JTA focus which forms the foundation of the credential and mark, it is important to choose a credential and mark that identifies people as sport psychology professionals such as CC-AASP. CMPC is not a fit	Con
I think AASP should go with "Certified Sport Performance Consultant" instead of Mental. Not because we don't teach mental skills but because the term "mental performance" is not face valid. We don't consult on their mental performance, we consult on their sport performance.	Con
The title Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) does not include the title of the association as in CC-AASP. A major reason for selecting CC-AASP was that title enabled AASP to include the term "Sport Psychology" without violating titles legally protected by state boards. The same advantages exist today for having sport psychology visible in the certification title.	Con
Removing AASP from the title of the certification credential and mark eliminates recognition of the important role the association has played and will continue to play in the certification and professional development process.	Con
I think that the AASP Certification Title is one that may have some issues in how it rolls off the tongue and is perceived by the public, but is still one that accurately represents the work that we do .	Con
As AASP is the Association for Applied Sport Psychology, it would behoove the association to incorporate the name of the field into the certification credential and mark as a clear representation of the owner of the mark. The association does not represent the field of mental performance	Con
From a business perspective, I understand the association is trying to incorporate as many specialties as possible to be housed under this name. This just seems like a mistake and a far cry from the mission of AASP (http://www.appliedsportpsych.org/about/mission-vision/). The mission of AASP clearly states, iAASP is an organization focused on human performance, holistic well-being and social functioning through education, research & practice, certification and service to the profession of sport psychology.î The profession of sport psychology does not seem to be reflected in the name change. It seems too vague to incorporate outside fields. Our association is about SPORT and exercise psychology not military psychology or performance psychology (business or art). There are other organizations that can help professionals with those specialties. We cannot be everything to everyone, and we should not try to be.	Con
From an ethical perspective, the name change from CC-AASP to CMPC. The term psychology is a protected term, but one we should be fighting for inclusion instead of settling for a sub-par name that does not describe what we do. Sport Psychology is what we as an organization do. When we change the name to mental performance consultant, we lose out on the professional identity that we have put years of effort to develop.	Con
The name should reflect sport. Performance is too vague of a word and does not reflect the identity of the field.	Con
The title CMPC does not include the title of the association as in CC-AASP. A major reason for selecting CC-AASP was that title enabled AASP to include the term "Sport Psychology" without violating titles legally protected by state boards. The same advantages exist today for having sport psychology visible in the certification title.	Con

By changing the certification title to CMPC the AASP would sacrifice a professional identity that has been built over 30 years. AASP and professional practice will progress further and faster by strengthening and building upon an existing title with recognized identity such as SPC and CC-AASP rather than starting from a brand base of zero.	Con
Removing AASP from the title of the certification mark eliminates recognition of the important role AASP has played and will continue to play in the certification and professional development process.	Con
the title doesn't specify that we are experts in the mental realm of sport, which is a focus of our academic curriculums. When I ask parents, coaches, and athletes how they found me as a consultant, they looked for the word "sport"	Con
using the AASP in the title connects us with a long-standing organization focused on the development of the science and practice of psychological aspects of sport.	Con
AASP is a Sport Psychology Association. Whether or not practitioners move away from sport psychology and engage in performance, military, exercise, wellbeing etc. is their choice - but the title should stick to what AASP is about - sport, and psychology.	Con
The best title that best reflects our practice, is either Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC) or Sport and Performance Psychology Consultant (SPPC). The word "Psychology" is allowed in HK. Although I understand that due to state licensure laws in US this term can't be used, I strongly suggest that we stick to the old credential "CC-AASP" until this term is legalized. There is certainly no rush for a new title.	Con
Changing from CC-AASP to CMPC also loses our instant tie to the Association. As CC-AASP there is an immediate recognition that the consultant is certified through the top organization within Sport Psychology. It gives a stronger sense of credibility and builds on the professional name that AASP has established over the years.	Con
Another reason was that changing our name, in a way, forfeited a lot of the momentum and work that had been done to establish the previous name of AAASP within the Spot Psychology field. The name change to AASP undoubtedly created some confusion and lost part of the identity that had been built during AAASP's years. If the Association continues to change names, titles, and points of recognition then the strong professional identity that they have yielded will slowly weaken. By keeping AASP tied to the certification title we are strengthening the already established relationship, rather than separating it and undermining years of work.	Con
It seems a bit of a disconnect that AASP would be the owner of the certification mark and yet there is no reference to sport psychology in the proposed certification credential/mark.	CON
I would also hesitate to remove AASP from the title of certification. The organization that represents the field and the pursuit of certification and training is intimately connected to the field itself and this should be seriously considered when adopting certification titles.	Con
The CPMC title is not a "bad" title, but it seems unclear why it was chosen. If the rationale is because "sport psychology" should be avoided due to confusion with "psychologists" or "psychological treatment," and the legality associated with it, then the existing title (CC-AASP) seems like a perfect way to acknowledge the fact that consultants have a sport (performance) psychology background. It does so in a way that promotes a consultant's area of expertise, their field, and the AASP organization (without implying that they practice clinical psychology).	Con
The field we study and work within (for the vast majority of us) is sport psychology. The fact that neither of those terms or the phrase "sport psychology" as a whole is not included within the proposed certification mark is not only confusing but concerning.	Con

Although change is necessary throughout life, it is also important to remember where we started and the foundation of our field - SPORT PSYCHOLOGY	Con
As an organization, AASP must practice what we preach. The avoidance of the word psychology indicates an unwillingness to fight for the members of the organization who work in a psychological field. The members have made it pretty clear that this title is important to them and is something they value. WE MUST FIGHT FOR THE MEMBERS OF AASP AND THE FUTURE OF OUR FIELD	Con
AASP NEEDS TO BE WILLING TO FIGHT FOR THE RIGHT TO USE THE WORD PSYCHOLOGY. We study sport and we study psychology - each of those words ought to be included in the title - EVEN IF IT MEANS GOING TO COURT OVER A SINGLE WORD AND PUSHING THE ISSUE WITH APA (as needed). We are not trying to call ourselves psychologists. We are simply trying to use a word that reflects our area of expertise. Please note that my comments in this area are coming from a psychologist in training. Again - there is room for both at the table	Con
some of my background is psychology and I'm studying "sport psychology" so I would've like the name to have included psychology.	Con
<i>What Specialization of Practice Should AASP Certify?</i> The primary focus of AASP is sport psychology. It is clear in the associations title. Many practicing professionals provide consultation to individuals and teams based on information from the field of study called Sport Psychology as well as from related disciplines. Practicing professionals represent many disciplines, however the common core is that individuals combine their education with sport psychology specific experiences (classroom and supervised applications) to meet AASP certification. Some individuals who are not AASP certified but who hold a state issued license in psychology may choose to self-identify as a "Sport Psychologist". The legal and ethical ramifications regarding the use of the title "Sport Psychologist" will be best addressed by state licensing boards not AASP. While much remains to be accomplished in developing the profession of sport psychology there is a history of research and practice specific to sport psychology.	Con
1) The title CMPC does not include the title of the association as in CC-AASP. A major reason for selecting CC-AASP was that title enabled AASP to include the term "Sport Psychology" without violating titles legally protected by state boards. The same advantages exist today for having sport psychology visible in the certification title.	Con
1) Removing AASP from the title of the certification credential and mark eliminates recognition of the important role the association has played and will continue to play in the certification and professional development process.	Con
Using the word "psychology" would also likely put consultants at risk for fielding referrals outside of scope of practice; these may cause ethical and legal conflicts that will be costly to consultants. I believe the title as it currently stands is protective of sport consultants	Pro
As I stated on the listserve: I personally don't mind the CMPC credential for myself (I even have it on my basic personal website! I have for years - I do this because I work with athletes and musicians), but for any official designation that goes along with my CC credentials, I would definitely prefer to have the use of "sport" in there too.	Pro
We need a title that is not directly tied to AASP. The CC-AASP suggests being a certified member of an organization that includes members who do not do applied sport psychology practice.	Pro
We need a title that does NOT include the term "psychology". Though we all want this — the legal battle would be lost and more money that AASP had would be spent in futile efforts to use the term "psychology"	Pro

<p>We need a title that does NOT include the term “sport”. Our consultants do more than “sport” work. The current hour breakdown for practice, to become certified, allows for 50% of the hours to be non-sport. If you want sport in the new title, than only SPORT based internships or practices should be allowed. If we want to maintain the broadened areas (e.g., military, dance) we should leave the title as is.</p>	Pro
<p>Other terms sound good — but are problematic: * using “coach” in the title would step on the toes of athletic coaches* using “psychology” is very problematic. The leaders of Div. 47 at APA were very clear that they would not support the use of the term “sport psychology” for non-licensed individuals * using “sport” is problematic unless we disallow all other performance practice (military, dance, music”) for our certification</p>	Pro
<p>To extend point #3, certification with the term "sport psychology" is the confusing option. As long as "sport psychology" remains in the certification mark, we must continue to inform our clientele exactly what we can and cannot do (further dividing clinical and non-clinical practitioners and confusing those we serve). "Sport psychology" is not intuitive and it is misleading. We must explain to our non-sport clients that we can work with them, despite that they are not athletes. We must explain to all our clients when we can provide therapy (because we have clinical or counseling backgrounds) and when we can't and why some practitioners can and others cannot. "Sport psychology" is sexy and nostalgic and has deep meaning to many of us (myself included), but it is not the way of the future. I do hope that one day "psychology" will not be protected and I can use "sport psychology" in my title with my athlete clients, but that day is not today and to halt progress because it isn't exactly what I want is selfish and irresponsible.</p>	Pro
<p>This is not an AASP issue (the ICC and CC, and WHOLE CERTIFICATION PROCESS, are autonomous), yet we are treating it as one. Certification will stand on its own. Resting on what A(A)ASP is/once was is counterproductive. It is a waste of resources. Despite some members' hopes to keep "AASP" in the certification mark, certification is no longer an AASP thing (although the ICC and CC are currently made up of AASP members). Keeping "AASP" in the certification mark will continue to confuse our clients who don't know what in the world AASP is, nor do they care.</p>	Pro
<p>Personally, I don't want the work psychology in the title because it still seems to have a stigma and negative connotation associated with it that does not reflect the work that we do.</p>	Pro
<p>Personally, I don't want the work psychology in the title because it still seems to have a stigma and negative connotation associated with it that does not reflect the work that we do.</p>	Pro
<p>Avoiding the word psychology also allows for a differentiation between performance enhancing mental skills building and general psychological mental health treatment</p>	Pro
<p>Personally, I don't want the work psychology in the title because it still seems to have a stigma and negative connotation associated with it that does not reflect the work that we do.</p>	PRO
<p>Personally, I don't want the word psychology in the title because it still seems to have a stigma and negative connotation associated with it that does not reflect the work that we do. Not having psychology in the title would also help delineate the difference between what we do and clinical practitioners, which would benefit both groups.</p>	Pro
<p>Personally, I don't want the work psychology in the title because it still seems to have a stigma and negative connotation associated with it that does not reflect the work that we do.</p>	Pro

Other Comments About the Mark – comments about the mark not included in other categories

I think having a standard credential across the discipline is necessary	Pro
I am in support of the name change to CMPC. The past CC-AASP was long and confusing to the general public. Simply calling one self a "Certified Consultant" did not adequately address what discipline we were speaking of or what services were offered.	Pro
CMPC closely aligns (in familiarity) with CPT (Certified Personal Trainer), which most coaches and athletes may already understand.	Pro
I support the CMPC credential and mark. The AASP ICC/CC has to call the new certification something, and the rationale provided makes sense (i.e., use of the term "mental" for legal reasons, and the focus on "performance" in a holistic sense, which includes performance excellence in the sport domain as well as other areas).	Pro
In support of change in title as proposed	Pro
Very simply I am in support of CMPC credential and mark. I think it is a step forward for the field and more professional than CC-AASP. I think by adding the weight to the credential with the test that will be taken it will also provide more credibility to the field as professionals.	Pro
I fully support the new title and have heard no alternative credential name proposed that works better. However, I would also be in support of AASP pursuing a legal challenge to the use of SPC (sport psychology consultant) as proposed by John Silva on numerous occasions. I recognize this path is a long-term challenging process but might be worth pursuing.	Pro
I am PRO (supportive of the CMPC credential and mark)	Pro
overall I think the new title captures pretty strongly the practical aspect of what it is that we actually do as consultants.	Pro
I am definitely PRO, in favor of the CMPC mark.(supportive of the CMPC credential and mark)	Pro
I have no issue with the new title and feel that the reasons communicated by the ICC for this title showed a high degree of thought and effort put into creating this title	Pro
Using the credential Mental Performance Consultant is consistent with a successful model (Canada)and we should follow in the footsteps of successful programs, rather than attempting to 'reinvent the wheel.' This may also serve to provide cohesion in the sport psychology fields across North America	Pro
Obviously there are always going to be various opinions about this word or that word could be different/better, but overall I believe CMPC captures who we are and what we do. I hope individuals are able to put aside their personal preferences for the good of the whole	Pro
I think the CMPC title was well thought out, rationales were explained clearly and represents a title that reflects the diversity of our organization. Since not all members can use the term Psychology (or related words) despite thinking they can, it allows the term "Performance" to address sport, exercise, and performance domains. I am fully in support of the use of this title	Pro
I am fully in support of the proposed certification title and mark.	Pro
I like the proposed credential and certification mark (CMPC). It encompasses most (if not all) of what we do. I believe that CMPC suits the needs of practitioners and of the field.	Pro
Certified Consultant - Association for Applied Sport Psychology or CC-AASP change to Certified Mental Performance Consultant - Association for Applied Sport Psychology or CMPC-AASP. This way all we are doing is adding two highly descriptive words in the title to speak more to what our consultants do, keeps sport psychology and adding the strength of a trademark	Pro

with CMPC or the spelling out of the words, it makes sense and it easily understood as to what the certification represents	Pro
Just wanted to indicate that i am PRO the CMPC title. As I am from Canada we have been through this before and have encouraged the members in Canada to use the Mental Performance Consultant term.	Pro
I really like the new title. It's definitely better than CC-AASP, it's inclusive of other types of performance consultations (e.g., arts), and I think it is more friendly to the public/clients.	Pro
I appreciated the review of how your committee came to develop it, and feel strongly about consistency in the field. It was mentioned that other boards use a similar mark, which supports that consistency.	Pro
I am in favor (PRO) for this credential and mark.	Pro
I think that it would be insanely difficult for the committee to come up with a better combination of terms that are more encompassing and accurate of the work that we do	Pro
Canada uses "MPC" We should use a title that is shared by Canada, if possible. That would truly unify US and Canada.	Pro
"CMPC" rolls off the tongue. It sounds good. A welcomed improvement over CC-AASP.	Pro
I think the CMPC title is great.	Pro
I think the CMPC title is great.	Pro
As a part of the JTA, I know that this title accurately represents what we determined practitioners in our field do within their various jobs	Pro
The MPC title has already been piloted successfully in other countries and appropriately supported (tried and true!)	Pro
PRO: While I appreciate our opportunity for input, the ICC was created in a unanimous vote by the organization members and has the sole right to create this new credential so I support the decision that was already made regarding CMPC 100%	Pro
I think the CMPC title is good, but not great.	PRO
The term is consistent with Canada's certification which is reportedly accepted and works.	PRO
I think the CMPC title is great.	Pro
I like that CSPA is already using MPC and this cross-country connection (so to speak) is encouraging for me to think that AASP might actually (maybe) take steps towards becoming the international organization it so desperately wants to be. While the title would still be North American-focused it is arguably more inclusive than the current CC-AASP.	Pro
I looked to the field of counseling for comparisons (much like many people have done with athletic training, S&C, and coaching). Those titles (a) do not list the association within it, (b) are general but specific, (c) often list license or certification first (e.g., licensed mental health counselor), and (d) their practitioner profiles or subsequent credentials list speciality (e.g., LMHC with a speciality in addictions, marriage and family, etc). The new title has a similar format to the bullet points mentioned.	Pro
I do not think the title is excessively vague.	Pro
CMPC is also a title that has been used by others successfully (think about Canada's MPC system) and I think that by aligning with other countries' titles in the same field as us, we will only grow stronger and more recognizable as a profession.	Pro
I think the CMPC title is great!	Pro

A "Certified Mental Performance Consultant" is far more resonant and descriptive of the work we do than "Certified Consultant - Association for Applied Sport Psychology" in the eyes of our stakeholders.	Pro
A coach wanting someone to come in and help their team excel has no idea what AASP is (nor do they care)...they want to know what you can do to help their team get better. the words "mental performance consultant" makes way more intuitive sense to them and will better describe what we will be doing with their team.	Pro
CMPC is cleaner and easier to "sell" to our outside constituents and stakeholders.	Pro
I think the CMPC title is catchy and it has potential to stick with the general public.	Pro
I like the idea of aligning with Canada's titling.	Pro
Strongly against the use of CMPC!	Con
The current title has too many broad terms making the title ambiguous. One recommendation is to pick two-three terms and settle on them for the title.	Con
the suggested name does nothing to provide more clarity to the general public about what we do...an issue that has lingered since the inception of this organization	Con
I would like to state my concerns regarding the new credential and mark. I am not in favor it.	Con
As it stands, it offers our clients more confusion than ever, especially when we will have to explain why the title does not relate to the actual Association name or what it stands for originally.	Con
I do not support the change to CMPC as the credential offered by AASP.	Con
I feel puzzled and alienated by the move to this new certification mark. I experienced the news as AASP having suddenly decided to use a smaller umbrella to draw its members together, and I feel I no longer fit under the umbrella	Con
Although it is not perfect, I am in favor of continued use of the CC-AASP credential and mark as it has gained recognition in the field and highlights the credential's relationship to sport psychology	Con
The new CMPC title seems to exclude key aspects of social psychology, health psychology, and exercise psychology	Con
The poor fit of the new credential and mark with the work that people do is highlighted by the Brief Summary and Utility of the Job Task Analysis shared with AASP members	Con
I have NO ISSUES with how the title was decided upon, nor do I have any issues with the title.	Con
I support the process, the task analysis, and the updated credential (PROS), except the name	Con
...it creates a division between those in Canada who are MPC's and those in the US who will now use the CMPC title... To truly unify North America as you mentioned in this email, all practitioners - MPC/CMPC - who have completed the same training should be referred to with the same title.	Con
The title currently proposed by the ICC, Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) will be disruptive. CMPC is vague to fellow professionals as well as the consumer.	Con
By changing the certification title to CMPC the association would sacrifice a professional identity that has been built over 25+ years. AASP and the professional practice will progress further and faster by strengthening and building upon an existing title with recognized identity such as SPC and CC-AASP rather than starting from a brand base of zero.	Con
Consider that there is significant resistance to the title Certified Mental Performance Consultant and that the new certification title and certification model may drive members away from certification and re-certification.	Con

<p>One of the intentions of the CMPC credential/mark is that it demonstrates that practitioners can “work effectively in sport and other performance domains (e.g., performing arts, military)”. With many practitioners currently working within the U.S. Army’s Ready and Resilient program, the MP within CMPC could be confused with the established acronym of MP - Military Police, making the credential convoluted.</p>	Con
<p>Consider that there is significant resistance to the credential/mark Certified Mental Performance Consultant and that this may drive members away from certification and re-certification.</p>	Con
<p>I know that sadly some people are considering leaving AASP, due in large part I believe to some of the many recent changes and the lack of "relevance" and lack of marketing of the certification as it stands now. This new CMPC title change does not help here.</p>	Con
<p>I am strongly against the name change Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC).</p>	Con
<p>From an outside perspective, this has the characteristics of a money grab and not a true effort to develop our field. This is why from a business perspective it does not make sense to change our overall mission.</p>	Con
<p>from a semantic perspective the title Certified Mental Performance Consultant simply put, is confusing. The mission and values of our field are engrained in the field of sport. The title does not reflect that our expertise is in sport. Mental performance can be anything. The abbreviation MP in a military setting stands for military police. The Canadian Sport Psychology Association has adopted the title MPC. The adoption of CMPC might confuse potential clients between the two organizations.</p>	Con
<p>The credential & mark do nothing to address the title issue. I respect that this call for comment was not about the title, but if the issue of title is substantial for the field, then making a substantive change to the credential and mark that does not, as specifically pointed out multiple times by AASP and AASP personnel, address the issue of title seems unnecessary. Despite this within the email from AASP on Aug. 23 it says the E-board began the discussion by including the issue of title. To then make them separate and distinct issues seems disingenuous at least. I am open to evidence that supports a change being necessary, even if it still does nothing for title, but absent that evidence it seems a change is being made for change’s sake.</p>	Con
<p>Why is trademarking the credential so beneficial? The culminating paragraph of the Aug. 23 email suggests that AASP will devote resources toward challenging non-AASP certified folks from using the “Certified Mental Performance Consultant” or “Mental Performance Consultant”. First, how does that help the field more than those same resources devoted to education for the public on why a sport psychology consultant (whatever the title) can help? Second, legally going after folks using “MPC” would seem to be those same friends in Canada using that title. How is that unifying? Finally, this is exactly a title issue as the Aug. 23 email culminating paragraph states “legally challenge non-certified individuals who chose to refer to themselves with any of these professional titles”. So we members are not supposed to link the professional title issue with the CMPC mark, but AASP can link the two for stating the benefits of making this change?</p>	Con
<p>Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) is long winded.</p>	Con
<p>I believe that one of AASP's aims is to try to have more influence in not only neighboring countries but also in Asia in the future. To this day AASP is still unknown in the greater China area. Given the fact that AASP prides itself on having international membership, the change in title makes it even harder for international members and CC-AASPs to carry out their work as it distances people away from understanding what the Association does.</p>	Con
<p>Although I like each term individually, they do not sound coherent when merged together.</p>	CON

The title feels long and bulky to me, so I appreciated that the ICC considered the measure of "rolling off the tongue" in their decision. At the same time, I don't think CC-AASP is that much better, but since I have been "raised" in AASP with this moniker over the last eight years, it feels more condensed and easily-understandable. I imagine that after a period of time, CMPC will become just as familiar. However, if there are other "sleeker" options, I would encourage the ICC/CC to consider those (but after reading the explanation it sounds like CMPC was the best choice of many ideas).	Con
I find the title to be vague. I feel it is both general and yet limited in scope.	Con
The CMPC title does not reflect my years of schooling/training.	Con
Certified Mental Performance Consultant and CMPC is long winded/wordy	Con
The Association has been going many years and has already built some credibility (mainly in the USA) with the CC-AASP credential. To change now to CMPC is almost a band aid approach to try and fix something that still doesn't quite resolve the issues concerning whether it describes what we do as a professional body	Con
I do not believe either mark (CC-AASP or CMPC) adequately describe who we are or what we do, and the proposed change is a step in the wrong direction.	Con
CMPC is vague and unclear - I suspect that if I were to ask 10 people to define mental performance, there would be 10 different answers	Con
CMPC is not consumer friendly. When I asked a marketing expert about the proposed CMPC title, their response was a wrinkled nose and an expression that communicated WTF? It was all she could do not to use the actual words. When she did speak, she said, (her quotes, not mine) "What does that even mean? It sounds gimmicky and like one of those made up credentials you get at one of those overpriced weekend workshops." She went on to say the proposed title "leaves a lot to be desired", and it "does not say anything that effectively communicates what you do". She concluded with the thought that the title needs to include the word Sport given that our field is rooted in sport.	Con
Expanding the certification title to Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) is non-descriptive and confusing.	Con
The title currently proposed by the ICC, Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) will be disruptive. CMPC is vague to fellow professionals as well as the consumer.	Con
We appreciate action by the AASP Executive Board, the ICC and the CC of the recommendations and the arguments offered in opposition to the proposed CMPC title.	Con
All of the undersigned oppose the selection of the proposed title Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC).	Con
1) By changing the certification title to CMPC the association would sacrifice a professional identity that has been built over 25+ years. AASP and the professional practice will progress further and faster by strengthening and building upon an existing title with recognized identity such as SPC and CC-AASP rather than starting from a brand base of zero.	Con
Regardless of title, the change from "CC-AASP" to "CMPC" requires an update to all of my professional materials. Being in private practice this comes directly from my pocket and includes websites, social media accounts, business cards, business flyers, and a variety of additional printed materials. A conservative estimate of this is at least \$500 and that is a direct expense. Unlike faculty members that simply spend the university's money or have IT make these changes, for individuals in private practice that is not the case.	Con

Legal or Licensing Concerns – comments about legality of titles or practice

<p>Because it is the organization that is identified (AASP), this seems like a clearly legal way to allow consultants to have "sport psychology" as part of their certification title. I would be an advocate of "Sport/Performance Psychology Consultant" except it gets into legally questionable territory.</p>	Con
<p>The idea that AASP and its credential should avoid the word psychology is problematic and concerning. Yes, following legally established practice acts are important - However, not all states have practice laws that limit the term psychology. More importantly, not all laws are just or appropriate. The fact that roughly half the states do not limit the term psychology is a good indication of these points. It is appropriate for our field to pursue the term psychology, even if it means that we will have to work state by state over many years to establish our own practice acts and bring clarity to the use of the term "psychology".</p>	Con
<p>A parallel example comes from the field of athletic training. Athletic training has been going through these types of battles "against" the field of physical therapy for several years now and THEY HAVE WON! IN COURT WHEN NECESSARY! AASP can win these battles too! It will take time - years if not decades - but we cannot talk about topics such as grit and resilience with our clients and then fail to exhibit these very same qualities within our own professional organization.</p>	Con
<p>Athletic training has been gradually gaining licensure in each state for many years now. It is absolutely a huge undertaking and a state by state process but their organization has shown that they are willing to do what it takes to protect their own profession (and their consumers) through certification marks, and licensure, and that it can be done, even if the process takes years to complete. WE MUST DO THE SAME!</p>	Con
<p>Even if AASP is denied legal use of the title SPC the process will be good for the profession and practice of sport psychology. It will be a step forward in providing information and clarity for the legal argument against use of the SPC title. If AASP is denied legal use, the association should appeal. Sometimes it takes a few attempts to revise an unjust law. AASP has the resources to address the title issue in a proper legal manner.</p>	Con
<p>CMPC will be trademarked.</p>	Pro
<p>It also allows for those of us not at the the licensed level (PhD or otherwise) to feel more connected and not "less than" (inclusive).</p>	Pro
<p>The word choices for the new title does an excellent job of navigating legally appropriate phrases (no psychology/counseling terminology)</p>	Pro
<p>Avoiding the word psychology in the title also helps to keep those non-licensed professionals from feeling justified in using the term and so it protects both licensed individuals who can still appropriately use derivatives of the word psychology and unlicensed individuals who will be less likely to unknowingly misrepresent themselves</p>	Pro
<p>CMPC completely and accurately describes what we do in a way that is also ethical and without legal concerns. Having worked with NCAA athletes, the term coach is incredibly problematic due to coach restrictions. Psychology/Psychologist stills carries a stigma with some teams and is concerning ethically at times. Performance encompasses some of the newer integration into other performance arenas beyond sport. Only utilizing sport and/or exercise may turn some clients away. CMPC is perfectly covers all of the necessary bases to advance AASP and the field. It means what it says and it says what it means.</p>	Pro

Suggestions for Marks other than CMPC

<p>I think the term “psychologist” should be a doctoral level designation (as in “sport psychologist”), but I have no problem with professionals calling themselves “sport psychology consultants” if they have the education and training to do so, whether the graduate degree is masters/doctoral, or the terminal degree is in psychology or sport psychology. As long as the education/training is achieved, and the professional meets AASP certification criteria (including receiving appropriate supervision and passing the exam, and maintains competence and capability through continuing education), then I’m in support of the title “Sport Psychology Consultant”. Since this title isn’t legally permissible for non-licensed practitioners to use yet, I’m in support of the AASP ICC/CC calling the certification credential “Certified Mental Performance Consultant or CMPC”. It is hoped that AASP will work with states and APA to allow the title (and thus certification credential and mark) “Sport Psychology Consultant” to be permissible in the future</p>	Pro
<p>Suggestions: Consider adding a designation to the type of certification/domain (ex: Clinically licensed providers have the "L" attached to the certification mark; Exercise Science/Kinesiology providers have the "E" attached; Performing Arts providers have the "P" attached...if a provider has documented training/supervision in multiple domains then the mark does not have a domain designation)</p>	Pro
<p>I would expect that we could have a similar process – a general title with speciality area that are acquired through schooling, degrees, exams, experience, and/or the like, such as "CMPC with a speciality in sport/exercise/performing arts/master athletes, etc." I realize we are not mental health clinicians (and the rest of the debate – plenty of work for both and need for both), but it might be useful to cite precedent for titling beyond the realm of sport.</p>	Pro
<p>I would consider “Specialist” instead of consultant as it still suggests a collaborative relationship and an expertise.</p>	Pro
<p>I believe strength and conditioning uses specialist and you often see it as “Behavior Change Specialist”.</p>	Pro
<p>I strongly agree with Jim Taylor’s suggestion that “Sport Mental Training Specialist-Certified” is a significantly more useful title for practitioners in the field.</p>	Con
<p>In thinking about the consumer (athletes, sport industry admin, parents, etc.) and words that are relatable to sport culture I have provided the following list of possible titles for consideration: Sport-Performance Specialist, Sport-Exercise Specialist, Sport Resilience Coach, Optimal Performance Professional, Peak Performance Specialist, Peak Performance Professional</p>	Con
<p>My suggested title would be "Certified Mental Trainer for Sport and Performance" or something along those lines</p>	Con
<p>I don't see why the term sports psychology consultant cannot be placed within the credential. The term sports psychologist is firmly credentialed in a consultant that has earned the PhD or PsyD level of education. The doctorate classification should be distinguishable enough to separate the difference between the two specialists.</p>	Con
<p>Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC) is the most descriptive and factually accurate title representing AASP certification. This title has been in use world-wide for many years.</p>	Con

<p>The Job Task Analysis (JTA) very clearly states the specifications are for applied sport psychology practitioners. While the Subject Matter Experts who worked on creating the JTA were from a variety of backgrounds, the Interim Certification Council (ICC) indicated in their email on August 23, that the JTA was completed "to identify the domains of practice, tasks performed, and knowledge required for the effective performance as a professional in sport psychology." Therefore, the improved certification program through AASP is fundamentally grounded in the education & training of sport psychology, hence the recommendation CSPC</p>	Con
<p>"Sport Psychologist" is the most commonly known title for practitioners in the field. By using similar language that is already well known and accepted by the general public and potential consumers, it would make CSPC easily recognizable, provide a smooth transition from CC-AASP, and positively impact the marketability of sport psychology services. Additionally, CSPC would build on the professional identity of AASP that has been established over the past 25+ years. Furthermore, CSPC would clearly distinguish a certified consultant from a licensed psychologist, allowing AASP to better educate the general public and potential consumers about the benefits of obtaining sport psychology services from a CSPC.</p>	Con
<p>I also like "Mental Skills Coach" and this is the main title we encourage our trainees here to use, especially the ones who are not getting clinical training.</p>	Con
<p>In the CMPC Credential and Mark Rationale email sent on August 23rd, it stated that the discussion about the legal use of "psychology" as a descriptor for this certification goes far beyond the scope of the charge given to the ICC/CC. Given that Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC) seems to be a popular choice for the certification credential/mark, perhaps a new charge should be given to explore and work towards that possibility.</p>	CON
<p>I have had rigorous training in performance, mental health counselling, wellbeing all within sport and general population contexts cross-Atlantic. This began within an applied counselling sport psychology program with further applied practice. If only there was this standardised training model in the sport psychology field. If any changes are to be made, why not negotiate with the Psychological Associations to adopt a certification title that reflects better what AASP stands for. Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC) would be a better way forward if the legalities can be negotiated. The title CC-AASP still has little sport institutional recognition in the United Kingdom and yet the Association prides itself on having international membership. Perhaps SPC, if recognised by APA, will have more recognition in other international countries. I would hope that it may be easier then to have some reciprocity with the likes of other psychological societies such as the BPS (DSEP)</p>	Con
<p>My marketing expert's suggested revision to the title: CERTIFIED SPORT AND PERFORMANCE PSYCHOLOGY CONSULTANT. She acknowledged that it was a little long but stated that at least it was clear, consumer friendly, and effectively communicated what we do.</p>	Con
<p><u>Recommended AASP Certified Title: Sport Psychology Consultant</u> "You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today". Abraham Lincoln Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC) is the most descriptive and factually accurate title representing AASP certification. This title has been in use world-wide for many years. A <i>consultant</i> is consistently defined as a professional who provides advice in a particular area of expertise. A SPC applies information from the established field of sport psychology and related disciplines on matters relevant and specific to that education and training. What would be the legal arguments against a person who has proper education, training and certification from a globally recognized sport psychology association having the right to be certified as a Sport Psychology Consultant?</p>	Con
<p>The time is right for AASP to make a legal claim to the title Sport Psychology Consultant.</p>	Con

Procedure Comments - comments or recommendations about the procedure that should be followed to decide on a certification mark

I recognize that the ICC/CC operate at an arm's length from AASP and the e-board, but rolling out a major name change without any greater membership consultation was a huge misstep. What we call ourselves is important and must have buy-in - this certainly wasn't the way to achieve the latter.	Con
Need more time to get input from members. The organization is "rushing" this process.	Con
I hope that the organization re-thinks these policies and delays all of decisions until February 2018. The organization needs time and feedback to get it right. I recommend having an open forum at the annual meeting in Orlando. I believe the organization may lose many existing members.	Con
Delay the name change for at least 5 years. This allows us to make an informed decision. It will also allow us to fight to be included to use the term psychology	Con
The membership, specifically those that are already CC-AASP, should be surveyed ahead of any potential name change.	Con
Where is the data that making this change is necessary and will be helpful? AASP is populated by a majority of members that are students or faculty and thus conducting studies is exactly within their wheelhouse. To make any substantial change, such as CMPC, there should be ample data to support the change. If no data is available in support, why make the change? Market research even in select localities or with select potential populations? Nationwide focus groups with current or potential clients to establish viable options? If any of this was done, I'm certainly willing to hear that CMPC is the winner, but absent it; I simply don't understand why a change was necessary.	Con
it seems based on discussions via SportPsy list serve that there is strong opposition still to this change and that further examination of a need to change seems essential.	Con
This is a big proposed change. Given discussions just started in April, there has not been an opportunity to discuss this item at AASP's conference business meeting. While there has been an opportunity to provide feedback via email, I think there is something to be said for having face to face interaction with membership at this meeting. It is helpful for AASP members to hear and participate in these exchanges to get a fuller picture of the issues on both sides.	CON
The decision for the new certification credential/mark was made because it was believed to be advantageous. In the CMPC Credential and Mark Rationale email sent on August 23rd, it states that both the E-Board and the ICC debated the pros and cons of this change. It would be nice to see not only the pros which were provided in the email communications, but also the cons and how those were responded to.	CON
In the CMPC Credential and Mark Rationale email sent on August 23rd, it states that there was overall positive support from the Fellows. Was a vote taken? While not	CON

all Past-Presidents are Fellows, I am aware that a number of Past-Presidents oppose this change.	
there needs to be a step by step process over years.	Con
IF a title change is to occur, I believe it should occur only after efforts have been exhausted to address the larger question of legality with titles. AASP should begin a systematic approach to lobbying States, in a manner that mirrors or is guided by what occurred with "School Psychologists."	Con
To this end, I believe AASP should create an independent committee with this goal in mind, which would be granted financial resources, especially to address legal fees.	Con
AASP should work in conjunction with the American Psychological Association to acknowledge that use of the SPC title is warranted when specified criteria are met.	Con
<u>Recommendations 1.</u> Place a five-year moratorium on the selection of a new title for AASP certification. 2. During this five-year time frame keep the current title: Certified Consultant – AASP. 3. Initiate proceedings for the legal protection of the title: Sport Psychology Consultant (SPC). A certified title granted exclusively by AASP which can only be legally used by individuals who receive AASP Certification. 4. The five-year moratorium can be removed only if litigation is successful or after all litigation options including the appeal process are exhausted. 5. Provide educational and re-tooling courses at the AASP conferences and on-line at no cost or very minimal cost to members. Do not overly tax the rank and file members who desire to receive AASP certification or re-certification.	Con
Last year, at the Business Meeting in Phoenix, AZ, we voted to give the ICC and newly formed CC autonomous control over decisions related to certification. We trusted those entities, and the individuals who compose them, implicitly, to act in our best interests, without input or approval from us. As such, THIS DISCUSSION IS A MOOT POINT!	Pro
Certification discussions do not need to be delayed any longer. We have had years to prepare for this and we have prepared and made a good decision. There is no need to backtrack now because some individuals did not voice their opinions during their numerous previous opportunities.	Pro
I writing to offer my unconditional support for the Certification Council and their decisions throughout the process of review and update of our certification process	Pro
Additionally, I'm disappointed in this recent ground swell of dissent, not because I'm against dissent but because the certification council has spent several years on this process and everyone has had multiple opportunities for input as well committee membership. This whole certification review process started years ago, then following the job task analysis has spent several years to come up with what they believe the best direction to take with the certification process to the benefit and support of our profession	Pro
The ICC is autonomous.	Pro

What One Calls Self - comments about what one or others calls him-/herself in practice

Moving forward with the CMPC title does not prevent practitioners from using other titles. In other words, practitioners will not be limited by the new title.	Pro
I have been in private practice for 19 years and currently work full-time in my private practice. I also have 6 people who are working for me in my company. The two larger contracts I have recently received (both prior to the CMPC announcement) have independently determined what my title would be with them. Both came back to me with the same title, "Mental Performance Coach". One of these is with a large university athletics department, the other is with a professional soccer team. They both stated to me that they did not want to use any terminology (specifically the word "psychology") that would make the athletes feel it was mental health. They were very clear in that they wanted someone who was trained in performance enhancement and thus, they each came up with that title.	Pro
The distinction between the term consultant and coach is significant in the title of the certification although those who choose to are free to call themselves a mental performance coach or use coach in their own title/label	Pro
Those individuals who wish to use different titles when referring to themselves to clients can do so as they choose. Certified Mental Performance Consultant/CMPC only refers to the designation on the business card/signature line. AASP is not limiting how you refer to yourself with clients. I think this may be the most misunderstood principle with regard to the credential, which seems to be upsetting to some.	Pro
The title of the certification and what you call yourself DO NOT need to be the same thing. For example, certified Strength Coaches call themselves Strength Coaches, but there certification is called a CSCS (Certified Strength and Conditioning Specialist).	Pro
The title of the certification does NOT have to determine what certified consultants call themselves.	Pro

Other – comments NOT about the CMPC mark, including changing certification process, changing the requirements or cost of the new certification process, rushing the process, that AASP should better market sport psychology or sport psychologists; etc.

Grand father people in who are already members with AASP. WE are getting penalized with taking a test etc. Many of us have been in the field 30 years. Other organization do not expect members to take new boards etc. New members should be required to take new exams etc, not members already certified.	Con
Re think cont education requirements. I was told to fulfill 6 during my period which started in 2013. Now I am expected to fulfill 15 by 2018. The new regulations require 75 hrs for 5 years!!! This is not consistent with the past requirements. I recommend that the Cont ed requirements be fair and consistent with the “original” requirements of each member’s situation. It is not fair to “change” this requirement. People have busy lives and would make this impossible.	Con
Recommend the organization for members to send in CV and achievements etc to be reviewed by committee.	Con
The field cannibalizes itself.	Con
It's members are mostly academic population.	Con
Almost 50% of it's members are students, and these are different students every few years.	Con
Applied wise- The field is then split between clinical psychologists & Sport Psychology.	Con
Clinical psychologists do not want non-apa licensure folks working with athletic populations. There haveeven been keynote addresses at AASP and NCAA white papers stating such stances.	Con
the field of applied sport psychology for non-licensured needs to keep the same standard and notworry nor waste time and money so much about what to call ourselves, but to promote, educate, andmarket CC-AASP to NCAA and NGB's, etc.	Con
I have no problem, with the CE or conference attendance requirements, but between the exam and change of mark, I think it is highly unlikely at this point that I will pursue recertificaiton when mine expires next year	Con
I worry that if changes are made, the authority of the committee moving forward will be in question as there will be evidence that their decisions can be changed.	Con
The potential costs and additional requirements for CMPC certification for new as well as established members of the practice are excessive and should be reconsidered.	Con
There is no evidence (at least to my knowledge) to suggest that CMPC and Certified Mental Performance Consultant have any real marketing value outside of Canada due to their development of the Mental Performance Consultant (MPC) brand for nearly a decade, versus the established marketing value of the terms sport psychology, sport psychology services, and sport psychology consultants. This is a massive concern in terms of moving the brand of CMPC and AASP, as well as sport psychology services in general, forward to generate web traffic and therefore business to practitioners in the United States. If anything, particularly in early years of adoption of CMPC, this may actually drive traffic and business to MPCs in Canada as online consulting capabilities are only proving to be stronger in this age of technological advances, which is counterproductive to marketing services to consumers in the United States.	Con
With the adoption of CSPC, there would leave few desirable titles for uncertified practitioners to use, as evidenced by ICC’s mention of the already existing titles of performance enhancement consultant, mental skills trainer, and mental coach. This would likely persuade competent practitioners to obtain certification and recertify at a higher level.	Con

<p>What is ultimately the most important is that AASP moves forward in building the brand of sport psychology, not of the association, and not of a more general, unestablished field of mental performance. This is what will help practitioners in a wide variety of settings (e.g., private practice, academia, athletic departments, professional sports organizations, etc.) to be successful, to be seen as credible, to be sought after, and to make a reasonable living.</p>	Con
<p>The dates surrounding the CMPC changeover and credential. Per the ICC's July 24 program update, it seems as though all currently CC-AASP folks are no longer able to use the "CC-AASP" designation as of October 1, 2017. That does not seem ethical in that the CC-AASP certificate was 'good' for a period of five years which would seem to run through a possibility of 2021 for some folks. I am projecting a bit, but I suspect there are hundreds of current CC-AASP folks that are to begin using a "CMPC" on their promotional materials before they take, and pass, the CMPC protocols. I don't see how that is ethical by any standard, which of course is ironic given the new re-certifying guidelines specifically require ethics CEUs. Much was made that there would be no "grandfathering" in for the CMPC, but by disavowing the CC-AASP immediately in favor of the CMPC, there seem to be more folks grandfathered in than not.</p>	Con
<p>I was strongly against the name change from AAASP to AASP several years ago for a number of reasons, one being that the removal of the word "advancement" would imply that we have reached our greatest potential and no longer have the need for growth and advancement. This is obviously not the case.</p>	Con
<p>While there are sport psychology professionals working in areas such as the performing arts and the military and I'm sure many do a great job with this, I question if appropriate consideration has been given to training. As part of the past and future certification processes, AASP members have had to demonstrate that they have had the appropriate training (knowledge/coursework) in the sport sciences. Should this expand to cover the other performance areas the ICC is trying to encompass in the CMPC certification credential/mark? And as a side note, will this be part of the new certification test?</p>	CON
<p>It is very appropriate for two different professionals to hold two different credentials that contain the same word - consider physical therapist, occupational therapist, and physio-therapist (international term). All three use the word therapist yet they each have distinct roles within the healthcare field. Another example is the word coach - there are sport coaches, strength & conditioning coaches, life coaches and so forth. All use the word coach. More importantly, all of these entities can, and do, get along, collaborate, and work alongside each other. There is room at the table for both sport psychologists (licensed by the state and certified by APA) and sport psychology consultants (licensed by the state and certified by AASP).</p>	Con
<p>1) Consider that there is significant resistance to the title Certified Mental Performance Consultant and that the new certification title and certification model may drive members away from certification and re-certification.</p>	Con
<p>1) The potential costs and additional requirements for CMPC certification for new as well as established members of the practice are excessive and should be reconsidered.</p>	Con
<p>I plan on practicing "sport psychology" in another country so I would hope that AASP will not only focus on helping this new certification gain traction in North America but also around the world.</p>	Pro
<p>The title is not really the concern for the field. The biggest concern for the field is not what we call ourselves, but rather, ensuring that only qualified people can use the title and practice in the field. There are far too many charlatans who believe they can do what we do after a weekend crash course reading a few books or a general degree in psychology with no sport specialization. It is incredibly frustrating to continue fighting this battle. Rather than fighting about what we call ourselves, we should be fighting to provide a verified space within the profession.</p>	Pro
<p>Overall, I like the explanations you gave in the original e-mail outlining why you selected each word. That was very helpful.</p>	Pro

<p>Delaying the new certification because some members are unhappy is counter-intuitive. First, there is no way to guarantee everyone's satisfaction--we tell our athletes and coaches this, it's time we look in the mirror. Second, stalling progress now not only hurts individual members, especially those delaying certification until the new system is in place, it also hurts our clients. We moved to new certification standards to increase the rigor of our certification. Failing to move forward because some individuals don't like the mark, CMPC, sacrifices the many for the few.</p>	Pro
<p>If we wish to unify sport psychology, as a field and a profession, globally, should we not start aligning ourselves with what the rest of the world (or at least Canada) is doing? Why do we need to reinvent the wheel? Why do we know better than all of the other sport psychology organizations around the world? If we can put our pride aside and admit that perhaps someone else has already figured it out, and that we can take that and build from it, won't we all be better for it, as a global community?</p>	Pro
<p>To return to my first point, and expand on it, we made a landmark decision in Phoenix in 2016, AS A MEMBERSHIP. We chose to give autonomous control of certification to the ICC and, later, the CC. Despite dissension in the fellows meeting and prior to voting in the business meeting, only one "nay" could be heard when votes were cast. I was there. It was a powerful moment. If we question this landmark decision, what groundwork are we laying for future decisions? How might we ever move towards accreditation or state-protected titles or globalization of our field? We counsel our clients to pick their battles; we need to do the same--this is not a battle we can or should fight.</p>	Pro
<p>For all those who had issue with CC-AASP not having teeth, this is our fresh start to create a title that is more representative and we can move forward very actively in marketing, trademarking, and following many other fields in which similar processes</p>	Pro
<p>Another concern I have is what I see as a knee jerk response to a few dissenting voices at the end of the long process of review an updating the certification process. If you do decide to undercut the findings of all of the committees work I would fear it would eviscerate the value of the committee process and the value of their work</p>	Pro
<p>Having a credential will be great for AASP, and the field in general, which will now be able to promote to consumers that there is an actual certification. Plus, this specific credential can be reserved for those individuals who earn it giving it more weight.</p>	Pro
<p>Last year, at the Business Meeting in Phoenix, AZ, we voted to give the ICC and newly formed CC autonomous control over decisions related to certification. We trusted those entities, and the individuals who compose them, implicitly, to act in our best interests, without input or approval from us. In short, not every single person will be happy with this, but that's ok. This change is needed if we want to eventually get the same respect as Athletic Trainers or Strength and Conditioning coaches (both certified and recognized).</p>	Pro
<p>I may not quote this exactly, but I have often heard that "the most dangerous phrase is, 'we've always done it this way.'" My believe is that although some of the voices that oppose CMPC are experienced and loud, they are not focused on the greater good of the field and our consumers. Certification is essential if we hope to grow and create more long-term positions for young professionals and students. I trust in the committee and in this process.</p>	Pro