



## CANADIAN PSYCHOLOGISTS CONTRIBUTE TO EPPP ITEM POOL

By Lynn Waldie, Ph.D.

On Saturday, October 29, two psychologists, Dr. Shanna Richman and Dr. Henry Solomon from the Professional Examination Service (PES) in New York met with eighteen Metro Toronto psychologists who had been invited to participate in an item-writing workshop and develop additional items for the pool from which the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) is derived. Metro based psychologists were selected because compensation for expenses was not available. The EPPP is developed by the American Association of State Psychology Boards (AASPB) in contract with PES. The development process is designed to maximize the content validity of the examination for its intended use.

Participants had previously received a package of orienting materials and guidelines for writing items and had been asked to prepare 10 multiple-choice items in advance with the understanding that they would have generated a total of at least 17 potentially useable items by the end of the workshop. The day began with the PES staff presenting background information regarding the process of item development, editing and review; and describing the ongoing efforts since 1964 to ensure the validity of the examination itself. In view of the potential for any item being scrutinized in the legal arena (e.g. if a candidate challenges its validity), participants were required to document the source of all items with specific references to text or journal. This imposed some constraints on the creative process since it ruled out armchair thinking unless a reference

could be pin-pointed after the fact. Also the items had to be geared to knowledge essential to basic entry-level practice. Hence, as specialists, participants had to dampen their enthusiasm for generating the kinds of items they might wish to try on experienced peers.

Despite the serious industry of the day (believe it or not, 17 items was a challenging target), evidenced by the mounds of texts surrounding bowed heads, there were occasional chortles as someone enjoyed but rejected a particularly absurd response option generated by themselves or a neighbour. This and the ample opportunity for collegial interaction as participants were encouraged to elicit feedback on their items from others, helped lighten the task.

This Canadian contribution to item development is timely, given the perennial concern that the EPPP should be appropriate for Canadian candidates, and the current involvement of Canadian psychologists in the affairs of AASPB: Barbara Wand as its President and Ray Engel as a new member of the AASPB Examination Committee.

## ON BEING AN ORAL EXAMINER

By Terrence J. Laughlin, Ph.D.

About six weeks prior to the Board's November oral examinations I received a letter from Dr. Wand asking if I would be willing to serve as a member of an examining team. While I was pleased to be asked, my stage one reaction was to decline in favour of not backlogging a sagging in-basket with another two days worth of administrative delights. By stage two I was recalling with twinges of previously repressed anxiety, my own pre-

parations as an oral candidate a decade ago. Obviously, there was no alternative but to go and attempt to make life easier for those on the threshold of permanent registration. Written assurance that the Board would cover expenses helped neutralize any budgetary reservations.

Other than the usual risk to life and limb on the speedways connecting Toronto International with downtown, the experience of being an oral examiner was professionally invigorating. There were much enjoyed opportunities to check out "Head Office", to meet new and veteran colleagues and to be both impressed and reassured by the talent and commitment of these people.

A briefing session prior to the examinations themselves made it clear that they were to be conducted in an atmosphere of support and welcome - very appropriate by that stage of the registration process, I thought. In general, candidates presented themselves well. Hopefully, felt trauma levels were minimal and any residual discomfort has long since dissipated. All are wished well.

A further note. Contrary to occasional rumours, the Board can be very hospitable! Now, back to the in-basket.

### ORAL EXAMINERS

The oral examinations were held in Toronto on November 23, 24 and 25. Assisting the Board in conducting these examinations were the following psychologists:

Morry Appelle, Ph.D., Private Practice, Ottawa;  
Gregory T. Banwell, Ph.D., Senior Consultant, Rohrer, Hibler and Repogle, Limited, Toronto;  
Michael P. Burger, Ph.D., Outpatient Psychologist, Consultant to Inpatient Psychiatric Services, Psychology Dept., Peterborough Civic Hospital;

Patricia DeFeudis, Ph.D., Neuropsychologist, Toronto General Hospital;  
Darla Drader, Ph.D., Consulting Psychologist, Private Practice, Ottawa;  
G. Ray Engel, Ph.D., Consultant, Private Practice, Toronto;  
Howard Jobin, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, Metropolitan Separate School Board;  
Terrence J. Laughlin, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, Dept. of Psychology, Ottawa Board of Education;  
I. Frances MacDonald, Ph.D., Supervising Psychologist, York Region Roman Catholic Separate School Board;  
William T. Melnyk, Ph.D., Professor, Dept. of Psychology, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay;  
Carl A. Rubino, Ph.D., Director, Surrey Place Centre, Toronto;  
Mark B. Sobell, Ph.D., Head, Sociobehavioural Research, Clinical Institute, Addiction Research Foundation and Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Toronto;  
Lynn Waldie, Ph.D., Psychologist, Hopkins Division, Ongwanada Hospital, Kingston.

### OFFICE NEWS

During the past few years a number of changes and additions have been made in the Board office that we thought might interest the readers of the Bulletin. The Board now employs four full-time staff working under the general direction of the Registrar, Dr. Barbara Wand. The Board staff answers numerous general inquiries about the registration procedure, specific questions from psychologists about ethics and standards, investigates complaints from the public about professional misconduct, and produces two publications, the quarterly Bulletin and the annual Directory. We have estimated that the staff handles about 17,000 pieces of correspondence each year. We would like to introduce ourselves to you.

---

### Connie Nakatsu

Connie joined the staff in 1982 to fill the newly created position of Director of Professional Affairs. Connie's background includes a law degree from Osgoode Hall and a masters degree in consumer studies from the University of Guelph. Her key responsibilities include review of complaints of violations of Section 11 of the Act against non-psychologists; correspondence concerning complaints in the area of professional practice; and in consultation with the Registrar and the Board's solicitor, review and analysis of conduct in the disposition of the complaint or the formulation of charges. In selected areas Connie also drafts policies, briefs, position papers and public statements. Connie's work frequently involves meetings with members of the public and other professions. As well, she consults with psychologists on interpretation of standards, particularly in areas where her background in law is helpful.

### Naomi Silverman

Naomi joined the staff in 1980, first as Administrative Assistant and then in 1983 as Director of Administration. She holds degrees in music and education from the University of Western Ontario and prior to joining the Board taught elementary school as well as acquiring some general office experience. Among her numerous responsibilities are the general operation of the office which includes assisting in the hiring and supervision of support staff. Naomi has primary responsibility for the coordination and maintenance of application files, and the temporary and permanent registers. She corresponds and meets with potential applicants, candidates for registration, supervisors and the Board members on matters of registration as well as answering questions from around the world about the requirements for registration

in Ontario. In addition she plans and organizes the Board examinations, both oral and written, and proctors the written exam in Toronto. Attendance at Board meetings and preparation of the minutes of Board meetings are other responsibilities.

### Gail Milne

Gail joined the staff in 1981 as Administrative Assistant. Her background includes a nursing diploma as well as general office experience. It is usually Gail's voice that is heard when someone calls the Board office. She is responsible for paying the Board's bills, doing its banking and preparing material for the Board's bookkeeper. Gail provides liaison with the computer services at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education that currently provide our mailing labels and prepare photo-ready copy for the Directory. Another of her important tasks is the preparation of copy for the Bulletin. In addition she acts as a general liaison with printers and suppliers.

### Jean Cole

Jean is the newest addition to the staff having joined in the fall of 1983 as Assistant in Administration. Jean came to the Board with extensive elementary school teaching experience. In addition she has taught word processing and business English at Sheridan College. She acts as primary word processor operator and general secretary. In addition she will soon be our primary computer operator.

### Equipment Purchase

In November, 1983 the most recent addition to the office equipment was installed in the guise of a microcomputer, the IBM PCXT. Among our plans for the computer will be the storage of files for

---

the temporary and permanent registers which contain the information needed for the publication of the annual Directory. The 1985 edition will, we anticipate, be produced by the staff with the assistance of the resident computer. We foresee unlimited possibilities for the computer to enhance office operations.

We hope you are now more familiar with the staff and the operation of the office. Your questions and/or comments are welcomed.

### DEVELOPMENTS IN LEGISLATION

In January, 1983, the then Minister of Health, Mr. Larry Grossman, announced that a review of the legislation governing the health professions would take place. In the year which has passed, the Ministry has hired consultants to gather the information for the review and appointed Alan Schwartz, a Toronto lawyer, to chair the review team.

Below is a summary of the address made by Mr. Schwartz at a recent continuing education program presented by the Law Society of Upper Canada. Mr. Schwartz briefly stated the goals of the review as follows:

- 1.(a) To determine which currently regulated health professions should continue to be regulated, and
  - (b) Conversely to determine which currently unregulated professions should be regulated;
2. To determine the appropriate form of regulation for the various professions;
3. To arbitrate and settle the outstanding issues which have arisen between several of the disciplines;

4. To ensure effective standard of practice mechanisms throughout all the health disciplines.

It was anticipated that the review would be completed and new legislation enacted in about two years. The process was commenced by circulating a list of twenty-two topics for consideration by all health disciplines as well as by associations and institutions which employ, train or bargain for health professionals, and to consumer and advocacy groups. All interested groups were asked to make written submissions to the review team by the end of 1983.

Since the review process is a public one, the submissions are being made available to all participants for their reaction and comment. After the team has identified areas of agreement and disagreement from the feedback, the second phase of the review will begin.

In this phase, all interested parties will be consulted and proposed solutions to the regulatory issues will be developed. While this work is being done, the survey of how other jurisdictions have handled regulatory issues will have been completed. While no deadlines have been established, the goal is to have legislation drafted by February 28, 1985.

This Board has completed its responsibility with respect to the first phase of the review process. Its submission was based on the brief accompanying the proposed new Psychologists Registration Act which was presented to the Ministry of Health in June of 1982.



### ACCESS TO AN OFFENDERS FILE

The following case was recently reported in the Ontario Reports. Only that part which involves a psychologist's reports is summarized. Egglestone and Mousseau had been confined to mental health centres after each had been found not guilty by reason of insanity of a criminal offence. The Lieutenant-Governor's warrants under which the men were incarcerated were being reviewed. The Advisory Review Board properly constituted under the Mental Health Act was to review the files of the men. Egglestone through his lawyer asked that he be allowed to see and copy his hospital record which included clinical records, nurses' notes and psychologists assessments and reports. The Board refused to allow any access to Egglestone himself but did make a provision to allow Egglestone's lawyer to review the file. The file could be reviewed by Egglestone's lawyer on the condition that no information from the file could be disclosed to Egglestone himself. Egglestone appealed this order to the Divisional Court. The Court upheld the decision of the Advisory Board.

Hospital staff had been concerned that unrestricted access to a file by the offenders would hinder treatment and/or limit the information which staff would write in a file. Egglestone's lawyer argued that if access is to be limited the decision to restrict access should be made either by the administrator of the facility or by the physicians involved in the care and treatment of the patient. The court rejected this argument. The court found that since the relationship was not only between physician and patient but between other hospital personnel and patient, the decision with respect to the offender's file should not be a medical one. The court recognized the contribution and interests of other professionals to the files. It was in consideration of this contribution that

the court felt that the Advisory Board was the party which could best consider the interests of all the parties in a treatment facility when a decision as to access to an offender's file was to be made.

The decision should alleviate concerns psychologists treating offenders had about the possible consequences of unrestricted access to files. Also of interest in the court's reasons for judgment is the recognition given to the other professionals involved in the treatment of the offender.

### ACCEPTABLE VOCATIONAL DESIGNATIONS

The Board receives many requests for clarification of standards. Section 1 of Appendix B of the Standards of Professional Conduct lists acceptable forms for individual vocational designation. Section 1(a) of Appendix B is the statement which makes the use of terms such as "child", "clinical", "forensic" to modify the title psychologist a violation of the standards. This position is in recognition of the fact that the present Psychologists Registration Act and the Regulations do not recognize specialties. A psychologist who has limited his or her practice to specific areas may use terms such as "practice limited to", "practising in" or "consultant in".

### CERTIFIED MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

On December 2, 1983, Bill PR-26 received Royal Assent. This bill titled "An Act Respecting the Institute of Management Consultants of Ontario" is of interest to those who work as management consultants. The act reserves the use of the title "certified management consultants" and initials "C.M.C." for those who are registered with the Institute.

the court felt that the Advisory Board was the party which could best consider the interests of all the parties in the treatment facility when a decision is required on an offender's file as to whether or not a return to the community is warranted. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record.

**ACCEPTABLE VOCATIONAL DESIGNATIONS**

The Board has received many requests for the inclusion of new vocational designations in the list of acceptable designations. The Board has reviewed these requests and has decided to accept the following designations for inclusion in the list of acceptable designations:

Child, "clinical", forensic to modify the title of a psychologist. A violation of the standards of this profession is a violation of the standards of the profession. The Board has decided to accept the following designations for inclusion in the list of acceptable designations:

**MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS**

The Board has received many requests for the inclusion of new management consultants in the list of acceptable designations. The Board has reviewed these requests and has decided to accept the following designations for inclusion in the list of acceptable designations:

Chair  
Ruth M. Bray, Ph.D.

Secretary-Treasurer  
Henry P. Edwards, Ph.D.

Members  
John E. Callagan, Ph.D.  
John A. McGrory, Ph.D.  
Robert J.M. Potvin, Ph.D.

Registrar  
Barbara Wand, Ph.D.

Staff:  
Connie Nakatsu  
Naomi Silverman  
Jean Cole  
Gail Milne

**ACCESS TO AN OFFENDER'S FILE**

The following case was recently reported in the Ontario Reports. Only that part which involves psychological reports submitted to the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology has been summarized. The Board's decision was based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record.

**bulletin** Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology



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

The court found that the Board's decision was based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record. The court also noted that the Board's decision should be based on the facts of the case and not on the basis of the offender's past record.