

**DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS****I**

Charges of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a psychologist against Dr. David Garner were heard by a Tribunal of the Board of Examiners on November 25 and 26, 1987.

**THE CHARGES**

The Notice of Hearing alleged that Dr. Garner was guilty of professional misconduct under the Psychologists Registration Act in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in his treatment of and relationship with his client, Ms. X, an eighteen year old woman who was suffering from anorexia nervosa and bulimia, by reason of the particulars alleged below. Further, it was alleged that he was guilty of conduct unbecoming a psychologist by reason of these particulars.

**THE PARTICULARS**

**1. SEXUAL IMPROPRIETY.** Between October 1985 and December 1985 at his office and elsewhere in and about the City of Toronto and the City of New York Dr. Garner was sexually intimate and had sexual intercourse with Ms. X, while she was his client and while she was subject to his continuing professional influence.

**2. UNPROFESSIONAL AND IMPROPER BEHAVIOUR WITH RESPECT TO HIS TREATMENT AND DEALINGS WITH MS. X.** During the period July to December 1985, Ms. X was receiving treatment from Dr. Garner and was subject to his professional influence. The particulars of the allegations were:

- (a) In or about September 1985 he advised Ms. X to move from her home in another city to Toronto. Ms. X followed his advice with the result that she was deprived of access to her independent sources of social, emotional and financial support.
- (b) During his treatment of Ms. X, he required her to remove all her clothes, except for her undergarments, prior to weighing her.
- (c) He purported to terminate Ms. X's treatment on October 4, 1985 without her knowledge or that of her parents, while she continued to suffer from and needed treatment for anorexia nervosa and bulimia.
- (d) On or about October 12, 1985, he employed Ms. X to work in his home as a mother's helper while she was subject to his continuing professional influence.
- (e) While he was treating Ms. X and she was subject to his continuing professional influence, he saw Ms. X socially, including, but not limited to, assisting her in obtaining an

apartment in Toronto, having her in his home for dinner, taking her to New York and visiting her at her apartment.

- (f) He did not refer Ms. X to other professional resources or appropriate social agencies for her social, financial and vocational needs.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE PARTICULARS**

At the outset of the hearing Counsel for the Board made the following amendments to the particulars stated in the Notice of Hearing: In paragraph 1, the phrase "while she was his client" was deleted. Paragraph 2(a) was withdrawn. Paragraph 2(b) was withdrawn.

**THE PLEA**

Dr. Garner, through Counsel, entered a plea of guilty to the charge of conduct unbecoming a psychologist and a plea of not guilty to the charge of professional misconduct.

Counsel for Dr. Garner admitted that the allegations of sexual intimacy and sexual intercourse by Dr. Garner with Ms. X were true. That Dr. Garner's treatment of Ms. X was terminated on October 4, 1985 was admitted, but that this was terminated without the knowledge of Ms. X was denied. The employment of Ms. X as a mother's helper in Dr. Garner's home while she was subject to his continuing professional influence was admitted, and the particulars of his social interaction with Ms. X were admitted. The particulars of the allegation that Dr. Garner failed to refer Ms. X to other professional resources were admitted subject to the interpretation by Dr. Garner that Ms. X did not require other referrals.

**THE EVIDENCE**

Counsel for the Board and Counsel for Dr. Garner both suggested to the Tribunal that, due to the nature of the allegations, witnesses would not be called unless there was some dispute about the evidence. Therefore, Counsel for the Board presented the evidence for the Tribunal to consider. Ms. X and Dr. Garner testified in respect to a portion of the evidence that was disputed.

The evidence disclosed that from September of 1986, the time Dr. Garner received notice of the complaint made against him by Ms. X, until November 24, 1987, the day before the commencement of the hearing, Dr. Garner denied the truth of the particulars as contained in the Notice of Hearing and had submitted to the Board, in response to the complaint of Ms. X, a 27 page summary of his professional and non-

professional contact with Ms. X denying that any sexual intimacy had occurred between himself and Ms. X. It was only on the day before the hearing was to commence when new evidence was presented to him that Dr. Garner admitted the particulars as stated in the Notice of Hearing as detailed above.

**STANDARD OF PROOF**

In reaching its decision and in considering the evidence, the Tribunal endeavoured to assure itself that the evidence was sufficiently convincing to substantially balance the probabilities on the side of certainty before the Tribunal could reasonably consider any of the allegations proved.

**THE DECISION**

In reaching its decision the Tribunal noted that the particulars as amended, save for 2(f), had been admitted. With respect to 2(f) the Tribunal found that allegation to have been proven.

The Tribunal found that Dr. Garner had failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in his treatment of and relationship with his client, Ms. X, and therefore found Dr. Garner guilty of professional misconduct, as charged. The Tribunal also found that, if it were necessary to do so, they would have accepted Dr. Garner's plea of guilty to the second charge of conduct unbecoming a psychologist.

In rendering its decision, the Tribunal reviewed all the evidence regarding the charge of sexual impropriety. The issue of whether the defendant, Dr. Garner, had been sexually intimate and had had sexual intercourse with Ms. X was not in question. This allegation had been admitted to be true. Furthermore, Dr. Garner had admitted that Ms. X was subject to his continuing professional influence. Based on the clinical history presented to the Tribunal, and the lack of any formal session by Dr. Garner with Ms. X to inform her of the end of her treatment, the Tribunal found that Ms. X had still been a client of Dr. Garner. There was sufficient evidence in the clinical records to indicate the need for on-going treatment and close monitoring of Ms. X's emotional and physical health. In addition, the Tribunal noted that future appointments had been made for Ms. X and her family by Dr. Garner's secretary, as a demonstration of Dr. Garner's recognition of the need for on-going therapy.

**THE PENALTY**

Counsel for the Board recommended a penalty



for the Tribunal to consider. Counsel for Dr. Garner agreed with the proposed recommendations except for the recommendation of full publication in The Bulletin. Both counsel presented arguments to support their positions.

After deliberation, the Tribunal decided that the penalty awarded to Dr. Garner would be a two-year suspension of certification of registration. At the end of this period, Dr. Garner could apply for reinstatement, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That a mental health professional complete an initial and final assessment of Dr. Garner;
- (2) Based on the final assessment, the mental health professional shall give a statement to the Board of Dr. Garner's suitability to resume practice;
- (3) If reinstatement is not recommended, the suspension will continue, pending satisfaction of these conditions;

During four days in October 1986 and during a further three days in May 1987, a Tribunal of the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology heard evidence concerning a charge of malpractice against a Toronto psychologist, Dr. Donald Franklin.

It was alleged that Dr. Franklin was guilty of malpractice under the Psychologists Registration Act R.S.O. 1980, Chapter 404 in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in his psychological assessment of candidate A with regard to suitability for the position of President of a client firm X.

The particulars of the allegation were as follows:

A. With regard to testing, Dr. Franklin (1) administered tests before having interviewed the candidate, (2) used an excessive number of tests, (3) included tests which were redundant and (4) used tests such as the Short Employment Test which were inappropriate for the selection of managerial/executive candidates.

B. With regard to interpretation of test results, Dr. Franklin (1) misinterpreted raw scores achieved by the testing, (e.g., interpreted a score on the Wonderlic Personnel Test as indicating "speed in learning"), (2) did not address the question of the validity of tests for the purpose intended, (3) improperly compared the candidate's scores to a score distribution based on an unrepresentative sample of job applicants, (4) placed the responsibility for interpretation of test results on the client firm and the candidate, (5) failed to assess the candidate in relation to the requirements of the job, and in his report, (6) presented misleading descriptors of the abilities and traits measured by the tests through his use of a graphic summary.

- (4) If the mental health professional recommends treatment, Dr. Garner must provide evidence that treatment has occurred;
- (5) The mental health professional shall have access to the Board's files with respect to this complaint;
- (6) The Board shall be permitted to receive the reports of the assessments.

Further, there shall be full publication in The Bulletin, with Dr. Garner's name, but the witness' name shall not be included.

### **REASON FOR THE PENALTY**

To its announcement of penalty, the Tribunal added the following statement in its written reasons:

In determining the penalty, the Tribunal considered the issue of trust to be paramount in this case; the therapeutic relationship must be one of utmost trust in our profession. Dr. Garner seriously breached this trust with his

## **II**

C. With regard to reporting the results of his assessment, Dr. Franklin's report (1) failed to explain how the assessed traits could be interpreted in terms of the qualifications for and responsibilities of the job in question, and (2) contained contradictory statements which were left unresolved. Further, (3) the responsibility for informing the candidate of the conclusion, opinions and advice issuing from the assessment was left to the client, and (4) test results were reported inappropriately (e.g., as presented in his graphic summary).

D. With regard to his responsibilities to the candidate, Dr. Franklin (1) failed to inform the candidate that a second written report was provided to the client firm comparing him with another candidate, and (2) failed to take proper care to ensure that the purpose of the tests and the report were not misunderstood by the candidate.

Dr. Franklin entered a plea of not guilty to all charges.

### **SUMMARY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING TO THE CHARGES**

The Tribunal heard evidence that A had applied for the position of President of X, and that he was asked by representatives of X to take "some psychological tests". A testified that he had agreed to take the tests provided that they were objective tests and that he would see the results. A further testified that at no time was he asked to sign a consent form.

A received a set of 11 untimed tests in the mail and subsequent to having completed these, he went to Dr. Franklin's office at which time he was administered a further 7 timed tests, all this prior to his one and only meeting with Dr. Franklin. Shortly after completing the

young client whom he knew to be dependent on him. The Tribunal found this breach of trust to be unpardonable.

The Tribunal was also dismayed by Dr. Garner's conduct over the preceding fourteen months during which he denied all the allegations and implied that the very fragile Ms. X was a liar.

The Tribunal is determined that such behaviour receive the widest condemnation in the profession and furthermore that the public be protected from this behaviour.

The Tribunal considered suspending Dr. Garner's Certificate of Registration for life. With the knowledge that the publication of Dr. Garner's name will have long-lasting effects on his professional career, the Tribunal recommended the two-year suspension with reinstatement only if all criteria are met.

timed tests, A met Dr. Franklin in the context of what was called a "feedback/interview," which A, according to his testimony took to be an interview intended to provide feedback since he had agreed to undergo objective testing only. However, during this session, Dr. Franklin was not only reviewing and interpreting the test results, which by his own testimony he had obtained only briefly before meeting A, but also forming impressions and gathering information about A which was subsequently used in the write-up of the report and which contributed to entries on his graphic summary sheet. The latter carried no indication that entries on the graph were actually based on a blend of subjective and objective information.

Two copies of the report were sent to X, with instructions that one copy was intended for A. In addition, unknown to A, another report was prepared comparing A to another candidate. When A received his copy of his assessment from X, he was disturbed to find that he had apparently scored poorly in terms of speed of learning, flexibility and energy level, and testified that he had not been informed of this during the feedback interview. He testified that he then telephoned Dr. Franklin, who tried to assure him that these terms are technical terms which have special meanings.

### **FINDINGS**

On October 5, 1987, the Tribunal reached its decision as follows:

A (1): On the basis of the evidence and materials available to it, the Tribunal judged that Dr. Franklin was not guilty of malpractice insofar as he administered tests before conducting an interview with the candidate. Although the Tribunal was of the opinion that it is



usually preferable to meet with the candidate prior to testing in order to explain procedures, limits of confidentiality, and consent requirements, failing to meet personally with the candidate prior to the testing does not in and of itself constitute malpractice.

A (2): The Tribunal found Dr. Franklin not guilty of malpractice with respect to the allegation of excessive use of tests. In reaching this decision, the Tribunal was concerned with four separate issues. First, was the battery of 18 tests in and of itself excessive? Second, is it appropriate to use the same battery of tests for all candidates at a given management level regardless of the position under consideration? Third, had Dr. Franklin carried out a job analysis in order to determine what qualities were needed for the particular job in question, or did the assessment simply revolve about a common set of tests with no regard for the particular and unique aspects of the job? Fourth, does the test battery possess any predictive validity for the selection of management personnel?

Expert testimony was consistent in the view that the number of tests was not by itself excessive. Furthermore, the Tribunal heard evidence to the effect that there is no single correct way of applying tests in the assessment of an individual as part of a selection procedure. On the one hand, it is reasonable to analyze the requirements of a particular job and then choose tests to measure the variables considered to be most pertinent as a result of that analysis. On the other hand, it is also reasonable, following a job analysis, to use a standardized group of tests to measure specific variables such as verbal reasoning ability and numerical ability, which contribute in a general way to capability in a wide range of jobs. The Tribunal was persuaded by the argument that a common core of basic cognitive and perceptual skills contributes to success across a broad range of management positions.

Expert testimony underlined the importance of a job analysis prior to assessment. The Tribunal in reaching its decision accepted Dr. Franklin's testimony that a job analysis had indeed been carried out although it had not been formally written up. The Tribunal also accepted expert testimony which spoke to the predictive validity of the test battery in question.

A (3): On the basis of evidence available to it, the Tribunal found Dr. Franklin not guilty of malpractice insofar as the allegation of having used tests which were redundant was concerned.

A (4): The Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of malpractice insofar as he used tests which were inappropriate to the selection of managerial/executive candidates. Notwithstanding the fact that the Tribunal accepted that the test battery itself might possess appropriate predictive validity, the use and interpretation of spe-

cific tests such as the Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT) and the Short Employment Test (SET) and the Wonderlic was given separate consideration. Dr. Franklin testified that the DAT is used to understand how a person's intelligence is constituted, and he suggested that it is a matter of personal preference as to whether or not one uses the WAIS, which he does not do. Other testimony was heard both in support of and against the appropriateness of these tests in executive assessment.

The Tribunal was not persuaded that the selection of tests was appropriate to the particular assessment task.

B (1): The Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of malpractice in misinterpreting raw test scores. The Tribunal found it to be misleading to label the score obtained on the Wonderlic as a measure of "speed of learning," since that phrase is very likely to mislead the layperson, and indeed is difficult to justify for the professional psychologist. Furthermore, the Wonderlic Personnel Test Manual contains no reference to "speed of learning."

B (2): The Tribunal judged that Dr. Franklin did indeed fail to address adequately the validity issue regarding the tests in his battery, and therefore found him guilty in this regard. Notwithstanding the Tribunal's decision to accept the general predictive validity of the test battery (A2), the specific interpretations of specific tests (see for example B1) raise separate issues of validity. The overall battery may or may not possess predictive validity when scores are correlated with job success. That does not necessarily mean that the use and interpretation of individual tests is either appropriate or valid. The Tribunal was also of the strong opinion that whatever validity the timed tests possess, that validity was vitiated by Dr. Franklin's failure to take into account applicant A's seemingly obvious signs of test anxiety, as exhibited by the candidate's reported behaviour in both the testing room and the interview/feedback session. The timed tests in question, as with timed tests in general, are subject to considerable interference from test anxiety, and it is the psychologist's responsibility to raise questions about the validity of test scores with respect to a particular client when such anxiety is so clearly manifest.

B (3): The Tribunal heard testimony that Dr. Franklin compared A's scores to a score distribution based on a normative sample, called the Canadian Business Sample, which was developed by James W. Westcott and Associates and which is comprised of the results of the administration of the same test battery to all candidates who have come to James W. Westcott and Associates for assessment in relevant areas.

The Tribunal found that Dr. Franklin's failure to indicate in his report the limitations of the Canadian Business Sample, to the extent that his interpretations based on that sample can

mislead, renders him guilty of malpractice.

B (4): The Tribunal heard evidence that A was invited to a "interview/feedback" session shortly after having completed the timed tests. Further testimony indicated that the content of this session was then used by Dr. Franklin to draw final conclusions which then went into the report. Indeed, Dr. Franklin testified that he was forming his assessment of A as he spoke to him.

The Tribunal, guided in part by Principle 8 of the Ethical Standards of Psychologists, found Dr. Franklin guilty of the charge of placing the responsibility for interpretation of test results on the client and the candidate. The Tribunal found unacceptable the suggestion that a psychologist can enter a session with a candidate he has never before had contact with, and with a set of test results that he has just received, and be able to provide adequate feedback. This proposition is more preposterous in the light of admission by Dr. Franklin that the entries on the graphic summary, which he testified was reviewed with A, actually reflect in part the outcome of the interview portion of the interview/feedback session. Thus, it was impossible to give feedback about the conclusions of the assessment since they had not yet been finalized, and indeed were themselves dependent upon the interaction in the feedback/interview session. Furthermore, to delegate to the client firm the obligation to provide a copy of the report to the candidate, and to fail to provide to the candidate the "Guide to report interpretation" which is provided to all clients but not to this candidate, compounds the failure to give adequate feedback. Moreover, the Tribunal, having observed and heard testimony about A, found incredible the suggestion that he would sit through a feedback interview and calmly accept that he was low in speed of learning, low in flexibility and low in energy, only to become very upset two weeks later upon reading those descriptors in the report. The Tribunal is persuaded that A did not receive adequate feedback about these particular points during the interview/feedback session.

B (5): The Tribunal judged that Dr. Franklin in his report made no effort to indicate how A measured up relative to whatever criteria Dr. Franklin had decided were important to the job of President of X. While the Tribunal accepted that it is not always necessary to draw specific conclusions about suitability, the Tribunal did not accept that this report, even in the hands of individuals on the selection committee at X, could easily be interpreted in terms of the requirements of the job in question. Therefore, the Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of failing to assess the candidate in terms of the requirements of the job.

B (6): In the opinion of the Tribunal, the use of the particular graphic summary employed by Dr. Franklin was unprofessional in that it is



confusing and misleading. The descriptors miscommunicate, and in this particular case, to the detriment of the candidate. Even an expert witness testifying in Dr. Franklin's defence demonstrated confusion in his interpretation of the meaning of entries on the graphic summary. Because the Tribunal saw it as incumbent upon the psychologist to communicate findings in a manner which is clear and not subject to misinterpretation, it found Dr. Franklin guilty of presenting misleading descriptors of the abilities and traits measured by the tests.

C (1): With regard to the charge that the report failed to explain how the assessed traits could be interpreted in terms of the qualifications for and responsibilities of the job in question, the Tribunal dealt with this in its consideration of allegation B (5).

C (2): With regard to the charge that Dr. Franklin's report contained contradictory statements which were left unresolved (for example, a statement about "good ability to deal with a heavy workload and a demanding schedule is a plus" and another statement about A's low energy level), the Tribunal, based on the evidence before it and its own reading of the report, found Dr. Franklin guilty of this charge.

C (3): With regard to the charge that Dr. Franklin put the responsibility for informing the candidate of the conclusions, opinions and advice issuing from the assessment on the client firm, the Tribunal heard evidence that a copy of the report was not sent directly to A by Dr. Franklin, but rather that two copies of the report were sent to the client firm, attached to one which was a form letter indicating that this copy was for A. Related issues have already been discussed under allegation B (4) above. Accordingly, the Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of this allegation.

C (4): With regard to the charge that Dr. Franklin reported test results inappropriately to the candidate and the client, (e.g., as presented on the graphic summary), the Tribunal has dealt with this matter in its treatment of allegation B (6).

D (1): The Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of malpractice inasmuch as he failed to advise the candidate and obtain his consent about the preparation of a second report, a comparison report. Informed consent of the candidate is required in such a case and it was not obtained.

D (2): The Tribunal found Dr. Franklin guilty of malpractice inasmuch as he failed to fully inform A about the nature and purpose of the assessment and the report. Dr. Franklin testified that it is standard practice at James W. Westcott and Associates to allow the client to obtain the consent of candidates for assessment and that nothing specific is provided by way of instruction to the client with regard to obtaining such consent. Dr. Franklin further testified that he was unaware of any limitations placed by A on his consent, and that he did not

inform A that a comparison report, comparing A to another candidate, would be written in addition to the report specific to A.

While the Tribunal accepted that it is not always necessary to obtain informed consent personally, it is mandatory that the psychologist assure himself or herself that consent has been obtained and that the candidate is informed as to what is being consented to, and that the psychologist remain within the limitations of that consent. A testified, and the Tribunal was persuaded, that A would not have consented to the testing had he been aware that subjective evaluation, by way of what A believed to be an interview session concerned solely with feedback, was involved.

### **PENALTY**

The Tribunal recognized that the defendant in this case was conducting himself in the manner sanctioned and encouraged by James W. Westcott and Associates and that he carried out his assessment and prepared his report in the identical manner of others working in the same firm. It therefore appeared to the Tribunal to be somewhat unfair to punish Dr. Franklin alone while those with and for whom he works go unscathed. Therefore, in recognition of this and in recognition also of the fact that this long hearing process had already exacted a considerable toll on Dr. Franklin, the following penalty was imposed:

1. A Reprimand
2. Publication of a summary of the findings along with Dr. Franklin's name in The Bulletin.

### **POSTSCRIPT**

It is to be understood that these findings establish what is to be expected of psychologists in carrying out and reporting on assessments. Future penalties may well be expected to be less lenient in consequence. The reader should also note that the Tribunal was particularly concerned both by the fact that there were numerous instances of malpractice in the assessment of A, and by testimony which indicated that Dr. Franklin followed precisely the procedure used year in and year out in the assessment of managerial/executive candidates at James W. Westcott and Associates.

The results of this hearing illustrate the following general points, among others, with regard to employment assessments:

1. The candidate is to be considered, so far as ethics are concerned, to be as much one's client as the firm paying for the assessment. This means that all the usual concerns about an individual's well-being must be kept clearly in mind. Informed consent must be obtained,

and proper attention must be given to providing feedback to the candidate.

Psychologists must recognize that psychological assessment is capable of causing great harm to the well-being of those who submit to such assessment. First of all, of course, good and suitable candidates may be denied access to specific jobs if inappropriate testing or incorrect interpretation of tests leads to unfavourable assessments. If the assessment comments negatively on a candidate's capabilities, the candidate's self-esteem may be severely damaged as well, and all the more so if the candidate accepts the ability of psychologists to adequately evaluate him or her.

2. The psychologist must show appropriate respect for the selection of appropriate tests. Just as some psychologists are concerned and shocked by the growing use of graphology by European industrial firms as a sole means of assessing suitability for a job, we too must be cautious to insure that whatever tests and procedures we apply are appropriate and predictive in the context in which they are being used. Note that the client firm generally has no direct way of assessing the success rate of the psychological assessment process, and certainly no way of knowing how successful might have been those candidates who were not hired because of poor results on the psychological assessment.

Finally, it is to be stressed that psychologists who carry out employment assessments are not put at any disadvantage by complying with the points raised by the results of this hearing, provided that they are using appropriate test batteries. The rest - informed consent, proper respect for the candidate's well-being, efforts to take test anxiety into consideration and to explore contradictory findings arising from the data, providing clear and adequate feedback - not only are ethically necessary but appeal to good professional sense as well. ■

## **WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS**

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology was administered on April 15, 1988 in Ottawa, Thunder Bay, Toronto & Windsor. The Board appreciates the assistance of Ron Frisch, Ph.D., Anisa Janmohamed, Connie Learn, Jane Ledingham, Ph.D. and William Melnyk, Ph.D. who served as proctors.



## APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD

The Board is pleased to announce the appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of Dr. Brian A. Ridgley of Toronto to a five-year term on the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology, effective June 1, 1988. Dr. Ridgley replaces Dr. Marta Townsend.

Dr. Ridgley received a doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Windsor in 1970, following undergraduate studies at the University of Toronto. Before moving to Sunnybrook Medical Centre to assume responsibility for the delivery of neuropsychological services, he was a psychologist on the staff at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto and research consultant to Sacred Heart Children's Village where he also supervised neuropsychological services. Since 1975 Dr. Ridgley has headed The Department of Psychology at Sunnybrook Medical Centre. ■

## NEW PERMANENT REGISTRANTS

The following candidates for registration in Ontario were admitted to the Permanent Register at a meeting of the Board held on May 27, 1988.

Barbara Armstrong	Carol Heusser	Catherine Pink
Linda Baker	Kathleen Hofmans	Mary Rees Nishio
Sandra Baxter	Lynne Hollander	Philip Ricciardi
Peter Bernstein	Connie Kushnir	Paul Robinson
Alan Best	Giuliana Malvestuto-Felice	Alan Shapiro
Gale Bildfell	Wayne Matheson	Lawrence Spreng
James Bowman	Frederick Mathews	Lynn Stewart
Edward Connors	Thomas Mawhinney	Michael Teehan
Mary Crawford	Donald Maxwell	Denise Tremblay
David Duncan	Avrum Miller	Ester Wagner
Frank Förde	Mary Morrison	Page Westcott
Carol Franklyn-Phills	Pamela Paris	Valerie Whiffen
Ross Gray	Debra Pepler	Dickie Yu
Kathryn Hall	Schrine Persad	

## REGISTRATION AT THE MASTERS LEVEL

During the years of the Health Professions Legislation Review the Board and the Ontario Psychological Association have been asked to state their positions on the question of the statutory registration and regulation of persons providing psychological services who hold a masters degree. During these years the Board has met with representatives of the Ontario Association of Consultants, Counsellors, Psy-

chometrists and Psychotherapists to discuss the issue, and this spring the Board attempted to survey the opinions of all of the masters-level personnel it could locate. As the Board has not surveyed the opinions of psychologists on this question since its survey in 1979, it intends to include a questionnaire in its mailing of The Bulletin in late September or early October. ■

## DECEASED

The Board regrets that it has been informed of the death of Dr. Susan London of Windsor on May 1, 1988, and of Dr. Leonard Kirk of St. Catharines on January 23, 1988. ■

## ORAL EXAMINATIONS

The oral examinations were held in Toronto on May 25, 26, and 27. Assisting the Board in conducting these examinations were the following psychologists:

NANCY ADSETT, Ph.D., Associate in Psychology, Peel Board of Education;  
HAROLD N. BLACKWELL, Ph.D., Private Practice, London;  
FREDERICK J. BOLAND, Ph.D., Associate Professor & Clinical Chairman, Department of Psychology, Queen's University;  
JOHN CROZIER, Ph.D., Associate Professor, York University;  
HENRY EDWARDS, Ph.D., Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa;  
MARIO FAVERI, Ph.D., Director, Community Programs Evaluation Centre, Addiction Research Foundation, London;  
MILAN HARMINC, Ph.D., Clinical Coordinator, Workers' Compensation Board;  
MARGARET MAMEN, Ph.D., Psychologist, Carleton Board of Education;  
JOHN MCGRORY, Ph.D., Chief, Department of Psychology, Windsor Western Hospital Centre;  
WILLIAM MELNYK, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychology, Lakehead University;  
BRUCE QUARRINGTON, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychology; Consultant, Counseling and Development Centre, York University;  
LAURA RICE, Ph.D., Professor (retired), Department of Psychology, York University;  
ALICIA RUIPEREZ, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, Lakehead Psychiatric Hospital;  
SARAH USHER, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, Wellesley Hospital, Toronto;  
CARLO VIGNA, Ph.D., Psychologist, Private Practice and Downsview Rehabilitation Centre.

## ADDITIONS TO THE TEMPORARY REGISTER SINCE APRIL, 1988

Joan Clayton  
Gary Fisher  
Delroy Louden  
Samuel Mikail  
Gwendolen Richardson  
Karen Spivak  
Carolle Trembley  
Barbara Wunder  
Robert Zacharko