



NEWSLETTER

Brenda C. Ward, Printed Editor
Onesimus Internet Solutions, Online Editor

2000

VOLUME 16 NUMBER 1

In this Issue

A message from the Board Chair	Linda Hartwell, Ph.D. Appointed to LSBEP
Past Board Chair Reflects	Recent Opinions & Policies by LSBEP
Post-Separation Family Violence Relief Act	New Policy/Procedure
Proposed Rule on Reciprocity	Proposed Rule: Doctoral Programs in Psychology
New Licensees	Committee Assignments
Board Meeting Dates	LSBEP CE Workshop Dates

A Message From the Board Chair

In July David Thomason, Psy.D. completed his term on the Board and year as Chair. David was an exemplary leader and consensus builder, always willing to listen to the diverse opinions, recommendations and sometimes ramblings from the rest of us. He not only kept the ordinary operations of the Board meetings going, but found time to initiate and develop a number of positive changes; a modified procedure for dealing with complaints, the incorporation of the CPQ in the rules, to name just a couple. David's efforts, thoughtfulness and consideration for everyone is deeply appreciated and will be missed.

The CPQ or Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology as many of you know is a program established by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (an alliance of member jurisdictions from state, territorial and provincial licensure boards in the US and Canada) to help ease problems with mobility for psychologists across jurisdictions. As increasing numbers of boards accept the CPQ it makes being licensed in other jurisdictions much simpler. ASPPB has established fairly stringent criteria for the issuance of this certificate including having been licensed for independent practice at the doctoral level by at least one member board in the US or Canada for a minimum of five years. There can be no history of disciplinary action; and the standards regarding education, training, supervision, supervised experience and examinations must be met. Problems with verifying training and experience, especially as one gets older, tend to increase with the relocation or death of former supervisors, etc. who are required to document experience. Inconsistency across jurisdictions regarding qualification (not infrequently, often minor differences in required hours, etc.) make getting licensed in another jurisdiction a major task.

In Canada, difficulties with mobility across provinces has ended with a mandate from the Canadian government to resolve the problems or face government mandates.

In addition to the CPQ there is also an ASPPB Credential Bank for those who may not yet qualify for the CPQ or others wishing to register their education, training, and so on.

In carrying out the mandate of the Board, the contribution of many people not currently on the Board is extremely valued. A number of former Board members help with many tasks, e.g. serving on oral examinations, providing consultation in complaint cases, and helping with the drafting of rule or policy changes that are under consideration. Psychologists in the community contact the Board regarding issues they have questions about or wish to bring to the Board's attention. It is this cooperative spirit and effort that makes the system work. Over the years former boards have wrestled with complex and thorny issues. The breadth and depth of their work becomes increasingly obvious when one has an opportunity to look at other jurisdictions and the issues they face. In many ways the Louisiana law and administrative rules governing the practice of psychology are in very good shape thanks to the work of many over the years. Finally we are most fortunate to have Brenda Ward, Executive Director and Jaime Monic, Administrative Assistant to keep the Board organized and the office running on a daily basis. Thanks to all.

In July, Linda Hartwell, Ph.D. joined the Board and will serve as Chair of the Committee on Continuing Education. More information about Linda in this issue.

This issue of the Newsletter contains a number of articles describing proposed rule or policy changes. We are interested in your comments and would like to hear from you.

news_fall2000_01.jpg (31431 bytes)

This is both a farewell to my tenure on the Board and a simultaneous farewell to the 20th Century. Looking forward, I believe there is a bright future for psychology and the LSBEP in the 21st Century.

Positive communication between the Board, the profession, and the public has increased over the past five years. LSBEP members have taken steps to clarify issues and respond timely to questions from the public and psychologists. The recent addition of a web site provides yet another means of direct communication with the Board, as well as forms for downloading and updates to psychologists.

My farewell comes with heartfelt thanks to Dr. John Brun, Dr. Beverly Stubblefield, Dr. Roy Allen and Dr. Janet Matthews for their ability to examine the issues and reach consensus during the year. Each has brought insight and careful deliberation to difficult regulatory issues. Brenda Ward excels in her administration of Board activities and provides leadership

in Louisiana which is unparalleled in other jurisdictions. Together, our Executive Director and Board Members create strong representation for Louisiana as our jurisdiction remains at the forefront of leadership in psychology governance. It has been a privilege to be associated with a progressive Board and I bid farewell with a sense of accomplishment.

[back to top](#)

PART IV.

Post-Separation Family Violence Relief Act

Louisiana Revised Statutes 9:361-369

The most common focus of complaints made to psychology licensing boards is court testimony related to child custody and visitation. Generally the psychologist is performing in good faith, objectively, and as competently as she can. Sometimes a psychologist finds herself involved in a custody or visitation hearing as a consequence of work that was done before there was even a separation. The key thing to remember is that there will almost always be at least one disappointed party after a court hearing. That person may view a psychologist who testified in a way that frustrated their aims as a personal enemy, and seek revenge. A professional, defensible expert court appearance relies on a thorough understanding of the relevant law. Sometimes, judges and attorneys are unfamiliar with important nuances of the law. However, a psychologist who advises in a way that is inconsistent with the law leaves herself open to attack, even if the advice is otherwise sound.

All psychologists are encouraged to study the following the following act, even if child custody and visitation are not ordinarily part of your practice. Please note that there are subtle differences between this updated version of the law, and the version published in recent LSBEP Directories.

§361. Legislative findings

The legislature hereby reiterates its previous findings and statements of purpose set forth in R.S. 46:2121 and 2131 relative to family violence and domestic violence. The legislature further finds that the problems of family violence do not necessarily cease when the victimized family is legally separated or divorced. In fact, the violence often escalates, and child custody and visitation become the new forum for the continuation of the abuse. Because current laws relative to child custody and visitation are based on an assumption that even divorcing parents are in relatively equal positions of power, and that such parents act in the children's best interest, these laws often work against the protection of the children and the abused spouse in families with a history of family violence. Consequently, laws designed to act in the children's best interest may actually effect a contrary result due to the unique dynamics of family violence.

Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

§362. Definitions

As used in this Part:

1. "Abused parent" means the parent who has not committed family violence.
2. "Court" means any district court, juvenile court, or family court having jurisdiction over the parents and/or child at issue.
3. "Family violence" includes but is not limited to physical or sexual abuse and any offense against the person as defined in the Criminal Code of Louisiana, except negligent injuring and defamation, committed by one parent against the other parent or against any of the children. Family violence does not include reasonable acts of self-defense utilized by one parent to protect himself or herself or a child in the family from the family violence of the other parent.
4. "Injunction" means a temporary restraining order or a preliminary or a permanent court ordered injunction, as defined in the Code of Civil Procedure, which prohibits the violent parent from in any way contacting the abused parent or the children except for specific purposes set forth in the injunction, which shall be limited to communications expressly dealing with the education, health, and welfare of the children, or for any other purpose expressly agreed to by the abused parent. All such injunctions shall prohibit the violent parent, without the express consent of the abused parent, from intentionally going within fifty yards of the home, school, place of employment, or person of the abused parent and the children, or within fifty feet of any of their automobiles, except as may otherwise be necessary for court ordered visitation or except as otherwise necessitated by circumstances considering the proximity of the parties' residences or places of employment. Such injunctions shall be issued in the form of a Uniform Abuse Prevention Order and transmitted to the Louisiana Protective Order Registry, as required by this Part.
5. "Sexual abuse" includes but is not limited to acts which are prohibited by R.S. 14:41, 42, 42.1, 43, 43.1, 43.2, 43.4, 78, 80, 81, 81.1, 81.2, 89 and 89.1.
6. "Supervised visitation" means face to face contact between a parent and a child which occurs in the immediate presence of a supervising person approved by the court under conditions which prevent any physical abuse, threats, intimidation, abduction, or humiliation of either the abused parent or the child. The supervising person shall not be any relative, friend, therapist, or associate of the parent perpetrating family violence. With the consent of the abused parent, the supervising person may be a family member or friend of the abused parent. At the request of the abused parent, the court may order that the supervising person shall be a police

officer or other competent professional. The parent who perpetrated family violence shall pay any and all costs incurred in the supervision of visitation. In no case shall supervised visitation be overnight or in the home of the violent parent.

7. "Treatment program" means a course of evaluation and psychotherapy designed specifically for perpetrators of family violence, and conducted by licensed mental health professionals.

§363. Ordered mediation prohibited

Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, in any separation, divorce, child custody, visitation, child support, alimony, or community property proceeding, no spouse or parent who satisfies the court that he or she, or any of the children, has been the victim of family violence perpetrated by the other spouse or parent shall be court ordered to participate in mediation.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

§364. Child custody; visitation

- A. There is created a presumption that no parent who has a history of perpetrating family violence shall be awarded sole or joint custody of children. The court may find a history of perpetrating family violence if the court finds that one incident of family violence has resulted in serious bodily injury or the court finds more than one incident of family violence. The presumption shall be overcome only by a preponderance of the evidence that the perpetrating parent has successfully completed a treatment program as defined in R.S. 9:362, is not abusing alcohol and the illegal use of drugs scheduled in R.S. 40:964, and that the best interest of the child or children requires that parent's participation as a custodial parent because of the other parent's absence, mental illness, or substance abuse, or such other circumstances which affect the best interest of the child or children. The fact that the abused parent suffers from the effects of the abuse shall not be grounds for denying that parent custody.
- B. If the court finds that both parents have a history of perpetrating family violence, custody shall be awarded solely to the parent who is less likely to continue to perpetrate family violence. In such a case, the court shall mandate completion of a treatment program by the custodial parent. If necessary to protect the welfare of the child, custody may be awarded to a suitable third person, provided that the person would not allow access to a violent parent except as ordered by the court.
- C. If the court finds that a parent has a history of perpetrating family violence, the court shall allow only supervised child visitation with that parent, conditioned upon that parent's participation in and completion of a treatment program. Unsupervised visitation shall be allowed only if it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the violent parent has completed a treatment program, is not abusing alcohol and psychoactive drugs, and poses no danger to the child, and that such visitation is in the child's best interest.
- D. If any court finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that a parent has sexually abused his or her child or children, the court shall prohibit all visitation and contact between the abusive parent and the children, until such time, following a contradictory hearing, that the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the abusive parent has successfully completed a treatment program designed for such sexual abusers, and that supervised visitation is in the children's best interest.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1; Acts 1995, No. 888, § 1.

§365. Qualification of mental health professional

Any mental health professional appointed by the court to conduct a custody evaluation in a case where family violence is an issue shall have current and demonstrable training and experience working with perpetrators and victims of family violence.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

§366. Injunctions

All separation, divorce, child custody, and child visitation orders and judgments in family violence cases shall contain an injunction as defined in R.S. 9:362. Any violation of the injunction, if proved by the appropriate standard, shall be punished as contempt of court, and shall result in a termination of all court ordered child visitation.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1; Acts 1995, No. 888, § 1.

§367. Costs

In any family violence case, all court costs, attorney fees, evaluation fees, and expert witness fees incurred in furtherance of this Part shall be paid by the perpetrator of the family violence, including all costs of medical and psychological care for the abused spouse, or for any of the children, necessitated by the family violence.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

§368. Other remedies not affected

This Part shall in no way affect the remedies set forth in R.S. 46:2131 through 2142, the Criminal Code, the Children's Code, or elsewhere; however, the court, in any case brought under R.S. 46:2131 et seq., may impose the remedies provided herein.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

§369. Limitations

No public funds allocated to programs which provide services to victims of domestic violence shall be used to provide services to the perpetrator of domestic violence.
Acts 1992, No. 1091, § 1.

[back to top](#)

Proposed Rule on Reciprocity

The following is being considered by the LSBEP as a Notice of Intent to amend Title 46, Part LXIII. Psychologists, Chapter 2. Reciprocity of the Louisiana Administrative Code to read as follows.

The Board is accepting written comments regarding the following draft.

[Chapter 2 Reciprocity](#)

§ 201 Licensure of Psychologists through Reciprocity

- A. Upon application thereof, accompanied by such fee as determined by the board, the board shall issue a license to any person who furnishes, upon a form and in such manner as the board prescribes, evidence satisfactory to the board that:
1. he/she meets all of the following:
 - a. is licensed as a psychologist by another member jurisdiction of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) if the requirements for such licensure in that jurisdiction are the substantial equivalent of those required by Chapter 3 of the LAC, and if that jurisdiction has entered into a similar agreement with this board providing for the licensure of Louisiana psychologists in that jurisdiction by reciprocity; and
 - b. has met the requirements of such board including five years of satisfactory professional licensed experience in psychology; and
 - c. has successfully passed written and oral examinations administered by such board; and
 - d. his/her doctoral program involved at least one continuous academic year of full-time residency on the campus of the institution at which the degree was granted; and
 - e. he/she has not been subject to any disciplinary action by a professional board, and does not have any pending complaints against him/her.
- or,
2. that he/she is a psychologist licensed in another state or territory of the U.S. or a Canadian province who has met the requirements for and holds a current Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology (CPQ) issued by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB).
- B. Applicants for reciprocal licensing must pass the Louisiana Jurisprudence Examination prior to the issuance of a Louisiana license, and the Louisiana board may require a meeting with the applicant to review and verify his/her satisfactory character, current fitness, plans to practice, and specialty declaration.

[back to top](#)

NewLicensees...

#840 - Melissa Celia Dillon, Ph.D. (CL)
#841 - Margaret Theresa Dempsey, Ph.D. (SC)
#842 - Kelley Francis, Ph.D. (CL)
#843 - Denise P. Sellers, Ph.D. (CL)
#844 - Ronald T. Murphy, Ph.D. (CL)
#845R - Tommy Overman, Ed.D. (None)
#846R - Theresa A. Wozencraft, Ph.D. (CO)
#847 - Cynthia Morgan-D'Atrio, Ph.D. (SC)
#848 - Linda J. Collings, Ph.D. (CL)
#849 - Shannon P. Helm, Psy.D. (CL)
#850 - Tammy D. Coots, Psy.D. (CL)
#851 - Brandi Braud Smiroldo, Ph.D. (CL)
#852R - Steven Craig DeAlmeida, Ed.D. (None)
#853 - ValaRay J. Irvin, Ph.D. (CO)
#854 - Amy L. Copeland, Ph.D. (CL)
#855 - Leigh Anne B. Terrebonne, Ph.D. (CO)
#856 - Cecilia Hsin-Hsian Sun, Ph.D. (CO)
#857 - Rebecca L. Wilkinson, Ph.D. (CO)
#858 - Nicole T. Celentano, Psy.D. (CL)
#859 - Joseph L. Etherton, Ph.D. (CL)
#860 - Daliah L. Bauer, Ph.D. (CL)
#861 - Claire E. Brown, Ph.D. (CL)
#862 - Kelly Paulk Ray, Ph.D. (CO)
#863 - Aaron M. Wolfson, Ph.D. (CO)
#864 - Victoria C. Swanson, Ph.D. (SC)
#865 - Michelle A. Stiaes, Psy.D. (CL)
#866 - Megan A. Ciota, Ph.D. (CL)
#867 - Christine B. Powanda, Ph.D. (DV)

[back to top](#)

*Linda J. Hartwell, Ph.D.,
Appointed by Foster to the LSBEP*

Governor Mike Foster recently appointed Linda J. Hartwell, Ph.D. to the Board of Examiners of Psychologists to fill the expired term of David D. Thomason, Psy.D. Dr. Hartwell's term of office stretches from July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2005. She is a resident of Shreveport, Louisiana, where she serves as a psychologist on staff at the Overton Brooks VA Medical Center. Dr. Hartwell was licensed to practice psychology in January 1987 with a declared specialty in Clinical Psychology. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Tennessee.

Since her appointment to the Board she has assumed leadership of the LSBEP Committee on Continuing Education for fiscal year 2000-2001. She also currently represents the LSBEP on the Medical Examiners Board's Advisory Committee on Pain, created by Act 1470 of the 1997 Regular Session of the Legislature. In October of 2000 she served as a Louisiana delegate to the Annual Meeting of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards. Dr. Hartwell is clearly a

hardworking and valuable new asset to the LSBEP. We look forward to working with her.

[back to top](#)

Recent Opinions and Policies Issued by the LSBEP

Opinion 003

It is the opinion of the Louisiana State Board of Examiners of Psychologists that although the topic of Media Presentations is addressed in Standard 3.04 Media Presentations further clarification of this area of practice is needed due to the potential for harm to the public as this practice area expands. According to Standard 3.04:

When psychologists provide advice or comment by means of public lectures, demonstrations, radio or television programs, prerecorded tapes, printed articles, mailed material, or other media, they take reasonable precautions to ensure that (1) the statements are based on appropriate psychological literature and practice, (2) the statements are otherwise consistent with this Ethics Code, and (3) the recipients of this information are not encouraged to infer that a relationship has been established with them personally.

Background

It is clear that media activity is not per se unethical. However, psychologists who practice in this area need to be especially careful regarding potential violation of Ethical Principles 1.03 (Professional and Scientific Relationships) and 1.19 (Exploitive Relationships). Entertainment is frequently the foremost purpose of broadcast mental health presentations but the mental health professional must never allow entertainment considerations to outweigh or dilute the principles of ethical mental health practice. Data are not readily available on the effects of media psychology on the consumer.

Suggestions for Ethical Media Practice

Those who enter this practice area are advised to be aware of ethical considerations, the rules of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and suggestions for ethical practice which have been developed by the Association for Media Psychology. Special attention should be paid to Ethical Principle 1.19a (Exploitative Relationships).

If participating in a call-in format, the psychologist should assure that all calls are screened off air and such screening procedures be developed by the psychologist rather than the show's producer. Whoever is responsible for such screening should receive sufficient training, analogous to that provided to crisis line workers, so that immediate referral to appropriate community resources is made for those callers who need such assistance.

Disclaimers should be developed for media shows. These disclaimers should include the fact that the presentation is not considered to provide a therapeutic relationship and that some individuals may be placed on hold for a period of time prior to being heard. Note should also be made that some callers may be referred for individual professional assistance rather than being heard "on air."

Media professionals need to be aware of those areas of concern which are most likely to arise in this setting and to be aware of their limitations of knowledge in those areas. Typical areas of concern are marriage issues, child care and discipline, various forms of emotional distress, issues of sexuality including contraception, addictions, and career issues. There is also a special need to be aware of cultural, ethnic, and special interest group differences which may impact responses but that such group membership may not be obvious in a call-in format.

Given the limited contact with the person available in call-in format media work, psychologists should avoid making suggestions for major life changes, criticism of reported prior forms of intervention, specific diagnosis of problems. In order to make the limitations of such presentations clear, a standard disclaimer should be developed and aired repeatedly on the program.

If asked to serve as a guest on a talk show, psychologists should be clear about their role. It is best to view the show before agreeing to participate. If the psychologist finds that the show exploits guests this may be a situation in which the psychologist may be in a position to influence the show's producers by explaining the parts of the Ethics Code which led the psychologist to decline the offer.

Because this practice area is relatively new, this is also an area where peer consultation should be used in any case in which the psychologist has questions about the ethics of the situation.

Opinion 004

Continuing Education Clarification on Graduate Courses

It is the opinion of the LSBEP that completing a graduate course is acceptable for continuing education (CE) credit. The number of hours of CE allowed in this case is calculated in the same way as the preparation for teaching such a course as specified in 805H.

[back to top](#)

*New Policy/Procedure
Adopted by the LSBEP*

PPM 2313
(7/31/00)
Committee on Complaints

Purpose and Structure

1. The philosophy of the Committee on Complaints is to take into consideration the aspirational and technical aspects (i.e., the spirit and the letter) of the rules and regulations when reviewing a complaint. The Committee on Complaints consists of assigned investigators, the Chair of the LSBEP, attorney(s) for the Board, and any other individuals appointed by the Chair to review a case.
2. Investigators are appointed as a means of enhancing due process for the psychologist against whom a complaint has been filed. In the event that an adjudicatory hearing is noticed, current Board members are required by law to hear the complaint and render a decision regarding whether a violation occurred, with an affirmative vote of at least four members necessary to suspend, place on probation, require remediation, revoke licensure or take other authorized action. The utilization of investigators provides for a process of complaint review which minimizes sitting Board members' exposure to information prior to any hearing which may be held.
3. Complaints received shall be rotated between former LSBEP members appointed as investigators. Appointment requires approval by four of the five current Board members after a review of the prospective appointee's records. Appointments may be revoked at any time by a majority vote of the Board. The Board Chair will serve as the committee chair. Both of the attorneys for the Board are *facto* members of the complaints committee.
4. The investigator shall be empowered to determine whether the complaint has merit and whether there are any potential violations. The complaint may be dismissed, a letter of instruction may be issued, or referred to the Board with a consent order or recommendation to proceed to a hearing. The investigator may dismiss a complaint at any point during the investigatory process, with advice and consent of the Board Chair. An attorney for the Board may be consulted as needed by an investigator. Investigators may collaborate across cases.
5. In the event that a complaint is filed against a member of the Board, two investigators and an attorney for the Board shall investigate the complaint and, by a majority vote, determine whether the complaint is dismissed, a letter of instruction is issued, a consent order is signed, or the matter proceeds to a hearing.

Procedures

1. A complaint may be initiated by a consumer, an agency, or any individual who is aware of a possible violation of regulations, rules or ethical standards. The Board may investigate an anonymous complaint if provided substantial evidence for an investigation to be initiated. The Board may initiate a complaint. A complaint should be received on an official form provided to the complainant.
2. Once a complaint form has been received, the office staff assigns a number to the complaint and notifies the complainant in a form letter outlining the steps in the complaint process. The Executive Director will keep copies of all correspondence involving the case in the designated file containing the complaint number and original complaint.
3. A copy of the complaint and any other supporting information is then forwarded to one of the appointed investigators. The investigator may recommend dismissal of the complaint prior to notifying the psychologist in question, if the complaint is found to be frivolous or without sufficient merit to warrant formal investigation.
4. If the complaint is not dismissed, however, the psychologist is informed in writing by certified mail regarding the complaint and any potential violations. The psychologist is given 30 days to respond in writing. Upon request and for good cause shown, the psychologist may be granted an extension of time in which to formulate a response.
5. The investigatory process may be conducted via written requests and responses, review of pertinent material, phone conversations and/or personal interviews, and/or attorney consultations. After all the facts have been reviewed, the investigator will classify the complaint in one of the following categories:
 - A. No Violation - there was either (1) insufficient evidence, or (2) clearly no violation. The complaint is placed on the agenda for review at the next scheduled meeting of the Board. If the Board affirms the investigator's determination, the psychologist and the complainant are notified in writing regarding the results.
 - B. Clear Violation, with minor offense - there may have been a technical error, dispute between psychologist and complainant, or other complaint involving behavior which has not been identified to be harmful or a danger to the public. If remediation is determined to be necessary, the psychologist will be notified by a letter of instruction. The Board may elect to have a meeting with the psychologist following the remediation and formal dismissal of the complaint. This level does not impose any limitations on licensure, is not considered formal disciplinary action, and is not reportable, though the letter of instruction is a public record under LA R.S. 44:1, et seq.
 - C. Clear Violation, with significant offense - Such violations usually, though not always, involve a preliminary determination by the investigator that the behavior at issue poses, or reasonably will pose, a threat to the public health and welfare. The violation represents behavior which warrants revocation, suspension, restriction, or any other formal limitations of license. The investigator will take one of the following steps:
 1. Proceed to negotiate a consent order. At the inception of a consent order, the psychologist signing the consent order shall appear before the Board.
 2. If a correct order cannot be obtained, advise the Chair of the Board that a hearing is imminent.

Consent Orders

This level is considered formal disciplinary action and is reportable. The Consent Order is a public record under LA R.S. 44:1, et seq.

When the psychologist against whom a complaint has been filed acknowledges a violation at Level C, opportunity is given for the psychologist to enter into a consent order which will delineate the nature of the violation(s), summarize relevant documentation discovered during investigation, and set forth the stipulations. The consent order is prepared by the Chair in consultation with the attorney for the Board and the investigator after reviewing the results of the investigation. The psychologist is informed in writing prior to signing the consent order that this action constitutes formal disciplinary action which is reported to the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, the Healthcare Integrity and Protection Data Bank, and any other organizations to whom the Board is empowered to make disclosure.

Formal Hearing

Hearings are conducted in compliance with the Louisiana Administrative Procedure Act. The investigator presents the facts discovered during investigation, and may be assisted by the Board's attorney. If the Board attorney is involved in the presentation of the case-in-chief, the Board may, if it wishes, retain additional counsel to advise it (or a hearing officer may be retained to preside at the hearing), in procedural or evidentiary matters.

[back to top](#)

Proposed Rule: Doctoral Programs in Psychology

The following is being considered by the LSBEP as a Notice of Intent to amend Title 46, Part LXIII. Psychologists, Chapter 3. Training and Credentials, 303.D. and D.11 in the Louisiana Administrative Code.

The Board is accepting written comments regarding the following draft. (That portion in bold indicates the change)

First Paragraph of §303.D Repealed

§303.D. All graduates of all programs, regardless of designation status in A or B above, must meet criterion 10 and 11 below. (Making items 1-11 under Paragraph D. a part of Paragraph C.)

Additionally,

§

The curriculum shall encompass a minimum of three academic years of full-time graduate study. **The program of study shall typically include graduate coursework with a minimum of three semester hours (five quarter hours) in each of the following three areas: scientific and professional ethics and standards, research design and methodology, and statistics and methodology. In cases where the material from one of these areas was incorporated into other courses, the program director shall submit material to the Board indicating the educational equivalence of this requirement. Additionally, the core program shall require each student to demonstrate competence in each of the following substantive areas. This requirement typically will be met by including a minimum of three or more graduate semester hours (five or more graduate quarter hours) in each of the four substantive content areas. Graduates who cannot document competence in all substantive content areas (a-d below), may demonstrate competence by taking additional course work or examination, not to exceed one substantive content area.**

[back to top](#)

2000-2001 Board of Examiners of Psychologists

news_fall2000_02.jpg (67667 bytes)

Left to Right

Member: Linda J. Hartwell, Ph.D.

Member: Robert Roy Allen, Ph.D.

Member: Janet Matthews, Ph.D.

Chair: John A. Brun, Ph.D.

Vice Chair: Beverly A. Stubblefield, Ph.D.

Committee Chairs

Complaints: Janet Matthews, Co-Chair, Committee A

Robert Roy Allen, Co-Chair, Committee B

Continuing Education: Linda Hartwell

Supervision & Credentials Review: Beverly Stubblefield

Legislative Oversight: Beverly Stubblefield

Long Range Planning: John Brun

Oral Examinations: John Brun, Co-Chair; Beverly Stubblefield, Co-Chair

[back to top](#)

Friday, 12/8/2000 - Baton Rouge
1/12-14/2001 - St. Francisville

LSBEP Continuing Education Workshop Date

Saturday 3/10/2001 - Baton Rouge

[back to top](#)
