

HEALTH PROFESSIONS LEGISLATION REVIEW

In October, 1986, as the Review entered its fourth year, the professions included in the review were asked to comment on a set of legal and procedural proposals prepared by the Review team. Accompanying the legal and procedural proposals were copies of the scope of practice definitions, licensed acts and protected titles that had been proposed by each of the participating professions.

The Board's comments on these documents were submitted to the Review early in December, and a condensation of comments that may be of interest is presented below.

LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL PROPOSALS

In drafting its discussion paper the Review team has followed the structure of the *Health Disciplines Act* which sets out the procedures presently followed by the Colleges governing the professions of dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy and optometry. The Review has attempted to adjust the language to accommodate the addition of some twenty other groups. It has suggested the creation of some new structures and has altered others.

The proposals include an expansion of the sections referring to the Minister's responsibility to administer the act, "to ensure that the Minister is in a position to obtain information about issues within his mandate". They include the duty, when necessary, "to inquire into any matter related to the practice of a member or members of one or more health professions". The Review team indicates that under the proposed provisions "it would be possible for the Minister to direct that a hearing be held". In its response, the Board of Examiners expressed some concern that exercise of these powers appeared to duplicate the functions of the proposed Health Professions Board, and the proposal was made without accompanying safeguards against political or other misuse of such powers. Other groups have questioned the proposal that would allow the Minister to by-pass the governing Council of a profession in reviewing the activities of one of its committees.

The proposed Health Professions Board would review decisions of the registration, complaints and discipline committees of each of the governing bodies included under the Act. In addition to this body, a new structure to be known as a Health Advisory Council would be created to advise the Minister. Although the Review team has as yet made no concrete proposals, it has invited comments on a number of suggestions as to the size, membership and functions of the body. The proposed man-

date of this Council is not clear, although the suggestions include review and advising on nearly every aspect of professional regulation. The composition of such a body would be of considerable importance. The Board is somewhat perturbed by the examples given by the Review team of possible "public" members of such a council, such as "health science academics", hospital administrators, "commercial health care organization representatives", and "unregulated health care professional representatives". In the opinion of the Board of Examiners, none of these groups would represent consumers and all might be considered to have special interests. There is also no mechanism provided for this Council to have any contact with the professions.

The proposal includes, as we have expected, the appointment of "public" members to each governing council and to its statutory committees as set out in the Act. In addition to an executive committee there would be committees to deal with complaints, discipline, registration, fitness to practice, and continuing competence assurance. Given a governing structure of this complexity, many details in the proposal would appear to require adjustment in order that the governing bodies could function effectively.

In its present form the proposal does not set a limit on the terms of appointment of public members. The proposal presently requires that the governing council meet only if a majority of the public members is present. If psychology were to have a governing council consisting, for example, of nine psychologists and three public members, and if two of the public members were absent, the other ten members of council could not do business. The Board supports the proposal to include public members on governing councils but does not support the concept that public members could control the functioning of a council, or its committees, to this extent.

It is recognized that members of disciplinary tribunals must be protected from prior knowledge of the matters brought before them in order that hearings may be fair and free of bias. However, the proposal does not set out a mechanism whereby this can be assured. One section proposes that "the Council or the Executive Committee may direct the Discipline Committee to hold a hearing and determine any specified allegation of professional misconduct on the part of a member". It is not clear why this is proposed when it is important that knowledge of the allegations should be restricted to the complaints committee until they are formally presented to the discipline committee in the hearing.

The proposal makes a number of suggestions that would create difficulties for professions with a small membership. It is proposed that hearing panels under the discipline committee consist of five members, two of whom are to be public members and at least one is a Council member. The Board has suggested that a panel of three would be sufficient, for more than half of the groups included in the Review have fewer members than the profession of psychology (see Table 1), and would have even greater difficulty in organizing five-member hearing panels.

In respect to assuring a member's continuing competence, the Review team proposes that "mechanisms adopted by professions must be in place and operating within five years of promulgation of the profession's statute", and indicates that "several models exist of statutory provisions for continuing competence responsibilities". However, no specific models are recommended nor are specific powers for instituting these mechanisms set out. The Board is concerned, moreover, that to date no evidence of the effectiveness of any particular mechanism for assuring continuing competence has been presented.

The Review team is proposing the extension to all health professions of mandatory reporting of "any termination of [a member's] employment, or limitations on provision of services for reasons purporting to constitute professional misconduct, incompetence, or incapacity." At present, such a provision affects only the profession of nursing. It is obvious, of course, that this provision would have no impact on independent practitioners and, therefore, little impact on professions whose employed members are in a minority.

The proposed legal and procedural modifications to the *Health Disciplines Act* are still incomplete. In their present form they pose difficulties for those professions with small memberships who would find it difficult to construct the complex bureaucracy required. It would also seem imperative that the language in the procedural Act be improved to avoid terms unsuited to those professions whose clients are not necessarily "patients", under their "care", and whose skills are not necessarily "clinical". The Review team is struggling valiantly to avoid sexist language and for this they should be commended.

SCOPE OF PRACTICE, LICENSED ACTS AND PROTECTED TITLES

The Board met with a committee of the Ontario Psychological Association before submitting

the requested definition of practice, a list of acts that the Board considered should be licensed to members of regulated professions, and the titles that it believes should be used only by psychologists. These recommendations were published in the last issue of *The Bulletin* (November, 1986). In January, 1987 the Review team asked to meet with the Board to make suggestions for further revision to the Board's proposals.

Scope of practice. The team recommended deleting the reference to research from psychology's definition of practice on the grounds that other professions do research. The Board's view remains that, if the practice of some members of other professions consists entirely of research, as it does for some segments of the profession of psychology, then research should be included in their definitions, but not deleted from the definition of psychological practice. The Board was thinking particularly of psychologists working in human factors, selection and classification research, and program analysis, as well as in the area of applied clinical research.

Licensed acts. The Review team had requested a list of professional activities from each group that, in their view, should be licensed because of potential harm to the public if performed by unregulated professionals. The Board had suggested that some uses of psychological tests and some forms of therapy should be licensed. The Review team found that neither suggestion met their requirements for licensed acts, expressing the view that the adequacy of testing might be better regulated through employing institutions. This suggestion does not address the potential misuse of tests in the private sector nor the adequacy of existing practices in school systems and hospitals. The team also considered psychotherapy should not be included among licensed acts because it was too difficult to define. The Board will engage in further discussions with the team on these points and will revise the definitions of the acts it considers should be licensed for the protection of the public. On the other hand, there is an indication that some of the other groups oppose the inclusion of any licensed acts in the legislation regulating any professions, and that the Review team as well is now questioning the feasibility of including licensed acts.

Protection of the title. The Board was mystified by the Review team's suggestion that the title, psychologist, could perhaps not be protected but, instead, only the title, registered psychologist. The team is apparently under the impression that the term, psychologist, is in wide general use in the public domain. It is a cause of some disquiet for the Board that, although the Review team has made a study of professional regulation across Canada and the United States, as well as in Europe and the

Commonwealth, it appears to attach little significance to the fact that the title, psychologist, is protected in fifty-two states in the USA, nine provinces and one territory in Canada, and in Ontario has been protected for twenty-six years. The Board does not understand why the team should propose that this protection be removed and that only the title, registered psychologist, be protected.

The Board believes the reasons it has heard are flimsy and not based on a correct assessment of the facts. The Review team suggested that, in its quest for a procedural Act applicable to all the professions to be governed by it, the inclusion in one legal document of "qualified" titles, such as registered nurse, and "unqualified" or "generic" titles, such as physician or psychologist, would in some way be inappropriate. The Board on the other hand considers this to be a strange concern for, until now, both "qualified" and "unqualified" titles have coexisted happily within the *Health Disciplines Act*.

For example, part VI of the Act uses an unqualified title in Section 116(j) which states:

"Pharmacist" means a person who is licensed under this Part as a pharmacist.

Part IV of the Act, respecting nursing, uses "qualified" titles in Section 69(h) which states:

"Registered Nurse" and "registered nursing assistant" means a person who is the holder of a certificate as a registered nurse or registered nursing assistant, respectively.

It is not clear why the Review team should now consider this association to be unseemly.

More important in the process of protecting titles is the manner in which the enforcement clauses are written, for these set out the restrictions on the use of titles by persons who are *not* registered under the Act. The enforcement clauses presently contained in the *Psychologists Registration Act* state

- (1) No person shall represent himself to be a psychologist unless he holds a certificate of registration.
- (2) A person represents himself to be a psychologist when he holds himself out to the public by any title, designation or description incorporating the words "psychological", "psychologist" or "psychology" and under such title, designation or description offers to render or renders services of any kind to one or more persons for a fee or other remuneration.

If the Review team were to recommend, and the government were to implement, the substitution of "registered psychologist" for "psychologist" in similar enforcement clauses under new legislation, the public of Ontario would be required to face a problem it has not had for twenty-six years. It would then have to distinguish between a group of regulated registered psychologists and all those persons who could,

TABLE 1
HEALTH PROFESSIONS
LEGISLATION REVIEW
GROUPS INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW:
BY SIZE OF MEMBERSHIP
REPORTED IN DECEMBER, 1983.

GROUP	N
Osteopathy	18
Podiatry	95
Chiropody	125
Denture Therapy	200
Midwifery ²	200
Respiratory Therapy ²	350
Dental Technician	466
Speech-Language pathology/Audiology ²	560
Optometry ¹	710
Occupational Therapy ²	730
Massage Therapy	737
Dietetics ²	1,100
Ophthalmic Dispensing	1,240
Opticianry	1,240
Chiropractic	1,298
Psychology	1,355
Dental Hygiene	2,150
Physiotherapy	2,789
Medical Laboratory Technology ²	4,154
Radiological Technicianry	5,000
Dentistry ¹	5,011
Pharmacy ¹	6,000
Medicine ¹	20,930
Registered Nursing/ Registered Nursing Assistantry ¹	135,000

Source: Each group's first submission to the Review.

¹ Presently regulated in Ontario under the Health Disciplines Act.

² Presently not regulated in Ontario under any Act but to be regulated under a new Act.

at will and without accountability, represent themselves to be "psychologists".

The Board maintains that in all the years since the introduction of the Psychologists Registration Act in 1960, the public has come to know that a psychologist is a member of a regulated profession, and therefore considers this suggestion to be irresponsible.

The Board considers that, by questioning the protection of the title, psychologist, the Review team has lost sight of the principle underlying all certification and protection-of-title legislation. In the Board's view the purpose of such legislation is to enable the public to identify a group of regulated service providers with a known set of qualifications and known standards of professional conduct, and therefore to enable the public to make an informed choice. In brief, the purpose is to offer truth in packaging. The Board considers that strong legislation to protect the titles of professional service providers is the first step in protecting the public interest. The Board cannot accept the suggestion that this provision should be weakened in the case of psychology, and the Board is not satisfied that there is any reasoned basis for this suggestion.

The Board's views on these matters were discussed in a meeting with representatives of

AUDITOR'S REPORT

We have examined the Balance Sheet of The Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology as at May 31, 1986 and the Statement of Revenue, Expenses and Accumulated Surplus and the Statement of Changes in Financial Position for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests and other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, these Financial Statements present fairly the financial position of the Board as at May 31, 1986 and the results of its activities and the changes in its financial position for the year ended in accordance with the accounting principles described in Note 1 applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Toronto, Ontario
August 15, 1986

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS OF MAY 31, 1986

THE ONTARIO BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN PSYCHOLOGY

BALANCE SHEET

As at May 31, 1986
(With Comparative Figures for 1985)

A S S E T S

	<u>1986</u>	<u>1985</u>
Cash	\$ -	\$ 31,221
Short-Term Investments	347,161	115,488
Due from Landlord	-	24,000
Sundry Assets	6,428	15,897
Leasehold Improvements - Net of Accumulated Amortization \$13,654 (1985 - \$ Nil) - Note 1	<u>54,616</u>	<u>42,055</u>
	<u>408,205</u>	<u>228,661</u>

L I A B I L I T I E S

Bank Indebtedness	26,779	-
Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities	20,328	43,192
Balance Due for Leasehold Improvements	-	61,133
Registration Fees Received in Advance	<u>233,691</u>	<u>46,360</u>
	<u>280,798</u>	<u>150,685</u>

A C C U M U L A T E D S U R P L U S

Surplus	<u>127,407</u>	<u>77,976</u>
	<u>\$ 408,205</u>	<u>\$ 228,661</u>

Approved on Behalf of the Board:

pal & gould, chartered accountants

THE ONTARIO BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN PSYCHOLOGY

STATEMENT OF REVENUE, EXPENSES AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS

For the Year Ended May 31, 1986
(With Comparative Figures for 1985)

	<u>1986</u>	<u>1985</u>
REVENUE:		
Registration Fees	\$ 382,721	\$ 322,297
Examination Fees	30,450	31,400
Interest and Other Income	<u>18,968</u>	<u>23,818</u>
	<u>432,139</u>	<u>377,515</u>
EXPENSES:		
Salaries	151,428	168,824
Examination Costs	25,842	28,252
Travel and Meetings - Board Members	26,743	29,006
Audit	3,027	2,187
Legal and Investigation Fees	26,278	41,274
Directory Printing and Distribution Costs	27,616	20,896
General and Office Expenses	17,724	13,707
Telephone	4,859	5,776
Directory Advertising	12,399	11,894
Employee Benefit Costs	18,321	19,765
Rent and Occupancy Costs	43,641	31,966
Office Furniture and Equipment	11,176	1,647
Amortization of Leasehold Improvements	<u>13,654</u>	<u>-</u>
	<u>382,708</u>	<u>375,194</u>
SURPLUS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	<u>49,431</u>	<u>2,321</u>
ACCUMULATED SURPLUS - At Beginning of Year	<u>77,976</u>	<u>75,655</u>
ACCUMULATED SURPLUS - At End of Year	<u>\$ 127,407</u>	<u>\$ 77,976</u>

pal & gould, chartered accountants

THE ONTARIO BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN PSYCHOLOGY

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FINANCIAL POSITION

For the Year Ended May 31, 1986
(With Comparative Figures for 1985)

	<u>1986</u>	<u>1985</u>
CASH - Beginning of Year	\$ 31,221	\$ 156,418
CASH WAS PROVIDED FROM:		
Surplus of Revenue over Expenses - Before Amortization of Leasehold Improvements \$13,654 (1985 - \$ Nil)	63,085	2,320
Increase in Registration Fees Received in Advance	187,331	-
Increase in Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities	-	25,151
Increase in Due to Leasehold Improvements	-	55,000
Decrease in Short-Term Investments	-	51,986
Decrease in Sundry Assets	<u>9,469</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>TOTAL CASH PROVIDED</u>	<u>259,885</u>	<u>134,457</u>
CASH WAS APPLIED TO:		
Decrease in Registration Fees Received in Advance	-	183,700
Decrease in Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities	22,864	-
Leasehold Improvements (Net of \$24,000 Recovered from Landlord)	2,215	42,055
Balance Due for Leasehold Improvements	61,133	-
Due from Landlord	-	24,000
Increase in Short-Term Investments	231,673	-
Increase in Prepaid Expenses	<u>-</u>	<u>9,899</u>
<u>TOTAL CASH APPLIED</u>	<u>317,885</u>	<u>259,654</u>
<u>NET (DECREASE) IN CASH</u>	<u>(58,000)</u>	<u>(125,197)</u>
<u>BANK (INDEBTEDNESS) CASH - End of Year</u>	<u>\$ (26,779)</u>	<u>\$ 31,221</u>

pal & gould, chartered accountants

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS May 31, 1986

1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

The Board follows generally accepted accounting principles in the preparation of its Financial Statements except as outlined below where the disclosed basis of accounting is considered to be appropriate.

Fixed Assets -

Purchases of Fixed Assets consisting of Office Furniture and Equipment, are fully expensed in the year of acquisition. Leasehold Improvements are being amortized over the term of the lease.

2. COMMITMENTS:

Under the terms of a lease expiring June 30, 1990, the Board is responsible for minimum rental payments of \$30,000 per annum.

In addition, a proportionate share of Operating Costs is payable under the terms of this lease.

BOARD DIRECTIVE TO PSYCHOLOGISTS OFFERING TESTING COURSES FOR TEACHERS

The Board has become aware that some psychologists are offering, for a fee, courses to teachers in the administration and use of individual intelligence and ability tests. The Board has no authority to prohibit the use of tests by teachers or to protect the public from any misuse of tests by persons who are not psychologists, or who are not supervised by psychologists.

However, the Board does have a responsibility to address the role psychologists may play in courses designed to instruct teachers in the individual administration of psychological tests – in particular, tests of ability and intellectual functioning. Psychologists who use these techniques apply their knowledge of human functioning (including developmental psychology, social and abnormal psychology, and measurement theory) in evaluating the observations they make in the course of testing an individual child. The Board does not consider it is in the public interest to use these techniques without the requisite academic background in the science of human behaviour.

In the instances of which the Board is aware, the courses are not given under the auspices of a university, but are arranged and given by individual psychologists under a private contract with a given school board. There is no undertaking that the teachers who enroll in the courses will be supervised by or report to a psychologist in their later use of these techniques. There is no requirement that the academic background necessary to support a competent use of these assessment tools be a prerequisite to taking the course.

In the Board's opinion, the testing that teachers do after taking such courses can not meet psychologists' standards for such a service; the psychologists who offer the courses do not assume, and will not be asked to assume, responsibility for the use of these techniques; and psychologists will not be involved in planning or directing this service. For these reasons, the Board considers that participation by psychologists in selling such testing courses for teachers is inconsistent with a responsible use of their skills.

The Board places great importance on the fact that psychologists share their knowledge willingly. In this instance, however, it is a set of techniques, rather than a body of knowledge, that is being dispensed; and the Board is addressing the potential harm to the public in the unintentional misuse, through insufficient knowledge and skill, of these powerful instruments. ■

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING BY TEACHERS AND REGULATION 262 UNDER THE EDUCATION ACT

Shortly after approving its statement to psychologists on offering courses in psychological testing to teachers the Board learned that the Ministry of Education is proposing amendments to the Regulations under the *Education Act* that would delete the sections referring to "a psychological test or examination". Hitherto,

these sections have at least ensured that informed parental consent would be obtained for such procedures. With this knowledge, the Board decided that it should bring its concerns to the attention of the Minister of Education. The text of the Board's letter to the Honourable Sean Conway is reproduced below:

The Honourable Sean Conway
Minister of Education
22nd Floor
Mowat Block
900 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1L2

February 12, 1987

Dear Mr. Conway:

Re: *The role of psychologists in providing courses in testing for teachers*

Pursuant to the terms of the Psychologists Registration Act, R.S.O. 1980, Chapter 404, the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology regulates the practice of psychologists in Ontario. The Board's responsibilities include setting standards of professional conduct to which psychologists must adhere.

The Board has prepared a directive for release to Ontario psychologists that sets out the Board's position in regard to courses in psychological testing offered by psychologists. As some teachers employed by school boards in Ontario may be affected by this directive to psychologists, I enclose a copy for your information and the information of those officials in your Ministry responsible for psychological testing by teachers in the school systems of Ontario.

In drafting this statement we have made no reference to the relevant sections in Regulation 262 defining a psychological examination and requiring parental consent for such an examination. At present they state:

- 1(f) "individual psychological examination or test" means an examination or test of a pupil's intelligence or personality administered to one pupil by an examiner*
- 12(3)j where it is proposed to administer to a pupil an individual psychological examination or test, [the principal of a school shall] obtain written permission therefor from the parent or guardian of a pupil*

Although these provisions do result in some constraint on the part of school boards in the use of psychological tests by teachers, we are aware of many school boards in which psychological testing is carried out by teachers and is actively encouraged by school administrators.

We have long been concerned that these practices, when undertaken by individuals who are neither trained in psychology nor supervised by psychologists, are potentially harmful to the public. We are doubly concerned now that we have learned that your ministry is considering the deletion of Section 1(f) from the Regulation. The result of this deletion would be to render the requirement to obtain parental consent applicable only to examinations conducted by psychologists. Psychologists have always been required by their professional governing body to obtain informed consent for their professional interventions and the clause therefore is, as it always has been, redundant where psychologists are concerned.

In our view the administration of psychological tests, defined in the Regulation as individually administered tests of intelligence or personality, by school teachers is not in the public interest. Teachers have no obligation to acquire the necessary training in measurement or personality theory; nor any obligation to adhere to recognized standards in the use and interpretation of these tests. The proposed amendment to Regulation 262 would relieve these teachers of the further obligation to obtain parental consent for such testing of a child. We believe this is unacceptable and the proposed amendments should receive wide public attention.

Representatives of our Board would be pleased to meet with you, or your designate, to discuss our reasons for considering that psychological testing by teachers and the Board's directive to psychologists on this matter raise issues of considerable importance in the protection of the public interest. As we understand that action on this proposed change in Regulation 262 is imminent we would appreciate an early reply.

Yours very truly,
V. Marta Townsend, Ph.D.
Chairman

PSYCHOLOGISTS' FEES

The Board has noted a marked increase over the past eighteen months in the number and seriousness of complaints against psychologists (see Table 2). Presently, complaints are being received at the rate of 40 a year in contrast to an annual average of roughly 20 in the five-year period between 1980 and 1984. The cost of investigating these allegations and holding hearings into charges of professional misconduct is reflected in the Board's legal fees. In the first eight months of the present fiscal year legal costs have exceeded \$50,000, a figure roughly double the amount expended in the preceding twelve-month period. Therefore, it became imperative that the Board make application to the Minister of Health for a change in Regulation 825 to increase the annual renewal fee. If the application is approved the annual renewal fee will rise to \$300 from \$255. This increase would be effective for the fiscal year 1987-88 and payable before May 31, 1987. Invoices will be mailed to all psychologists when the Board has been notified of the Minister's decision. Other fees will remain unchanged.

TABLE 2

COMPLAINTS AGAINST PSYCHOLOGISTS
RECEIVED BETWEEN JUNE 1, 1985
AND NOVEMBER 30, 1986:
CATEGORIZED BY SUBJECT OF COMPLAINT

SUBJECT OF COMPLAINT	NUMBER
Provision of Service	
Obligations to parents	2
Confidentiality	1
Testing procedures	3
Testimony as an expert witness	2
Custody & access assessments	10
Personal misconduct	7
Substance abuse	2
Failure to provide alternate service	1
Practising outside area of competence	1
Fitness to practice	1
Unprofessional behaviour	5
Termination of services	3
Vocational assessment	1
Supervision	
Failure to supervise	1
Supervision outside area of competence	1
Interference with professional autonomy	1
Problems in Private Practice	
Advertising and announcements	8
Fees and billing	4
Incorporation	3
Practising while not registered	1
Frivolous and vexatious	2
TOTAL	60

NEW TEMPORARY REGISTRANTS SINCE NOVEMBER, 1986

Jean-Pierre Bergevin	Ross Gray	Kerry Lawson	Debra Peplar	Lorne Switzman
Margaret Brigham	Christine Gudas	Lewis Leiken	Joseph Persi	Lorna Tener
Sharon Burton	Sophia Kahill	Larry Litman	Cheryl Pohlman	Judith Tudiver
Louisa Gembora	Arunima Khanna	Susan Lollis	Terry Prociuk	
Marilen Gerber	Brian Kowalchuk	Mary Morrison	Kenneth Reesor	
Marcia Gragg	Godwin Lau	Frances Owen	Leon Steiner	

NEW PERMANENT REGISTRANTS SINCE SEPTEMBER, 1986

Linda Alcorn	Marie-France Dionne	Colleen McMullin	Nancy Schmidt
Robert Bagby	Debora Dubreuil	Brian McLean	Linda Siegel
Frederick Bellemare	Susan Eadie	Ian Manion	Suzanne Simpson
Catherine Bielajew	Barbara Fulford	Brooks Masterton	Zitza Simpson
Jane Blouin	Leonard George	Maxine Morrison	Brenda Spiegler
Gary Burkhart	Michelle Goodman	Katalin Nathan	Beverly Wolfus
Brian Burt	Shelley Gorman	Frances Newman	Donald Young
Gerald Cavallaro	Leslie Greenberg	David Nussbaum	Rosemary Young
Joan Chase	Susan Johnson	Michael Persinger	
Steven Cronshaw	Paul King	Witold Poplawski	
Eileen Davelaar	Jo-Anne Lewicki	Dmytro Rewilak	
Edward DeYoung	Christine Littlefield	Stuart Ross	

The BULLETIN

The Bulletin is a publication of the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology.

CHAIRMAN

Marta Townsend, Ph.D.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

James E. Alcock, Ph.D.

MEMBERS

Elsbeth W. Baugh, Ph.D.

John A. McGroary, Ph.D.

E. June Rogers, Ph.D.

REGISTRAR

Barbara Wand, Ph.D.

STAFF

Susan Brooks

Jean Cole

Connie Learn

STAFF CHANGE

The Board and staff will miss Naomi Jeffs who, after seven years with the Board, is leaving to pursue other interests. In her four years as Assistant Registrar: Administration many applicants and temporary registrants have sought her advice. On March 1, Ms. Connie Learn will assume these responsibilities. ■

ORAL EXAMINATIONS

The oral examinations were held in Toronto on November 26 and 27. Assisting the Board in conducting these examinations were the following psychologists:

LYNNE BEAL, Ph.D., Senior Psychologist, Toronto Board of Education;
DAVID DAY, Ph.D., Consultant, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto;
HENRY EDWARDS, Ph.D., Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa;
KINGSLEY FERGUSON, Ph.D., Retired, former Psychologist-in-Chief, Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Toronto;
MARGARET HEARN, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, University Hospital, London;
TIMOTHY HOGAN, Ph.D., Executive Director, Canadian Psychological Association, Ottawa;
GAIL HUTCHINSON, Ph.D., Director, Counselling and Career Development Services, University of Western Ontario;
JOHN PLATT, Ph.D., Director, Department of Psychology, Peterborough Civic Hospital;
SOPHIA RADZIUK, Ph.D., Psychologist/Counsellor, Counselling and Development Centre, York University, Toronto;
REGINALD REYNOLDS, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, Ontario Correctional Institute, Brampton;
BARBARA RICHARDSON, Ph.D., Children's Psychiatric Research Institute, London;
GARY SNOW, Ph.D., Consultant to Neuropsychology, Sunnybrook Medical Centre, Toronto;
HEATHER WHITE, Ph.D., Senior Psychologist, Credit Valley Hospital, Mississauga. ■

Continued from page 1

the Review team on February 11. The Board intends, along with representatives of the Ontario Psychological Association, to use every opportunity it may have to continue its discussions with the Review team in order that the titles of the regulated professions may be adequately protected in new legislation.

B.W.

Portions of this text were presented in a symposium at the Annual Convention of the Ontario Psychological Association in Toronto, February, 1987. ■

THE BULLETIN

The Bulletin is published quarterly. Subscriptions for Ontario psychologists are included in their registration fee. Others may subscribe at \$10.00 per year, or \$2.50 per single issue. We will also attempt to satisfy requests for back issues of The Bulletin at the same price. ■