

The South Carolina Board of Examiners in Psychology

Message from Administrator Patti Glenn

(1) The Psychology Board welcomed four new Board members appointed by Governor Jim Hodges on September 23, 1999. The new appointees are: D. Oliver Bowman, Ph.D., a counseling/school psychologist from Charleston; Robert Caesar, Ph.D., a clinical psychologist from Irmo; Jerry L. White, Ph.D., a clinical psychologist from Mt. Pleasant; and Leon N. Richburg, public member from Summerton. Dr. Bowman replaces Dr. Paul Doerring from Hilton Head Island, Dr. Caesar replaces Dr. Connie Best from Charleston, Dr. White fills the clinical psychologist vacancy, and Mr. Richburg fills the public member vacancy. Our sincere thanks go to Connie and Paul for their dedication and service to the Psychology Board.

(2) Paul Doerring will continue to serve the Board in his role as "consulting psychologist" on the Complaint Review Committee. This change in complaint procedures, appointing a former Board member rather than having a current

See ADMINISTRATOR on page 3

Inside

Board Members	2
Disciplinary Actions	2
Sufficient Professional Information	3
Complaint Information	4
Questions & Answers on EPPP	5
Complaint Review	7
License Report	8
Mobility	9
Application & Exam Report	10

Regulation and Public Policy

By **DAVID E. BARRETT, Ph.D., Chair,**
S.C. Board of Examiners in Psychology

In the last four years, the Board of Examiners in Psychology has been visibly involved in a number of legislative matters. These include testifying against master's level licensure for psychologists before the State Reorganization Commission (1996-1997), helping to amend Chapter 55, the South Carolina statute governing the practice of psychology (1996-1998), and testifying before the Administrative Law Judge Division regarding regulations for licensed professional counselors, marriage and family therapists and psycho-educational specialists (1999-present).

The Board's recent involvement in legislative matters raises a number of questions about the proper role of the Board, and specifically the relationship between the Board's function as a regulatory agency and its activity relating to policy-making. From the point of view of Board members, the issue we must address is how to ensure that we uphold our obligation to objectively enforce existing laws, even as we recognize the need for and, on occasion, work toward changes in those laws. From the point of view of the public, the issue is the integrity of the Board as a regulatory agency, as opposed to an interest group promoting the profession of psychology. In this column I address these concerns.

The South Carolina Board of Examiners in Psychology is a regulatory agency. The members of the Board are appointed by the Governor to enforce the South Carolina Code of Laws as they pertain to the practice of psychology. This involves, among other things, deciding who can and cannot be licensed, determining the appropriate specialty areas and limitations on practice for licensed psychologists, and disciplining psychologists who break the law.

Although its function is to protect the

public by enforcing state law, the Psychology Board, like any regulatory agency, must also be involved in public policy. There are three levels at which the Psychology Board engages in policy-making: (1) the development of internal rules and procedures necessary to enforce statute and regulation, (2) the continual evaluation of existing law and, when appropriate, the recommending of changes in the law, and (3) the education of the public, including lawmakers and other non-psychologists, regarding the professional practice of psychology.

An example of the first type of policy-making involves the Board's efforts to appropriately interpret section 40-55-80:5 of the South Carolina Code of Laws. According to South Carolina law, to be licensed as a psychologist the candidate must furnish the Board "with satisfactory evidence that the candidate has not engaged in unethical practices." What constitutes satisfactory evidence? Consider for example the applicant who is licensed in another state and against whom there is an unresolved complaint. Does the absence of a previous finding by a state psychology board that the applicant committed an ethical violation constitute satisfactory evidence? Or should the Board delay any action on the application until the other state Board has arrived at a conclusion about the complaint? Finally, what if an investigation against an applicant has been closed but with the applicant admitting in a settlement agreement to some or all of the allegations? These are interpretive issues, and the Psychology Board must arrive at a set of decision rules for determining whether or not the application requirements set out in 40-55-

See REGULATION on page 8

Board of Examiners in Psychology Members

Disciplinary Actions of the Board

MEMBER	SPECIALTY	TERM EXP
George Atkinson, Jr., Ph. D. Redfern Health Center Counseling & Psychological Services Clemson University Clemson, SC 29634 (864) 656-2451	Counseling	3/21/2001
David E. Barrett, Ph. D. 4811 Great Oaks Dr. Anderson, SC 29625 (864) 656-5088	Experimental	5/21/2003
Janet U. Boland, Ph. D. One Harbison Way, #110 Columbia, SC 29212 (803) 781-4265	School	3/21/2000
D. Oliver Bowman, Ph. D. 6 Fort Royal Ave. Charleston, SC 29407-6012 (843) 766-5699	Counseling	5/21/2003
Robert Caesar, Ph. D. 313 Shillingford Rd. Irmo, SC 29063 (803) 898-1542	Clinical	4/30/2002
Leon N. Richburg Route 2, Box 2218 Willie Richburg Rd. Summerton, SC 29148 (803) 435-2527	Public Member	7/21/2002
Jerry L. White, Ph. D. 678 Pelzer Dr. Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464 (843) 851-5010	Clinical	4/30/2002
Brian J. Yore, Ph. D. 97 Laurel Ridge Greenville, SC 29609 (864) 455-3806	Clinical	3/21/2001

Board Officers Serving 2000-2001:

David E. Barrett, Ph. D., Chairman
Janet U. Boland, Ph. D., Vice Chairman
George Atkinson, Jr., Ph. D., Secretary

During the 1999-2000 fiscal year (beginning July 1, 1999), the Board investigated 11 new complaints of licensed psychologists from members of the public. The Board also investigated and corresponded with seven persons (not licensed as psychologists) who were misrepresenting themselves to the public as providers of psychological services.

The results of those investigations of licensees from fiscal year 1999-2000 are as follows:

- Two complaint forms were never returned to the Board office.
- After full investigations, three complaints were dismissed for insufficient evidence or were found to be groundless complaints.
- One complaint was dismissed with a "Letter of Caution" addressing the issue of record keeping. The Board recommended that the psychologist be more specific in taking notes during therapy sessions.
- Four complaints are ongoing, three of which may result in hearings.
- One anonymous complaint could not be investigated because the anonymous complainant would not give the name of the psychologist involved in the complaint.
- Seven "Cease & Desist" letters were sent to unlicensed persons misrepresenting themselves as a psychologist or practicing as one.

Three ongoing investigations from fiscal year 1998-1999 resulted in the following:

- All three complaints were dismissed for lack of evidence to support a violation of the South Carolina Code of Laws, Chapter 55 or Regulation 100.

Sufficient Professional Information

By Brian J. Yore, Ph. D.

In response to numerous inquiries and a recent publication, the Board of Examiners has engaged in formal discussions concerning the issue of sufficient professional information. In the regulations implementing the licensing statute, the section on code of ethics states, "A psychologist rendering a formal professional opinion about a person shall not do so without direct and substantial professional contact in a formal assessment of that person." [Section 100-4.C. (6)]

While it appears that in the vast majority of cases, the regulation leaves little need for interpretation, the Board is aware of circumstances where "substantial professional contact, readily interpreted as face to face contact, may be limited." There may be circumstances

where "blind interpretation" is required.

As most practitioners are aware, the pressures of managed care to reduce services are ever increasing, leading to limited test selection, pressures for immediate discharge in inpatient settings, etc. While rarely desirable, the Board believes that opinions can be rendered under such circumstances as long as the type of contact is delineated, and that the resultant uncertainty in terms of the opinion rendered be clearly noted. Practitioners may want to avoid, in such circumstances, the development of formal diagnoses and/or utilize the various notations available indicating diagnostic uncertainty. Practitioners may also want to note in their reports the specific circumstances and limitations imposed externally (e.g. managed

care limitations, specific referral source requests, etc.), as well as listing what would be necessary in terms of additional time or assessment instruments to render a more certain opinion.

The Board is aware that practitioner's roles change, depending on various settings and circumstances. Members of treatment teams may require less interview time than consultants or solo practitioners. It is clear from Board discussions that no hard and fast rules would apply to all circumstances, and that, as usual, inquiries will necessarily be dealt with on an individual basis. Licensees are urged to be mindful of the regulations and to exercise prudence in rendering their professional opinions. ■

From the Administrator

Continued from page 1

Board member sit on the Complaint Review Committee, was recommended by the LLR General Counsel's office. This new procedure allows the full Board to participate in a hearing or disciplinary proceeding without a Board member having to recuse himself/herself.

(3) The new computer database has been in effect for a year, and we have been extremely pleased with the transition to the new system. The staff is now proficient in its usage, and licensing and renewals were handled in a timely manner. We have also had positive feedback from licensees regarding the new one-page annual renewal form. It seems everyone we've heard from likes the new abbreviated form.

(4) For post doctoral supervisees and supervisors – In accordance with §40-55-80, all post-doctoral supervision must be documented on a Supervision Contract, submitted and approved by

the Board prior to the initiation of the supervision. Please make sure your supervisees have made an application to the Board on the proper forms before the supervision is begun. Although this is the applicant's responsibility and is spelled out in the Application Information Form found in the Preliminary Application for Licensure, supervisors should make sure that supervisees have submitted the Post-Doctoral Supervision Contract to the Board prior to beginning supervision. Any request to consider post-doctoral supervision which took place prior to the submission of an approved contract, must be considered by the entire Board, and the Board may require additional supervision. Supervision must be comprised of at least 1,500 hours of actual work; to include direct service, training and supervisory time.

(5) ASPPB, in conjunction with PES, will move to computerized delivery of the EPPP in April 2001. Candidates, after Board approval of their credentials and application, may take the exam whenever they want to schedule it with the test delivery vendor. More information will be coming soon from ASPPB on the sites and

specifics for taking the EPPP.

Applicants for licensure are encouraged to contact the Board office to learn more about the new procedure for taking the exam.

(6) Mail your annual renewal form back ASAP! During the annual renewal period, it may take three to four weeks longer to process your annual renewal form; print and mail your license card; and verify your license status to your employer and/or insurance companies. Renewal forms will be mailed out to all licensees on the 1st of September. In order to avoid delay in processing, the staff asks that you complete your renewal and mail it back as soon as possible. If you wait until the middle of November to return your form, it may take three to four weeks before you receive your license card. It may take longer to verify your license status to insurance companies or hospitals. ■

S.C. Board of Examiners in Psychology

Complaint Information

A. General Information

The Board has the authority to investigate allegations of illegal, unethical and/or incompetent behavior on the part of licensed psychologists and allegations that unlicensed persons are practicing in violation of Chapter 55 and Regulations 100 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina.

B. Initial Complaint

When an initial written or telephoned complaint is received in the office, an official "Complaint Form" and "Release of Information Form" are mailed to the complainant by the Administrator. Complainants are encouraged to put complaints in writing, but verbal or anonymous complaints are logged in and investigated as to their validity and concern for public safety. The Board, or the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, can act as the complainant if necessary.

C. Official Complaint

(1) When a Complaint is received in the office, a letter is sent to the complainant and respondent by the administrator. This letter informs the complainant and respondent that the complaint process is confidential, and the complaint is assigned to an investigator who will be communicating with the complainant and respondent in the near future regarding an investigation of the complaint.

(2) All complaints are investigated fairly and thoroughly by the investigator.

(3) At the completion of the investigation, the complaint is brought before the Complaint Review Committee (CRC) made up of the Board administrator, investigator, Board attorney and consulting psychologist (former Board member) where evidence is reviewed in relation to the specific statutes which may have been violated. More serious complaints affecting public health and safety are given priority.

(4) The CRC makes a recommendation, which may range from dismissal of the complaint to a formal hearing.

(5) The investigator presents the complaint and the CRC's recommendation to the full Board in the form of a blind brief.

(6) The Board may choose to accept the presented recommendations, make its own recommendations or request further investigation. At each step in the process, the identity of the licensee remains confidential, and only when the Board files charges does the name of the licensee become public record. If the Board determines that the complaint should be dismissed, both the complainant and the licensee against whom the complaint was made are notified of the dismissal.

D. Formal Hearing

If a Formal Hearing is recommended, a legal document setting forth the alleged misconduct is served upon the licensee against whom the complaint was made. A hearing is then held pursuant to South Carolina Administrative Procedures Act, Sections 40-55-20 through 40-55-180 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina, and the Regulations of the Board.

The Board hearing process includes a Formal Hearing before members of the Board. The Board considers evidence, including witnesses, presented to the Board by the department attorney and investigator. At the same time, the licensee who has been charged with misconduct and aided by his/her counsel, presents his evidence and defense. After the hearing, the Board considers the evidence and reaches a decision regarding the merits of the allegations.

E. If the Board decides that the licensee has engaged in illegal, unethical or incompetent actions, the Board will issue a Final Order, which includes a statement regarding the Board's decision and disciplinary action/sanctions taken by the Board. All Final Orders are public records, except a dismissal (where no misconduct is found) or a private reprimand. ■

Questions and Answers on the Computerized EPPP

Reprinted with permission from ASPPB Newsletter

The EPPP will be offered on computer beginning in April 2001, depending on each jurisdiction's chosen start date for computer-based testing (CBT). These questions and answers are excerpts from a document mailed to ASPPB member board offices in late June. For a copy of the full document, contact Katrina Rudolph, ASPPB Central Office at 1-800-448-4069, and ask for the CBT frequently asked questions document.

What are the steps for examination via computer?

1. Candidates will obtain application materials from the licensing authority of the state or province (jurisdiction) in which they are seeking licensure. These materials will include a computer-scannable application for candidates to complete.
2. Candidates will return completed application materials, along with payment of examination fees, but exclusive of the exam administration fee, to the appropriate organization as identified on the instructions. If the scannable application is incomplete, it will be returned to the candidate by the jurisdiction or its agent.
3. Each jurisdictional licensing authority will approve eligible candidates and mail their scannable applications to Professional Examination Service (PES).
4. PES will scan the applications and compile daily eligibility lists.
5. PES will send an "authorization-to-test" letter to each eligible candidate containing a toll-free number to call to schedule the examination.
6. Candidates will call to schedule an examination at their chosen location. Candidates must sit for the examination within 60 days of the date on the "authorization-to-test" letter provided by PES. If they do not sit for the examination within these 60 days, they will be removed from the eligibility list and will be required to begin the application process again.
7. Candidates will sit for the examination at their chosen Prometric testing site.
8. PES will send scores to the jurisdictions on a monthly basis. No information regarding pass/fail status will be available to candidates at the Prometric Testing Center. Test results will not be given over the phone.
9. The jurisdictional licensing authority will mail examination results to candidates.
10. If a retake is necessary due to failure of an examination, candidates must reapply to the licensing authority, following the steps outlined above. Candidates for retakes must wait at least 60 days before an appointment to test will be scheduled.

Must candidates test in the jurisdiction in which they are seeking licensure?

No. Candidates may sit for the examination at any of the approximately 300 testing centers in the United States, U.S. territories and Canada. They are not required to sit for the examination within the jurisdiction in which they are seeking licensure. The examination is only available in the United States, U.S. territories and Canada. If a candidate passes the examination, he or she may then transfer his/her score to additional jurisdictions. Score transfers may be arranged through the Licensed Psychologist Data Source maintained by ASPPB.

When may examinations be taken?

Candidates must sit for the examination within 60 days of the date on the

"authorization-to-test" letter provided by PES. However, they are strongly encouraged to call Prometric to make an appointment as soon as they receive the letter from PES. Testing will be scheduled at the location and on the date and time of the candidate's choosing, if available. If not available, alternate dates, times and/or locations will be offered. If requested, a candidate has a right to an appointment within 30 days of the date requested, at a location within a 50-mile radius of the location requested. If he/she wants an appointment within 30 days of his/her requested date and is unable to obtain one, he/she should notify PES and the jurisdiction to which he/she applied for licensure. (He/she must provide the date and time of his/her call to Prometric; name of the person he/she spoke with; and date, time and location of his/her requested appointment.)

How much time is given for the examinations?

Candidates are allowed four (4) hours and fifteen (15) minutes for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology. There are 225 items (questions) on the examination.

What are the acceptable forms of payment for the test administration fee?

Payment for Prometric test administration fees may be made by credit card (Visa or MasterCard) or by direct debit to a checking account. To pay by direct debit to a checking account, a candidate will be asked to provide bank information and a checking account number. (This information can be found on a blank check.) Payment of the test administration fee must be made at the time the candidate schedules his/her

See QUESTIONS & ANSWERS on page 6

Questions and Answers

Continued from page 5

examination. It is not possible to pay the test administration fee at the testing center.

What are the requirements for admission to the testing center?

Candidates must arrive 30 minutes prior to their scheduled appointment. Candidates must have a currently valid, government-issued photo ID (passport, driver's license, etc.), as well as another piece of identification imprinted with the candidate's name and containing a signature (credit card, CPR card, etc.) A social security card is not an acceptable form of identification. On both forms of ID, the signature must match the pre-printed name. All testing sessions will be videotaped and audio-monitored. [Several additional security options are being considered, including thumb-printing and digitized images.]

How often can the examinations be taken?

This varies by jurisdiction. However, a candidate may take the examination a maximum of four times in any 12-month period.

Do candidates need to wait a specified period of time between testings?

Yes. Candidates must wait for a period of 60 days between administrations. It is estimated that much of that time will be taken up by the need to reapply to the licensing authority for each subsequent examination administration.

While taking the examination, can candidates move back and forth between test questions?

Yes. While taking the computerized examinations, candidates can skip forward or backward through the examination, and review questions at any point during their testing session.

What can a candidate do if the computer malfunctions while taking the examination?

A candidate who experiences technical difficulties while taking the examination must alert Prometric staff immediately. If Prometric staff cannot remedy the situation within 30 minutes, or if the problem persists, the candidate has the right to request rescheduling of the examination within his or her 60-day eligibility period at no additional cost. The candidate should also contact both the jurisdiction in which he or she is seeking licensure and PES to notify them of the technical difficulties.

Can individuals with disabilities be accommodated?

All centers are fully accessible and compliant with the American with Disabilities Act. Candidates must submit appropriate documentation of their request for special accommodations to the licensing authority of the jurisdiction in which they are seeking licensure, at the time that they submit their initial application materials. Only candidates who have been granted approval from their licensing authority will receive special accommodations during testing.

What are scale scores, and what is the passing score?

The ASPPB Scale Score is an arithmetic conversion of raw scores (the number of questions a candidate answers correctly) to a scale that ranges from 200 to 800. One reason for converting raw scores to a scale score is that forms (versions) of the examinations may vary slightly in their level of difficulty. A given raw score on one form of the examination may not be comparable to the same raw score on another form of the examination. To ensure that scores on different forms of the examination have the same meaning, raw scores are converted to scale scores that represent equivalent levels of achievement regardless of the test form taken.

For example, while the ASPPB-recommended passing score of 500 for independent practice never changes, the number of questions that have to be answered correctly to achieve a score of 500 can change. If a form of the examination is easier than the form on which the passing score was set, more questions would have to be answered correctly to obtain a scale score of 500. If the form of the examination is harder, fewer questions would have to be answered correctly to pass the examination. Thus, candidates are not unfairly rewarded because their test was easier nor unfairly penalized because it was more difficult.

After equating, the ASPPB-recommended passing score of 500 is equivalent to the criterion-referenced passing score of 140 that was applied to the anchor form of the examination and that was adopted by the ASPPB as a recommended passing score for independent practice as a psychologist. Beginning in April 2001, jurisdictions that adopt computerized administration will receive their scores as scaled scores. After January 2002, scores on the examination will only be reported as scaled scores. ■



Visit us on the
WEB!

www.llr.state.sc.us

Complaint Review Process

By Paul Doerring, Ph. D.

It has been my privilege to serve as psychologist representative on the Complaint Review Committee for the past four years, first as a Psychology Board member and more recently as an appointee of the Board. Having a psychologist representative who is not an active member of the board hopefully serves to create an even greater “arms length” between the investigative and the deliberation phases of the complaint review process. In this way, we hope to create the best balance possible in order to accord a fair due process for the psychologist while increasing diligence in representing the public.

I want to state at this time that we in South Carolina enjoy considerable advantages as the result of the Psychology Board having access to the resources of LLR. First, we have a trained and full-time investigator in the person of Larry Atkins. In addition to Sharon Dantzler, an attorney who advises the Board, Patrick Hanks serves as attorney to our Complaint Review Committee. The remainder of the Complaint Review Committee is made up of Patti Glenn, our Board administrator, and the psychologist representative. Other states, some larger than South Carolina, must rely on their psychology board members to carry out their investigation and their financial resources are limited to fees they raise through licensing.

Over the past three years, the Psychology Board has actively encouraged its licensees to contact the Board regarding instances where complications arise professionally, specifically those having regulatory implications. In short, they anticipate the problem and seek either a Board member or myself to walk through the process with them. These inquiries have produced benefits for all as the Board discovers needs to operationalize and specify aspects of those laws governing our practice. For example, an article published here within the past year on how to terminate a practice.

NOW FOR HOT ISSUES:

Child Custody Matters:

As always, matters surrounding child custody cases remain a minefield where parties involved appear unusually tempted to appeal to the Board instead of looking to the courts for remedies. At a personal level, I find myself irritated when I see ads in our professional journals offering training in forensics, targeting psychologists whose practices have dwindled and need “fillers.” Certainly, quality forensic services are needed and can be done well, but this is not an arena for the unprepared.

“Blind” Evaluations:

“Blind” evaluations refer to those occasions where a psychologist re-

views records other than their own for the purpose of arriving at a differential diagnosis without the benefit of “sufficient” patient contact. Dr. Brian Yore is addressing this issue in this current publication. I would only add that one be aware of the presence of any defacto diagnosis. This could occur where no formal diagnosis is stated, but where the psychologist might assign an individual to one of several programs of assistance where each is designed to serve a population based on the severity of their stated problems.

Treatment Notes:

Over the past few years in particular, I have struggled reading stacks of unusually cryptic and barely comprehensible treatment notes. Two issues. Poorly written notes make it difficult to determine whether a sufficient standard of care has been provided. Second, it is difficult to defend the psychologist in terms of the presence of treatment goals and whether the therapy utilized was focused on those goals.

Office Policy Statement:

The suggestion here is to consider the policy statement a work in progress, one always under review. No doubt it is a challenge to design a statement inclusive of a statement of fees, considerations of confidentiality and reference to the patients option to contact the Psychology Board etc., without it appearing as a blatant effort to cover our legal posterior. ■

Regulation

Continued from page 1

80:5 have been met. Parenthetically, let me note that the present Board interprets this section of the statute very strictly. In instances where the Board has reason to believe that an applicant committed an ethical violation in another state, the Board does not conclude that absence of a disciplinary action by the previous board constitutes "satisfactory evidence" in the applicant's favor.

Most psychologists are familiar with the second type of policy-making and that is the revision of current statute or regulation in order to better protect the public. A major effort in this area was the Board's involvement in the revision of Chapter 55, the statute providing for the regulation and licensing of psychologists. Before 1998, it was difficult for the Board to prevent non-psychologists from engaging in psychological testing, or from offering other types of psychological services. Although we on the Board believe that South Carolina law, even before 1998, restricted psychological testing to licensed psychologists, there was disagreement on this matter, and as late as

1997 the office of the Attorney General was unwilling to interpret Chapter 55, as a "practice act." As a result, the Board felt it was not in a position to stop non-licensed persons from giving psychological tests for remuneration, even though doing so would be in the best interest of the public. As a result, the Board undertook a revision of Chapter 55. In the summer of 1996, the Board began a process of amending different sections of the statute and then discussing the proposed revisions in open meetings with other health professionals and consumer representatives. This effort culminated in Senate Bill 718, passed by the legislature in June 1998 and signed into law by Governor Beasley.

A third type of political activity could be described as educational/consultative. The Board of Examiners in Psychology is frequently asked to provide information to other agencies regarding policies or regulations which directly or indirectly affect psychologists. In the last two years, for example, the Psychology Board has provided information and or recommendations to the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) with respect to third-party payments to psychologists; the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (LLR)

with regard to disciplinary procedures for LLR licensees; and the Board of Examiners for Licensed Professional Counselors, Marriage and Family Therapists and Psycho-educational Specialists on the issue of regulations to support recent changes in statute.

The primary role of the Psychology Board is to help serve and protect the citizens of South Carolina. We do this by enforcing statutes and regulations pertaining to the profession of psychology. At times, our regulatory function brings us directly into the political arena. It is our responsibility to ensure that when we are involved in policy-making or policy recommendations, our actions serve, first and foremost, to promote the well-being of South Carolinians with respect to quality of psychological services and protection from harmful practices. It is in this way that we differ from state professional associations, who must promote the professional interests of their members, and public advocacy groups, who must be concerned with special interests. Our concern is the public interest, and it is this concern which must inform all of our decisions and activities. ■

Report of Psychologists Licensed by the Board (July 1, 1999-June 30, 2000)

Licensed September 24, 1999

Tora L. Brawley, Ph.D.	Clinical
Brooke A. Dean, Ph.D.	Clinical
Edward D. Haigler, III., Ph.D.	Clinical
Stephen B. Levenberg, Ph.D.	Clinical
Adrian D. Novit, Ph.D.	Clinical
Jill C. Strasser, Psy.D.	Clinical
Stephen C. Strzelecki, Psy.D.	Clinical
Karen F. Swaim, Ph.D.	Clinical
Tina K. Traxler, Ph.D.	Clinical
Gary Wright, Ph.D.	Clinical

Licensed November 19, 1999

Loy Keith Atkins, Ph.D.	Counseling
Rhea M. Cravens, Ph.D.	Clinical

Mark D. Cunningham, Ph.D.	Clinical
Nancy S. Diehl, Ph.D.	Clinical
Kasey L. Hamlin, Ph.D.	Counseling
Sophie L. Lovinger, Ph.D.	School
Carroll Y. Lytch, Psy.D.	Clinical
Susan R. McChesney-Atkins, Ph.D.	School
Sigrid A. Rogers, Ph.D.	Clinical

Licensed January 21, 2000

Sarah E. Deitsch, Ph.D.	Clinical
Stanley J. Huey, Jr., Ph.D.	Clinical
Doris Paez, Ph.D.	School
Nancy L. Voight, Ph.D.	Counseling
Sara J. Wilcox, Ph.D.	Clinical

Licensed March 24, 2000

Juliet A. Buchwalter, Ph.D.	Clinical
Martin R. Wong, Ph.D.	Counseling

Licensed May 19, 2000

Leslie D. Bessellieu, Ph.D.	Clinical
Frank W. Gaskill, Ph.D.	School
Theresa L. Gibson, Ph.D.	Clinical
Janice E. Herron, Ph.D.	Clinical
Fayth M. Parks, Ph.D.	Counseling
Lloyd R. Pilkington, Ph.D.	Counseling
Elizabeth G. Seabrook, Ph.D.	Counseling

Mobility

Reprinted letter from APA President, Patrick H. DeLeon, Ph.D., J.D.
(edited and revised by Board staff)

As psychology enters the 21st century, considerable discussion is taking place over the issue of licensure mobility, especially the lack thereof. As you know, even in our highly mobile society, licensure mobility remains difficult; relicensure is one of the most arduous tasks associated with being a psychologist. Momentum is building, however, through the efforts of state psychology boards and credentialing organizations, to streamline the process. State licensing boards now have the opportunity to facilitate mobility and relicensure in numerous ways. **[The Board would like to know the views of its licensees regarding this matter. Please send your comments to the Board office by mail at P.O. Box 11329, Columbia, SC 29211-1329 or by e-mail "glennp@mail.llr.state.sc.us."]**

One path to mobility is exemplified by the "senior psychologist" provision, offered by several licensing boards. This statutory/regulatory provision allows psychologists who have earned degrees, fulfilled experiential requirements, and been licensed for as few as five and as many as 20 years to qualify for accelerated admission to licensure.

Another option, initiated by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), is the Reciprocity Agreement. This requires participating states and provinces to bring their licensure requirements into conformity with the standards in the agreement and to accept each others' licensees.

The third option is mobility by individual recognition. State licensing boards that utilize this option allow private, non-profit organizations to provide endorsement by credential. These organizations attest to confirmed qualifications such as education, internship and postdoctoral experience, licensure, and disciplinary record on

behalf of the psychologist to streamline admission to licensure. Three organizations, all originally created with the support of the American Psychological Association, offer nationally recognized individual credentials currently being used to facilitate licensure by endorsement. These organizations include the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP), which offers Board Certification (Diplomate status); the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology (NRHSPP), which offers the Health Service Provider in Psychology credential; and the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), which offers the Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology (CPQ).

The benefits of licensure by individual recognition, or endorsement, are significant both to psychologists and state psychology boards. The three credentialing organizations require primary source documentation of education, internship and postdoctoral experience, and licensure for their respective credentials. This documented information, provided through endorsement by these credentialing organizations, can be used as a cost effective and efficient tool for psychology boards to streamline admission to licensure. In addition, psychologists do not face the time-consuming task of relocating the same information because all three organizations maintain credentials repositories, to enable the credentialing organization simply to verify this information to the state licensing board.

[The Board is currently examining the ASPPB Reciprocity Agreement and the CPQ to learn what alteration, if any, might be required to bring our statute and/or regulations into compliance. As we examine these alternatives, the Board solicits your opinions and ideas regarding licensure mobility.] ■

Update of Licensed Psychologists as of June 30, 2000

Renewals Mailed:	509
Did Not Renew	-14
Total Renewed:	495
New Licensees:	+33
Total Licensed	528

List of Psychologists Not Renewing

James Ralph Barclay, Ph.D. - Retired
Joseph Edward Biron, Ph.D. - Out of State
Cheri Lynn Brunetti, Ph.D. - Expired
Christina Anne Byrne, Ph.D. - Out of State
Scott Franklin Coffey, Ph.D. - Out of State
James Edwin Hall, Ph.D. - Out of State
David Alan Ott, Ph.D. - Out of State
Gunger Ozbeck, Ph.D. - Retired
Jackson P. Rainer, Ph.D. - Out of State
Sheryl S. Redpath, Ph.D. - Out of State
Michael T. Reid, Ph.D. - Out of State
David S. Siegel, Ph.D. - Deceased
Ellie T. Sturgis, Ph.D. - Out of State
Barbara A. Trout, Ph.D. - Out of State

In Memory of . . .

The Board of Examiners in Psychology has learned, with regret, of the death of **Dr. David S. Siegel**, of Columbia. The Board extends its condolences to his family, friends and professional colleagues.

Application and Examination Report

Inquiries regarding licensure in South Carolina were received from 126 persons during the 1999-2000 fiscal year.

Ten applicants took the Examination for the Professional Practice of Psychology (EPPP) in October of 1999. Of the 10 who took the EPPP in October, seven passed and three failed. In April of 2000, 16 candidates took the EPPP. Of the 16 who took the EPPP in April, 14 passed and two failed.

Forty-eight new applicants submitted Preliminary Applications for Licensure (PAL). Of the 48 PALs, 40 were from APA-approved programs and accepted. Eight of these were not from APA-approved programs and were reviewed by the Board to see if their graduate course work met the ASPPB's educational criteria as statutorily required. Six of the eight non-APA programs were approved by the Board.

As of June 30, 2000 (end of fiscal year 1999-2000), 34 applicants have completed the application process and have taken oral examinations. Thirty-three applicants received a passing score on the oral exam and were licensed as psychologists in South Carolina. One applicant failed the oral exam. ■