

	
	
	
A Farewell Address	FYI
Three New Rules Adopted	Competencies 2002 Conference
New Opinion Issued	Q&A
LSBEP/LPA Election Process Agreement	LSBEP Meeting Dates
New Licensees	Disciplinary Action Report
Supervision of Candidates	Steps Toward Licensure

A Farewell Address *Robert Roy Allen, Ph.D.*

Several years ago, irked at some actions the Board had taken, I resolved that if I didn't like the way it was being run, I could either rail at it from the sidelines or participate. In those days I viewed the Board as being imperious and remote. It was a few years before I was ready to think seriously about nominating myself. I certainly didn't take my endorsement by the psychologists of Louisiana for granted. I supposed I might eventually make it if I ran two or three years in a row. But on my first attempt, I out-poll the next nominee by one vote, and Governor Foster appointed me.

Considering some of my motivations for running, I was a little apprehensive about joining the Board. I wanted to make a difference, but I also wanted to be a good team member. I didn't want to find myself on the short end of a lot of four to one votes. However, I was quickly reassured in two ways. First, I learned that the Board strives to operate by consensus, and most issues are discussed until agreement is reached. Second, I learned that the Board had evolved while I was thinking about running, and its current members had a vision of the Board that was not inconsistent with my own.

Another thing I learned was that the world of psychology looks a lot different from the perspective of a Board member than it does from outside. The responsibility for protecting the public is a weighty thing, and the tools for achieving it are circumscribed. Whenever one is in a position to make decisions which affect others, some people are likely to be disappointed. It would be impossible to please all the psychologists all the time even if that were the goal, and it is not the goal. But I was convinced that more could be accomplished with the support and good will of psychologists than with their resentful or reluctant acquiescence.

During my tenure on the Board, I strived to make the Board more accessible and "user-friendly". The enforcement arm of the Board still exists and will always need to exist. However, I believe that the public is harmed more through ignorance and misdirected good intentions than through willful violation of ethical principles. And since the Board only deals with the ethical violations that come to its attention (a small minority of them, I'm sure), disciplining errant psychologists by itself does not afford much protection to the public.

Therefore, I promoted the educational function of the Board, I supported training workshops sponsored by the Board and tried to be as available as possible for questions from psychologists and the public. And I tried to answer the questions as clearly as possible. I regret that I have not done a better job at publishing the newsletter, which has a lot of untapped educational potential.

As I look back on the last five years, I feel a mixture of satisfaction, relief, and regret. I thank all who supported and assisted me. Serving on the Board was much more interesting and fun than I expected. Service to the public is rewarding in a unique way. On the other hand, one can always look back and see ways that things could have been done better. Also, there are projects I had hoped to complete which just didn't get done. Board membership is a considerable commitment of time and energy, and I have looked forward to a break from it. I will miss being on the Board. But I doubt I will run again anytime soon.

In thinking about what final message I would like to leave my peers while I still have this forum, I recalled Robert Sternberg's recent article in the Monitor. His point was that psychologists have become too negative and hostile in expressing their differences of opinion with each other. He suggested that this incivility is divisive in an unconstructive way and disproportionately colors the way that psychologists are viewed generally. He argued that psychologists ought to be positive leaders and that any lasting contributions that are made are likely to be positive accomplishments and not the result of tearing anyone else down.

I was reminded of it recently when I heard about a social worker who was outraged that a colleague had described her in terms of a mental diagnosis. My first thought was that I had heard her use diagnostic terms to describe acquaintances who are not her clients. My second thought was that I, and many psychologists I know have also been guilty of that kind of loose talk. I also thought of how I have heard psychologists indiscriminately use belittling terms to describe the talents of other kinds of mental health professionals. I also thought of the personal invective I have heard psychologists use to malign each other in person or otherwise.

I have no doubt that this kind of talk not only harms individuals, but also injures the public perception of our profession. At the same time, I agree with Dr. Stenberg that it rarely advances any worthwhile cause. Therefore, I hereby pledge to eschew negativity and try to focus on the positive as much as possible in my personal and professional communications. Anyone who will not join me in this crusade must be rotten to the core.

[back to top](#)

Three New Rules Adopted by the LSBEP

I.

Chapter 7. Supervised Practice Leading Toward Licensure

§703. Duration and Setting of Supervised Practice

A.2. To be credited toward the two years full-time requirements each assignment in a setting or integrated program shall be of at least 500 hours in duration and at least half-time for that setting or integrated program. Supervised practice must be completed within five calendar years, and for cause shown, the Board may grant extensions.

II.

Chapter 2. Reciprocity

§201. Licensure of Psychologists through Reciprocity

A. 2. 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), or,

3. that he/she is a psychologists licensed in another state or territory of the U.S. or a Canadian province who is a current Diplomat of the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) in good standing.

III.

Chapter 9. Licenses

§901. Renewal of Lapsed Licenses

E. A lapsed license shall be reinstated as of the date all applicable requirements of RS 37:2357 have been met. However, the Board retains the right to reinstate licenses retroactively in unusual circumstances as specified in the policy and procedures of the LSBEP.

[back to top](#)

Opinion No. 011

March 14, 2003

Ordering Medical Tests

It is the opinion of The Louisiana State Board of Examiners of Psychologists that it is generally advisable for psychologists to avoid ordering medical tests. This is particularly true if the psychologist is considered the primary caregiver. If the psychologist is the primary caregiver and has reason to believe there is organic pathology, referral to a physician is generally the appropriate course of action.

[back to top](#)

LSBEP/LPA Election Process Agreement

The following is a joint agreement between the Louisiana Psychological Association (LPA) and the Louisiana State Board of Examiners of Psychology (LSBEP) on procedures for the election of nominees for membership on LSBEP. The purpose of the agreement is to set mutually acceptable policies and procedures for the efficient and equitable nomination and election of LSBEP candidates. This agreement shall be in effect for twelve months from the date of signing by officers of the two organizations.

Introduction

1. Under the provisions of Louisiana R.S 37:2353 the Louisiana Psychological Association is charged with conducting an election of all Louisiana licensed psychologists to create a list of LSBEP nominees. The governor selects an individual from the list to fill the annual or other LSBEP vacancy. LPA recognizes its responsibilities and obligations under the law and intends to fulfill them in a systematic, objective, and fair manner.
2. Within LPA, the Nominations and Elections Committee is charged with conducting the election. The chair of that committee is the immediate past president of LPA. The membership of the committee is governed by the bylaws of LPA, as revised on _____.
3. LSBEP has a manifest interest in insuring that the election process and subsequent appointments to LSBEP are conducted efficiently and fairly. LSBEP is justly concerned about the efficiency and validity of the election process to ensure the competence and integrity of its members. The objectives and values of LPA and LSBEP in this matter are entirely congruent.

Nominations

1. In September of each year, LSBEP will supply LPA with mailing labels for all currently licensed psychologists. In October, LPA shall mail to all duly licensed psychologists solicitations for self-nomination to the LSBEP. The deadline for self-nomination will be thirty days from the date of the mailing. The deadline will be prominently displayed on the solicitation form.
2. A candidate for the LSBEP shall have rendered service, teaching, training, or research in psychology for at least five years, shall have held a doctoral degree in psychology from a school or college as defined in R.S. 37:2352(7) for a period of five years, and shall be licensed under R.S. 37:2356. No other qualifications for self-nomination shall be made.
3. LSBEP and LPA agree that there should be a minimum of four self-nominations (candidates) on the subsequent ballot to provide the electorate with sufficient diversity of experience and viewpoints on relevant issues. If four or more candidates are identified by the deadline, the nomination process will end. If fewer than four candidates are identified by the deadline, the deadline will be extended automatically for thirty days from the date of the original deadline. During that period, the Nominations and Elections Committee of LPA will actively and impartially solicit additional candidates. LPA shall appeal to individual psychologists to self-nominate and shall approach state and local professional organizations to identify qualified nominees.
4. If at least two candidates have been identified by the end of the extended deadline, the nomination process will end. If fewer than two candidates have been identified by the end of the extended deadline, the nominations process will continue indefinitely ending when at least two candidates have been identified.
5. A Candidate shall not be permitted to run for a vacant seat, which they have immediately held and/or have immediately resigned from.

Election

1. Within fifteen days from the close of nominations, ballots will be mailed to the electorate using current mailing labels supplied by LSBEP. The ballots will be on a form without letterhead, and will not contain the name of any psychologist other than the candidates. Candidates' names will be listed in alphabetical order on the ballot. Each voter will select one candidate only. Ballots returned by first class mail postmarked no later than thirty days from the date of mailing, which deadline shall be prominently displayed on the ballot, will be considered valid. No signature shall be required on the ballot or the mailing envelopes. No substitute ballots shall be provided. Ballots shall be mailed to the LPA office where they will remain unopened until officially tallied.
2. To assist the electorate in making an informed choice, LPA shall request from each candidate a written, voluntary statement containing information relevant to his/her candidacy. The Nominations and Elections Committee will prepare a standard form or format that may contain the following information.
 - a. Education and credentials
 - b. Professional activities and publications
 - c. Service to the profession
 - d. Service to the community
 - e. History of professional disciplinary action
 - f. Statement of issues facing LSBEP and psychology

With his/her permission, the statement submitted by a candidate will be disseminated to the electorate by LPA by inclusion in the mailing of the election ballot and/or by other means.

3. Neither LPA nor LSBEP shall formally endorse a candidate. However, individual psychologists who are members of LSBEP and LPA are free to voice their preferences for a candidate so long as it is unmistakably clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the organizations of which they are members.

Selection

1. LPA shall unseal and count the election ballots within thirty days of the deadline for receipt. LPA will provide reasonable notification to LSBEP of the date, time, and place for the tallying of the ballots. The tally is open to the public.
2. LPA shall forward a list to the governor via certified mail or hand delivery of the two persons receiving the highest number of votes. The list shall contain the actual number of votes obtained by each of the two candidates. LPA shall simultaneously furnish the same information to the chair of LSBEP.
3. To assist the governor in making a selection, LSBEP shall forward to him/her any known facts about professional disciplinary action or other relevant, verified adverse information about either of the two candidates. LSBEP shall indicate the source and reliability of such information.

Untimely Vacancies

1. Should an unexpected vacancy occur on the LSBEP, LSBEP shall notify LPA within fifteen days of the vacancy. If the unexpired term of the vacated position is 12 months or longer from the date of resignation or vacating of the office, LPA shall conduct a special election to fill the vacancy.
2. Special elections shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures for annual elections with the following provisions and exceptions:
 - a. LPA shall act expeditiously to conduct the special election.
 - b. LSBEP shall provide mailing labels of licensed psychologists in a timely manner.
 - c. The nomination process shall end as soon as two candidates have been identified so long as thirty days shall have elapsed from the date the nominations process was formally initiated by LPA.
 - d. LPA shall expeditiously unseal and count the ballots of the special election and shall promptly forward the results to the governor for his/her action.
3. A Candidates shall not be permitted to run for two vacant seats simultaneously.

Dual Positions

LSBEP and LPA agree that it is not appropriate for an LSBEP member to be also a member of the governing body of LPA because of the potential conflict of interest created by the responsibilities of each organization. LPA shall inform LSBEP if either of the two candidates whose names are submitted to the governor is a member of the governing body of LPA. LSBEP shall in turn provide the information to the governor and shall inform him/her of the provisions of this joint agreement.

_____ Cathy Orman Castille, Ph.D.

President, Louisiana Psychological Association Date _____

_____ Robert Roy Allen, Ph.D.

Chair, Louisiana State Board of Examiners of Psychologists Date _____

[back to top](#)

New Licensees

License # - Name

915 - Amanda Duplantis, Ph.D. (CO)
916 - Valerie A. Wajda-Johnston, Ph.D. (CL)
917 - Harold John Miller, Ed.D. (CO)
918 - Nancy Brehm, Ph.D. (CL)
919 - George M. Schreiner, Ph.D. (CO)
920 - Jessica L. Brown, Ph.D. (CL)
921 - Kathryn L. Nathan, Ph.D. (CL)
922 - Felicia Ann Owen, Ph.D. (DV)
923 - C Laurel Franklin, Ph.D. (CL)
924 - Steven R. Gentile, Psy.D. (CL)
925 - Shanyn Aysta Danos, Psy.D. (CL)
926 - Bryan Louis Bolwahn, Ph.D. (CO)
927 - Lisa Lyn Persinger, Ph.D. (SC)
928 - George J. Haag, Psy.D. (CL)
929 - Keith R. Cruise, Ph.D. (CL)
930 - Gina Manguno-Mire, Ph.D. (CL)
931 - David Glenn Atkins, Ph.D. (CL)
932 - Rebecca L. Mandal, Ph.D. (SC)
933 - Judith R. Steward, Ph.D. (CL)
934 - Stephen Lee Swender, Psy.D. (CL)
935 - Kristin L. Duhé, Psy.D. (CL)
936 - Christopher D. Gamer, Psy.D. (CL)
937 - Miriam McCaa Tighe, Ph.D. (CL)
938 - James B. Pinkston, Ph.D. (CN)

[back to top](#)

Supervision of Candidates

In an effort to protect the public and to provide supervisors with guidance regarding their supervision of candidates for licensure the following information was approved and hereby supplied by the LSBEP for appropriate use by both Candidates and Supervisors:

Supervised Practice Leading to Licensure

- 1) The purpose of supervised practice leading to licensure, as stated in Louisiana Administrative Code, Title 46, Professional and Occupational Standards, Part LXIII, Psychologists, Chapter 7, Section 701, includes "guidance in administrative issues in the practice setting, continues and expands education in skills, offers emotional support, and provides evaluation for purposes of the supervisee's growth, as well as administrative judgment relative to the supervisee's capacity for autonomous professional function.
- 2) Ultimate responsibility for the services provided by the supervisee rests with the supervisor.
- 3) Supervisors assist the candidate for licensure in preparation for eventual independent functioning as a licensed psychologist.
- 4) Supervisors inform both the candidate for licensure, and possibly the Board, of candidate behaviors that may be problematic for the full scope of independent practice.
- 5) Supervision may be conducted on both an individual and group basis. There must be a minimum of one hour per week of individual supervision. The number of supervisory hours and format, in addition to this one hour, is determined by the supervisor based on the supervisee's level of skill.
- 6) Supervision includes preparation for the remainder of requirements for obtaining an independent practice license. This preparation will vary depending on the supervisee's area of specialization but will likely include the use of a range of assessment and intervention modalities, state law as it relates to the practice of psychology, and ethics of practice.
- 7) As a way to continue their development as supervisors, psychologists seek feedback from their supervisees following their oral examination with the Board.
- 8) In order to provide the needed guidance to candidates for licensure, supervisors will limit the number of individuals simultaneously supervised. Generally, supervising no more than two candidates will be approved by the Board.
- 9) Supervisors suggest readings, in-service programs, and continuing education in areas where the candidate's preparation may be weak.

Supervisors discuss this information with the candidate during the supervision process.

[back to top](#)

FYI

RS 37:2360. Violation and Penalties

A. It shall be a misdemeanor:

- (1) For any person not licensed under this Chapter to represent himself as a psychologist; or
- (2) For any person not licensed under this Chapter to engage in the practice of psychology; or
- (3) For any person to represent himself as a psychologist during the time that his license as a psychologist shall be suspended or revoked or lapsed; or
- (4) For any person to otherwise violate the provisions of this Chapter.

B. Such misdemeanor shall be punishable upon conviction by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than five hundred dollars, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Each violation shall be deemed a separate offense.

C. Such misdemeanor shall be prosecuted by the district attorney of the judicial district in which the offense was committed in the name of the people of the State of Louisiana.

[back to top](#)

Competencies 2000 Conference *Janet R. Matthews, Ph.D., ABPP*

From November 6-9, 2003, the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) convened a group of psychologists from the United States, Canada, and Mexico to discuss the future directions in education and credentialing in professional psychology. It was called the Competencies 2002 Conference. The conference was cosponsored by 23 groups including APA, 11 divisions of APA, ASPPB, the US and Canadian Registers of Health Service Providers in Psychology and numerous training councils. Delegates were selected from a large group of nominees to represent a broad spectrum of "education, training, practice, public interest, research, credentialing, and regulatory constituency groups." At the foundation of this conference was the philosophy that competencies can be identified, educated and trained, and assessed. Many definitions of competencies were provided. During Dr. Nadine Kaslow's opening address, she noted that competencies, as we use the term in psychology, are elements of "competence." A working definition of competence given by one speaker was "connotes professional judgment of an individual's ability or capability (to do certain things) based on education, training, experience, and special assessment." This led to the question of whether some competencies are more teachable than others.

Although it is difficult to capture in a short summary what occurred at a conference of this length and magnitude, this article attempts to provide some general information. All delegates were sent a reading list in advance as background for the discussions. Three goals, given in advance, for this conference were: "(1) identification of core and specialized competencies building upon already existing models; (2) formulation of developmental and integrated models of competencies for the training of the next generation of psychologists; and (3) development of strategies for the evaluation of competencies."

Following a general plenary session and panel presentation as an overview of the charge, delegates were subdivided into workgroups to address specific subsets of the topic. The workgroup topics were: scientific foundations of psychology and research; ethical, legal, and professional issues; supervision; assessment; individual and cultural diversity; intervention; consultation and interdisciplinary relationships; professional development; specialties and proficiencies; and assessment of competence. I was assigned to the scientific foundations and research work group. Each work group included a member of the steering committee, an assigned chairperson, and a recorder. In order to facilitate cross-fertilization of ideas, we also had one session where one member of each work group went to another of the groups to discuss the ways our topics were related and to share information. In this latter case, I attended the psychological assessment group.

Although some of these types of conference attempt to achieve consensus and only report those areas where such agreement occurs, that was not the goal of Competencies 2002. Our goal was to generate concepts and products that could be developed in other ways after the close of this conference. It was viewed as a starting point rather than an end in itself. At the end of each of the first two days, we were given summary notes from the recorders of each group so that we could see the directions they were going. Notes from the final day were available after the conclusion of the conference. The final session centered on presentation of the suggested "future directions" of each of the work groups.

What, then, is the outcome of such a broad meeting? A general summary of the proceedings is expected to be submitted to one of the major APA practice journals. In order to facilitate the development of specific projects and products, subsets of the delegation are currently working on individual outgrowth products such as convention presentations, articles, a possible book and future conferences to pursue subsets of the information from this conference.

Although I felt somewhat in a state of "information overload" at the end of these three intense days, I wanted to share some of my impressions of topics discussed. These are personal impressions and not part of a conference report. As a member of LSBEP, one topic I found of interest was the discussion of the role of self-assessment in addition to external evaluation for competence. Many of the delegates discussed formalized systems being used for self-assessment. One delegate raised the point during our discussion of future directions that it would be helpful to training programs to know when one of their graduates, now a practicing psychologist, was disciplined by a regulatory board. This comment was made in the context of training in ethical practice. The outcome measure in this case is whether or not the psychologist does, in fact, practice ethically. Currently such information is transmitted through the disciplinary data bank to professional organizations and credentialing bodies but not to the original training program. A distinction was made between "competencies" and "capabilities." The latter term was used most often to refer to the ability to adapt to change. Although capability is something of interest to LSBEP, regulatory bodies often talk about the "competencies" of candidates for licensure. Many different competencies were discussed as being important for the practicing psychologist. When we tried to consider precisely what we meant by this term, the descriptors I frequently heard were, "observable, measurable, containable, practical, derived by experts, and flexible." During a plenary session, one speaker

suggested that cultural competence is a superordinate competence to be addressed. Further, he suggested that cultural competence has various levels including societal, organizational, professional (the standard of practice), and individual (training issues). One of the delegates to this conference represented the new Consortium of Combined and Integrated Doctoral Programs in Psychology (CCIDPP). As I spoke to him about the programs in this area, I began to wonder how a graduate of one of these programs would fit into our specialty designation structure in Louisiana. These programs give a combined professional degree in such areas as clinical-counseling-school. Whether or not this will become a growing trend in training programs remains to be seen.

Hopefully this summary has given Louisiana psychologists some flavor of both this conference and issues being raised on a national level about practice in the current century.

[back to top](#)

Q&A

Question: Would it be acceptable for a candidate to pay the difference in his supervisor's malpractice premium caused by his supervision?

Answer: No, the malpractice premium for adding an unlicensed candidate for licensure in LA should be paid by the supervising psychologist. The candidate is not paying for and should not be paying for supervision. If the candidate does pay, this results in a dual relationship which constitutes an ethical violation. The LSBEP realizes that this adds to the difficulty of obtaining supervisors for candidates leading to licensure, but it avoids the appearance of impropriety.

Question: If an individual is being supervised for licensure by a psychologist and employed by that psychologist, does it make a difference if the candidate for licensure is paid for the services that are performed on a 1099 or a W-2?

Answer: No, it does not matter which form is used for the candidate to report income for taxable purposes or form under which the candidate is paid. This is not under the scope of the LSBEP and does not impact on the role of the supervisor. This is more of a tax form issue.

[back to top](#)

LSBEP Meeting Dates

- September 12, 2003
- November 14, 2003
- December 12, 2003
- January 9-10, 2004 (New Orleans)

[back to top](#)

Disciplinary Action Report

On July 14, 2003, Richard John Wakeman, Ph.D. entered into a Consent Agreement with the LSBEP following an investigation of a complaint alleging violations of R.S. 37:2359 (B)(2)(b) and R.S. 37:2359 (B)(12); as well as Ethical Standards of Psychologists, General Standards 1.17(a) and 4.05(a).

On August 1, 2003, Allen Michael Johnson, Ph.D. entered into a Consent Agreement with the LSBEP following an investigation of a complaint alleging violations of R.S. 37:2359 (A), (B) (12), and (B)(14); as well as Ethical Standards of Psychologists, General Standards 1.03, 1.11(a)(2), 1.13 (a,b,c); 1.15, and 1.19(a).

[back to top](#)

Steps towards Licensure

Click [here](#) to view list

You must have Acrobat Reader to view list. Download