



ASPPB

Association of State and
Provincial Psychology Boards

Supporting member jurisdictions in fulfilling their responsibility of public protection

President

Herbert L. Stewart, PhD

Chief Executive Officer

Mariann Burnett-Atwell, PsyD

Past President

Alan B. Slusky, PhD, CPsych

President-Elect

Michelle G. Paul, PhD

Secretary-Treasurer

Cindy Olvey, PsyD

Members at Large

Hugh D. Moore, PhD, MBA

Jennifer C. Laforce, PhD, CPsych

Ramona N. Mellott, PhD

Frequently Asked Questions about the EPPP

General Topic:

Why do licensing boards need to assess competency?

It is the duty of licensing boards to protect the public by making all efforts to ensure those who practice psychology are competent to do so. The public expects this of the healthcare professions and believes that it is being done. Assessing candidates is not a “hoop” or punitive action for potential licensees. A great deal of thought goes into requirements for licensure and the required assessment of these requirements. ASPPB has spent more than 15 years evaluating the need and methods to assess competency, and the revised EPPP is an effective method to accomplish this goal.

Is there a need for skills assessment as part of licensure requirements?

Yes. The EPPP has historically been a foundational knowledge exam and has been criticized for not being a skills-focused exam. Although many other healthcare professions have moved toward competency exams, psychology has been an outlier in not having a standardized competency exam. This has posed problems for licensing boards because skills assessment was left to individual boards. As each licensing authority now assesses skills differently, this introduces variability in how candidates are assessed. The most common techniques used by licensing boards are counting supervised practice hours, using letters of recommendations, and administering oral examinations. All these methods have known reliability problems. The EPPP (Parts 1 and 2) provides a universal, standardized, objective, and reliable tool for regulators to ensure that their candidates demonstrate competency.

The need for competency assessment has been noted in the literature for many years as well. Rodolfa, Ko, and Petersen (2004) reported that Training Directors agreed that a significant majority of candidates were not ready for practice upon receipt of the degree. The authors further noted that Training Directors believed that approximately 3,400 hours of supervised experience were needed for licensure. Yet, many states have eliminated the post-doctoral training requirement. Another study revealed that 77% of psychology students reported competency problems among their peers (Furr & Brown-Rice, 2017). APPIC has also reported increasing consultation requests from members for competency concerns for three straight years.

How has the EPPP been revised?

The EPPP was revised to transition from a foundational knowledge-focused examination to a fuller measure of competency (both knowledge and skills). Until recently, the EPPP focused on assessing knowledge [EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge)]. The EPPP now includes the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) and the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) as a comprehensive competency assessment that allows licensing authorities to evaluate both foundational knowledge and practical skills.

Why did ASPPB decide to revise the EPPP to include an applied skills portion?

ASPPB's primary mission is to support American and Canadian psychology licensing boards in meeting their mandate of public protection. Licensing boards have the responsibility of ensuring that the professionals they license are competent to practice. Competence is defined as the integrated and consistent use of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values of the profession. The membership of ASPPB supported a revision to the EPPP that would further enhance their ability to evaluate candidate readiness to enter into independent practice. With this revision of the EPPP, licensing boards have available to them an examination that will offer a standardized, reliable, valid, and legally defensible method of assessing both the knowledge and the applied skills necessary for independent practice.

Why not just require that candidates graduate from an accredited educational program?

Accreditation is valuable and provides a level of assurance that the training program in psychology has met certain standards. Evaluation for licensure must ensure that training in psychology and the degree conferred are acceptable for licensure, and *also* that the candidate for licensure possesses the necessary knowledge and skills for practice in the profession. Thus, accreditation is a **program** review, whereas evaluation for licensure is an **individual** review. The EPPP adds to the tools used to assess the *individuals* who are applying to practice psychology independently. Although program accreditation might ensure that educational requirements for licensure were met by individuals, licensing boards must be able to ensure that each individual also meets a standard level of knowledge attainment and skills that makes them able to practice without supervision.

Is the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) valid and reliable?

The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) was developed using the same methodology as the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge), and this methodology complies with the guidelines outlined in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (2014). The development process was extensive and is ongoing. This work has included hundreds of Subject Matter Experts (licensed psychologists) throughout the development process. Some of the processes that help support the validation include: two Job Task Analyses that surveyed thousands of licensed psychologists for refinement of the test specifications, multiple levels of item review, ongoing statistical analysis at the item level and the exam level, and a Standard Setting process to develop an empirically derived pass point.

ASPPB stands by the process used to establish a fair and valid examination. A more thorough discussion about the validity of the EPPP is provided later in this document.

The need for mental health providers is great. Will a two-part examination create barriers to licensure?

There is a recognized shortage of health care providers, and ASPPB is committed to supporting an accessible, navigable, and efficient path to licensure for all qualified candidates. Although such services are needed, it is important to also recognize that these services must be delivered by individuals who have demonstrated their competence in the knowledge and skills needed to practice.

Prior to the development of the EPPP (Part 2- Skills), numerous jurisdictions had created their own versions of skills exams or employed oral exams in an effort to evaluate skills. The cost of jurisdictional-level skills assessment is very high, and oral exams tend to be more subjective and are subject to legal challenges. The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) provides for a standardized assessment of skills across jurisdictions that meets credentialing/licensing industry standards. It is expected to *replace* these current steps to licensure, *not* add to them. Nevada, for example, eliminated a state-specific skills exam by replacing it with the EPPP (Part 2-Skills).

Additionally, ASPPB recommends that the timing of the EPPP (Part 1 Knowledge) be shifted to the point of knowledge acquisition: when all foundational coursework is completed and prior to or during internship. This has some advantages in that pass rates tend to be higher at this point in training, and this eliminates delays at the culminating point of licensure.

Candidate-related Topic:

What does this mean for taking the EPPP in my jurisdiction?

Jurisdictions have gradually adopted the revised EPPP whereas some jurisdictions continue to require only the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge). You can find a list of jurisdictions that are presently using both parts of the EPPP here:

<https://www.asppb.net/page/EPPPPart2-Skills>

Beginning in January 2026 all jurisdictions that require the EPPP will use the updated version which includes both a knowledge portion and a skills portion.

What is the process for taking each part of the exam?

In order to take the EPPP, an individual must be a candidate for licensure in one of the 65 ASPPB member jurisdictions. This means that one must apply for a Psychologist license in the State, Province, or Territory where that person wishes to practice. The licensing authority determines if the candidate meets the requirements for licensure in that jurisdiction and will approve the candidate to take the EPPP.

Once approved, candidates will receive an email notification that will allow them to register online for the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge). Candidates may register and schedule testing at one of many Pearson testing centers located in the US and Canada. In jurisdictions that require the EPPP (Part 2-Skills), candidates may take the skills portion *only* after they have passed the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge). If both parts are required for licensure, the candidate must pass both parts to pass the EPPP. See the Candidate Handbook for more complete details:

<https://www.asppb.net/page/CandHandbook>

What does the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) look like?

The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) is designed to assess a candidate's ability to demonstrate what should be done in practice settings. In the simplest terms, questions focus on what psychologists should *do* in a real-world context. This part of the exam contains 170 questions - 130 of these questions are included in the exam score and 40 questions are "pretest" questions that are being statistically evaluated prior to their use on subsequent versions of the exam. The item types include traditional multiple choice (3 options), scenarios with multiple parts, animations, exhibits, "point and click" items, and items with multiple correct responses.

Sample items can be viewed on the ASPPB website. <https://www.asppb.net/page/EPPPPart2-Skills>. Additionally, candidates who have registered to take the exam may take a Sample Exam online or in testing center to familiarize themselves with the format and item types, similarly as taking a Practice Test for the EPPP Part 1.

Is the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) just for Health Service Psychologists or is it for all psychology service providers?

The EPPP (Part 2-Skills), like the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge), is for all psychology service providers (i.e., Health Service Psychologists and General Applied Psychologists) who must be licensed to practice independently as psychologists.

Is the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) also for those taking the examination under a master's license requirement?

Yes, just as jurisdictions have used the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) as a requirement for licensure regardless of degree level, the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) is being used for that purpose as well.

Will the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) be required for individuals who are already licensed psychologists?

No. ASPPB has recommended that Individuals who were licensed in their jurisdiction before the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) is required should not be required to take it.

Please note that although ASPPB does not expect any jurisdictions to require the EPPP (Part 2- Skills) in this circumstance, jurisdictions have the authority to determine their own requirements for licensure.

Will the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) be required for people who are licensed but apply for a license in a jurisdiction that requires both parts?

When a licensed person is seeking licensure in another jurisdiction (Licensure by Endorsement), they may be required to take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) in the new jurisdiction. The decision on such a requirement is up to the licensing board in the new jurisdiction.

ASPPB has recommended that jurisdictions that presently require both parts of the exam only require licensees by endorsement to take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) if those individuals were initially licensed *after* the receiving jurisdiction required candidates to pass both parts of the exam. However, individual jurisdictions may have rules that require all applicants to follow the same process. Candidates must check with the jurisdiction in question to understand the requirements.

Why would taking the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) after completion of graduate coursework be a good idea?

When moving to a two-part examination model, it makes the most sense to assess foundational knowledge near to the point of acquisition and skills at the point of licensure (after all supervised training hours have been completed). This is the sequence used in other health care professions. Here are a few important points to understand:

- ASPPB data indicate that pass rates are higher the closer a candidate is to completed coursework. Licensure for psychologists is general, and the EPPP assesses global knowledge. People tend to become more specialized as they move from completed coursework to practice, and acquired general knowledge of psychology may not be as fresh. It is therefore to a candidate's benefit to take the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) earlier if possible.
- This should reduce reliance on expensive third-party test preparation programs. Taking the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) shortly after that information has recently been learned should reduce the need to prepare to the same extent as is often done by candidates under the current model.

- Taking the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) once coursework has been completed allows the candidate who does not pass to assess their knowledge and remediate any deficiencies much earlier in the process, and when the candidate has the greatest access to educational remediation resources.

Ultimately, early admittance for the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) allows for a more streamlined process to licensure, provides earlier feedback, requires less preparation time, should reduce reliance on expensive test preparation materials, and would likely result in fewer retakes of the exam.

What is the cost of the EPPP?

The ASPPB Board of Directors has set the following fee schedule:

- The EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) \$600.00 USD per sitting.
- The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) \$300.00 USD per sitting until 08/15/2023.
- The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) \$450.00 USD per sitting after 08/15/2023.

Do candidates receive their examination results unofficially at the examination site?

Yes, candidates will receive results at the examination site for the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) and for EPPP (Part 2-Skills). The results, however, will not be official until they have been confirmed by the jurisdictional licensing board.

In my jurisdiction, the board requires an oral examination. Will I still be required to take it if I am taking the EPPP (Part 2-Skills)?

The determination of requirements for licensure is the domain of the jurisdictional licensing board where a candidate applies for licensure. The licensing board in each jurisdiction will decide if an oral examination is still required.

Are there testing accommodations offered for those with identified disabilities?

Yes, accommodations are offered in cases where a candidate has a disability and the impact of that disability requires an accommodated administration. All candidates must be approved for accommodations. Requests for accommodations must be sent in writing to the licensing board and must include the accommodations requested and medical/professional documentation supporting the request. Reasonable requests that do not impact the validity or the security of the examination will be considered.

How much time is allowed to take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills)?

The amount of time that will be allowed to take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) is 4 hours and 15 minutes, the same amount of time that is allowed to take the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge).

Can I take both parts of the EPPP before I apply for licensure?

Jurisdictions that are using the revised EPPP may allow their candidates to take the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) before they have finished their graduate degree, but after they have completed all academic coursework (excluding research, practicum experience, and internship). All candidates may take the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) post-degree once they are candidates for licensure in a jurisdiction and have been registered by that jurisdiction. To take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills), candidates must be approved and registered by a jurisdictional licensing board that is using both parts of the EPPP in accordance with established ASPPB policies. ASPPB is recommending that the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) be taken after all supervised experience requirements are completed. Jurisdictions will determine whether they will accept exam scores for those individuals who took the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) prior to internship. Jurisdictions will also determine when the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) can be taken. Candidates

should check with the jurisdiction where they would like to become licensed for the licensing requirements that apply in that jurisdiction regarding when each part of the EPPP can be taken.

More Technical Topic:

Can you provide more detail on validation? Have there been studies addressing predictive, incremental, or concurrent validity?

Content Validity. Questions have been raised about the validity of the EPPP as a tool to assess the knowledge and applied skills necessary for independent licensure. The EPPP is one component of the assessment of an applicant’s readiness for independent licensure as a psychologist. **The accepted standard of validity for credentialing and licensing exams is evidence of content validity**, which is determined primarily through a Job Task Analysis. According to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, “validation of credentialing tests depends mainly on content-related evidence, often in the form of judgments that the test adequately represents the content domain associated with the occupation or specialty being considered” (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014, p. 175).

The content of the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) has been validated through Job Task Analyses for more than 50 years. The most recent Job Task Analysis, completed in 2016, was conducted to address the validity of the content and structure of the revised EPPP (both Part 1 and Part 2). Based on data from more than 2,700 licensed/registered psychologists across the United States and Canada, the 2016 study refined the *ASPPB Competency Model* and validated the blueprint for the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) portion of the EPPP. This blueprint (and a more detailed description of the job task analyses from 2016) can be found on the ASPPB website at: <https://www.asppb.net/page/EPPPPart2-Skills>

Predictive Validity. Other types of validity, such as predictive validity, are **not** considered the standard for addressing the validity of licensure examinations to determine readiness for independent practice. In fact, the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (2014) indicate:

“Criterion-related evidence is of little applicability because credentialing examinations are not intended to predict individual performance but rather to provide evidence that candidates have acquired the knowledge, skills, and judgment required for effective performance.” (pp. 175-176)

As noted in the *Standards*, all assessments should be validated in accordance with their intended use. In this case, the exam is used to determine if the candidate can demonstrate the foundational knowledge or skills required for entry-level practice. This is the question that licensing bodies must answer to have assurance that the candidate is ready to practice safely. Predictions of future outcomes are beyond the scope of the exam—this is not the purpose for which the EPPP has been developed.

All licensing exams are validated in a similar manner. The reason for this stems from the nature of the licensure process and the use of the examination. Although questions such as, “Would an applicant’s score on the EPPP predict the likelihood of that person being disciplined by a licensing board?”, “Would the EPPP score predict improved patient outcomes?”, or “Does a higher score predict that one is more competent than someone with a lower score?” sound like reasonable questions, however they are **not relevant or applicable** to licensure examination scores. Licensure examinations are a **special type of selection exam** where the goal is to identify test takers who pass and those who fail. Unlike other forms of assessment, the discriminatory power of the exam is at the pass point. The precise score obtained by a candidate, how far above or below the pass point, is not relevant

to the question of readiness for licensure. A score that greatly exceeds the pass point does not necessarily indicate greater competence than a score that is just above the pass point; both scores are passing scores.

The implication of this for exam development is that, in addition to a restriction of range problem in only using scores from those who passed the exam, an analysis of the relation of (passing) exam scores to any professional activity would not actually address the validity of the exam in determining readiness for independent practice at the time of application for licensure. To examine predictive validity questions about the future activities of those who took the exam without the restriction of range challenge, it would be necessary to compare an adequately sized and demographically similar sample of individuals who have passed both parts of the EPPP and individuals who have failed the applied skills portion of the EPPP. In this scenario, both groups of individuals would be allowed to practice autonomously for a number of years so that their EPPP scores could be related to whatever criterion is selected to be the standard of “competence” (e.g., patient outcomes, no disciplinary complaints, etc.). An empirical investigation of predictive validity such as this is not feasible because it would depend on a sample of licensing boards allowing people who have been deemed to be unqualified to practice to actually practice independently. Because such a scenario could involve potential harm to the public, it is hard to imagine that any licensing board would consent to take part in such a study.

Incremental validity. Questions have been raised about the incremental validity of assessing skills over the assessment of knowledge. Incremental validity addresses the question of whether an additional means of assessment (i.e., applied skills exam) adds anything to an existing measure’s (i.e., knowledge exam) ability to predict the standing of test takers on an established criterion variable (Hunsley & Meyer, 2003). The type of analysis necessary to evaluate incremental validity would not be consistent with the decision-making process used in a licensure context. This is because it is not simply a matter of whether a new piece of information accounts for significant additional variance in the predicted variable (assuming an appropriate criterion variable could be identified). Licensing boards make the decision of whether an individual, at a specific point in time, is prepared for independent practice. The boards have several requirements for licensure, all of which must be met before a license for independent practice is given. First, educational requirements must be met, followed by passing the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge), followed by passing the EPPP (Part 2-Skills), good ratings from supervisors, possibly a state or provincial jurisprudence exam, and possibly an oral exam. Most of the requirements are sequential in nature so, as examples, one cannot take the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) without appropriate academic qualifications, and one cannot take the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) until the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) has been passed. In a licensure context, the data from these various evaluations should not be subjected to an incremental validity analysis because (a) each discrete measure assesses a different essential component of the ultimate decision to grant the license and (b) data from a measure is available only after data have indicated that earlier requirements of the licensing process have been met.

In the case of the EPPP, the different parts, EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) and EPPP (Part 2-Skills), are designed to assess different essential components of the overall construct of professional competence. The results from the applied skills portion of the EPPP enhances a licensing board’s ability to determine readiness for independent practice by measuring a key element (i.e., applied skills) that previously had not been evaluated or that was evaluated in a less standardized and objective manner (e.g., supervisor ratings) (Johnson et al., 2008).

Concurrent validity. Some individuals have inquired about concurrent validity studies; that is, studies that examine whether scores on the EPPP are correlated with other measures of competence. One of the confounding issues in conducting such validation studies is the question of the accuracy of those other measures of competence. For example, supervisor ratings of competence are widely used in academic and training environments, as well as by licensing boards, to assist in determining the competence of trainees. There are

many questions about the objectivity of supervisor ratings, however, due to the multiple roles that supervisors play (i.e., supervisor/mentor and gatekeeper) (Johnson et al., 2008). Although it remains necessary for licensing boards to continue to use supervisor ratings for some aspects of the evaluation of candidate readiness for independent practice (specifically for some aspects of interpersonal relationship competence), the introduction of the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) provides a psychometrically sound, objective, standardized measure of many of the skills needed. Licensing boards are tasked with answering the ultimate question about those they license as psychologists: “Is this individual safe (competent) to practice independently?” Training supervisors are not responsible for that final approval, or for answering that ultimate question. The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) provides an objective, standardized, and appropriately validated measure of professional skills to enhance a licensing board’s ability to answer that question. At this time, there are simply no other psychometrically sound general measures of competence relevant to all areas of professional psychology that can be used in concurrent validity analyses of either part of the EPPP.

Has the EPPP been independently evaluated?

The California Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) evaluated both parts of the EPPP in 2021. This office evaluates all licensing exams for use in the state of California. If examinations do not meet standards, they are not allowed to be used, and the Office develops a state exam for that profession instead. OPES found that:

- “The procedures used to establish and support the validity and defensibility of the...EPPP Part 1 and Part 2 **appear to meet professional guidelines** and technical standards outlined in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (2014) (*Standards*) and in California Business and Professions (B&P) Code § 139.”
- “The content of the EPPP Part 1 assesses general knowledge required for entry level psychologist practice in California, with the exception of California law and ethics.”
- “The Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were impressed by the EPPP Part 2, both by the concept of measuring skills and by the design of the scenario-based items.”
- “SMEs concluded that the EPPP Part 2 more thoroughly assesses skills than those measured by the EPPP Part 1.”

You can find more information about California’s report here:

https://psychology.ca.gov/about_us/meetings/materials/20211022_materials.pdf (pp. 103-143)

How is ASPPB involving stakeholders on questions and concerns about the new assessment?

ASPPB has created the Examination Stakeholder Technical Advisory Group (ESTAG) which is composed of representatives from the training community, licensing boards, and people with measurement expertise from outside of psychology. This group represents a collaborate effort to enhance communication as a mechanism to bring forth issues and concerns. The group serves as a “think tank” for research related to the EPPP and serves as liaisons to their respective communities on licensing matters.

How has, and is, the issue of potential bias with the EPPP being addressed? Can you provide any assurances that the EPPP is a fair and nondiscriminatory exam and will continue to be so?

The ASPPB Examination Program is committed to providing valid, reliable, and fair assessments of candidates for licensure. ASPPB adheres to guidelines of the American Psychological Association, the Joint Commission on Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, and the American Educational Research Association in the development and maintenance of the Examination Program.

Potential item bias is addressed at *each phase* of test development and review. The initial step in the test development process consists of a large survey of psychological practice (the Job Task Analysis). Psychologists included in the sample reflect the racial, ethnic, cultural, gender, and geographic make-up of the profession. The analysis of survey results provides the areas that are to be assessed on each examination, resulting in the test specifications, or a test “blueprint.”

Subject matter experts involved in the Examination Program, all of whom volunteered to help develop the EPPP, represent a diversity of racial, ethnic, geographic, gender, and practice characteristics. This includes exam item writers, members of the Item Development Committees, and members of the Examination Committees. The item-writing training that item writers receive involves, among other things, consideration of cultural and linguistic issues. Each item that is written is reviewed by members of the Item Development Committee, which is comprised of a group of content experts who together cover each domain area. Each potential exam item is reviewed for clarity, language, correctness, sensitivity/bias, and relevance for entry-level practice. The reviewers either return items to the writers for changes or approve them to go to the Examination Committee for review.

The Examination Committee is comprised of psychologists who represent various demographics, specialty areas, and expertise in each of the domain areas assessed on the examination. The Examination Committee reviews each new item and must reach consensus on the item’s sufficiency before it is pretested on a form of the examination. The reviews are similar to those carried out during the item-writing process and provide an additional check on each item before it is pretested. As such, this committee provides another layer of review regarding fairness and relevance.

All items are pretested before they are used as operational (scored) items. For the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge), there are an additional 50 pretest questions included with the 175 operational items on each exam. For the EPPP (Part 2-Skills), there are an additional 40 pretest questions included with the 130 operational items. The pretest items are distributed among the operational items throughout the exam. When an item is being pretested, that item appears on the examination, but does not count toward the candidate’s exam score. An item is approved for use as a scored item *only* if its statistical performance is acceptable to members of the Examination Committee based on Item Response Theory analyses. Thus, the item must be verified as a consistent, reliable, valid, and fair measure of the test-taker’s knowledge (or applied skills) in a particular domain. This system of pretesting questions protects examination candidates by using *only those questions* that have proven effective and fair in testing relevant entry-level knowledge or relevant entry-level applied skills. Additionally, all candidate comments on items are reviewed, and items that candidates have reported as potentially problematic are again reviewed by content experts to ensure the fairness of each item.

After pretesting, items that meet established statistical criteria are once again reviewed by the Examination Committee before being placed on an exam as an operational item. Collectively, ASPPB incorporates these multiple layers of analysis to provide assurance to the extent possible that each question is free from bias. As a result of the safeguards that have been put in place, the EPPP is viewed as a fair and nondiscriminatory examination of the knowledge and applied skills necessary to practice psychology independently.

The question of ethnic bias in the revision to the EPPP has been raised during our discussions with various psychology groups. Those who comment about issues of bias often cite articles such as Sharpless and Barber (2009, 2013) who reported that they found differences on scores and pass rates on the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) based on ethnicity. The authors, however, were clear that their study design *did not allow them to state*

definitively that the differences they found reflected an ethnic bias as opposed to being an artifact of the training program attended. They concluded that it was “...unknown whether minority applicants fare less well on the EPPP, or whether programs with higher percentages of minority students tend to have applicants of all ethnicities who pass at lower rates” (p.8).

To specifically address the possibility of ethnic bias in exam items, ASPPB has also incorporated an additional layer of review for items that, by statistical analysis (i.e., Differential Item Functioning analysis) and review. Items that were answered differently by certain groups (i.e., groups differing by sex or race/ethnicity) are “flagged” and reviewed by an independent committee of psychologists who have expertise in cultural humility and experience working with underrepresented groups. This group evaluates these flagged items and determines if there is anything that is irrelevant to the measured construct and results in different performance for a particular group. If that is the case, those items are removed from being operational items. To date, ASPPB has evaluated over 1,300 items using the DIF analysis, with 32 items being statistically flagged. Of the 32 flagged items, 7 were removed for potential wording concerns. In short, very few items have been statistically flagged for potential bias and even fewer have been removed for content or wording concerns.

In sum, ASPPB takes the same level of care and thoroughness in developing both the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) and the EPPP (Part 2-Skills). Our intent is to continue to provide exams that are standardized, objective, reliable, valid, and defensible measures of the knowledge and applied skills needed for the entry-level psychologist.

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association & National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing: 2014 Edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Furr, S. & Brown-Rice, K. (2017). Psychology doctoral students perceptions of peers' problems of competency. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology* 12, 118-124.
- Hunsley, J. & Meyer, G. (2003). The incremental validity of psychological testing and assessment: Conceptual, methodological, and statistical issues. *Psychological Assessment*, 15, 446-455. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.15.4.446
- Johnson, W. B., Elman, N. S., Forrest, L., Robiner, W. N., Rodolfa, E., & Schaffer, J. B. (2008). Addressing professional competence problems in trainees: Some ethical considerations. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39, 589 –599. doi:10.1037/a0014264
- Rodolfa, E., Ko, S. F., & Petersen, L. (2004). Psychology training directors' views of trainees' readiness to practice independently. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35, 397–404
- Sharpless, B. A., & Barber, J. P. (2009). The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) in the era of evidence-based practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 333–340. doi:10.1037/a0013983
- Sharpless, B. A., & Barber, J. P. (2013). Predictors of program performance on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 44, 208–217. doi: 10.1037/a0031689