

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
Professional and Vocational Licensing Division
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
State of Hawaii

MINUTES OF MEETING

The agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, as required by § 92-7(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS").

Date: July 19, 2019

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Place: Queen Liliuokalani Conference Room
King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, 1st Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Present: Sherry Sutherland-Choy, Psy.D., APRN-Rx, Chairperson
Marty Oliphant, Vice Chairperson
Rosemary Adam-Terem, Ph.D., Member
Don Pedro, Psy.D., Member
Christopher Fernandez ("EO")
Daniel Jacob, Esq. Deputy Attorney General ("DAG")
Susan A. Reyes, Secretary

Excused: Jill Oliveira Gray, Ph.D., Member

Guests: Matthew Turner – Association of State and Provincial psychology Boards ("ASPPB") (via teleconference)

Call to Order: There being a quorum present, the meeting was called to order by Chairperson Sutherland-Choy at 1:34 p.m.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

Old Business: a. Enhanced EPPP

At 1:34 p.m. Matthew Turner from ASPPB called in by telephone to brief the Board on the Enhanced EPPP, and to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Dr. Turner gave an overview as follows:

1. Starting January 2020, ASPPB will launch the two-part version of the EPPP and the jurisdictions will have the option to continue using the knowledge version or to start using both.

2. One of the main complaints about the EPPP is that it is not about what a psychologist does on a day-to-day basis. It is based on a job task analysis with graduate level information, but it is not practice-based. ASPPB did another job task analysis in 2016, to determine how ASPPB can assess competency better. ASPPB came up with a module, but it was so big that it required more time than ASPPB could deliver on a four-hour exam.
3. ASPPB developed the Enhanced EPPP to better regulate competency and to protect the public. It will provide a more thorough assessment of competence.
4. The EPPP is currently knowledge based only. The skills assessment is left to each individual jurisdiction based on their own rules and are assessed variably by oral exams, number of supervised hours or letters of recommendation.
5. The bottom line for regulators is to have a more comprehensive tool. However, some jurisdictions do not want to use an oral exam, due to liability issues and not legally defensible.
6. The EPPP (part 2-Skills) provides information on candidate understanding of how to proceed in applied situations. This is done by presenting case situations, or real-world information, in a variety of item formats including:
 - a. Multiple Choice: Candidate must choose the best choice of 3 responses.
 - b. Multiple Choice/
Multiple Response: Candidate will be allowed to choose more than one response from a series of possible answers. For example, select 2 of 5 options.
(45% of the exam)
 - c. Scenarios: Presents information from an applied situation. Scenarios have up to 3 "Exhibits" which present additional information. This can be an animation, a description of an interview, a test protocol, or other data that adds information. Each Exhibit can have up to 5 questions that pertain to that part of the scenario.
(45% of the exam)

- d. Point and Click: A graphical image is presented (ie. A test protocol, a business card, an advertisement, a letter, etc.) and the candidate may select one or more areas on the image to indicate a response to the question.
- e. Drag and Drop: Matching multiple appropriate stimuli on the left side of the screen to an appropriate response on the right side of the screen.

Dr. Turner asked the Board if they had any questions.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy said that Hawaii has a very culturally diverse population and our clinicians are very culturally diverse as well. She wanted to know how this will impact their performance on the EPPP part 2.

Dr. Turner said ASPPB recruited writers with different ethnic backgrounds from all over the United States and Canada. These writers were from different practice backgrounds, such as I/O representatives, counseling, school, clinical, hospital and private practice. ASPPB will have these writers go through supervised training in how to write an item and how to look for things from experts in these fields. ASPPB has experts on cultural competence that will review the items as well. Most of the items are being reviewed in a group format by multiple psychologists. Once it is passed and approved, the final step goes through an exam committee of experts in cultural competence before the item goes onto an exam. Dr. Turner said that they started a collection of ethnicity data, which ASPPB has never done. This voluntary ethnicity data is taken from the EPPP and they will start collecting it from Part 2. ASPPB will look at the scores, and at the item level, to see if there are any differences in performance based on ethnicity. If so, ASPPB has a flagging procedure that lets ASPPB know that there may be a problem. ASPPB has a committee of cultural competence experts who will review the item, and if there is a problem, that item is thrown out. A lot of thought and effort is put into EPPP and especially Part 2, in making sure that ASPPB puts out a good product.

Referring to one of the example questions from the EPPP2 that asks what may appear on a psychologist's business

card, Dr. Adam-Terem said that she was thinking about the concept of cultural competency and how much variance there is between the different cultures that ASPPB may come across. She explained that she is on the board for the Society for the Advancement of Psychotherapy, Division 29 of the APA, and stated that Division 29 had invited international membership and one set of people, from mainland China, asked if they could say on their business cards that they are members of Division 29. They said they would be honored to be members of Division 29. However, from the western standpoint, we cannot be using this relationship to advertise ourselves. But, it makes no sense whatsoever to the Chinese psychologist who wants to say they are engaging with the American Psychological Association in Division 29 and that their client should know this.

Dr. Turner said that ASPPB had their itemizers review this item, and they found all kinds of things wrong with the business card question; more than what the writer had intended. The problem was unintended, particularly in this one item. It was not so much advertising that you're a member, it was advertised in such a way as it was almost an award. He said that here are always those sorts of issues. When ASPPB does an ethics-based item, they tend to be easier because you would have to be explicit and clear. Dr. Turner stated that if you know your APA or CPA guidelines, you'll be able to get the answer. There is a physical analysis done, so if there is something that comes up strange in the pattern of performance for test takers, then ASPPB can catch it this way as well. There are a lot of reviews that go on before an item is seen by a candidate.

Vice Chairperson Oliphant asked Dr. Turner if the cultural committee sees all of the questions and answers before they go out.

Dr. Turner said that there is always someone with cultural competence expertise that sees it before it ever sees the exam.

EO Fernandez wanted to know the regular cycle of changes and/or time frame of a process if there was an issue with an item.

Dr. Turner said that it takes six months before ASPPB will pull an item off the exam. Dr. Turner said that the process

is rigorous and there has been an emphasis on this for more than seven years.

Regarding the exam order, EO Fernandez said it was described to the Board prior, that Part 1 would be first and Part 2 would come after and if this is still the same?

Dr. Turner said that the prerequisite to Part 2 is passing Part 1. Dr. Turner said that it makes the most sense to give them the option to take the exam after they have completed all the course work and everything but their internship and postdoc. But, ASPPB had to leave it up to the jurisdictions because there were jurisdictions that were opposed to that.

Dr. Adam-Terem said the Board screens the applicants to see if they are eligible to take the EPPP. The Board was interested in having the applicants do the EPPP 1 before the applicants graduate. Dr. Adam-Terem asked Mr. Turner, who would do this and how would it happen?

Dr. Turner said that if the Board wanted to screen the applicants, it would be up to the Board. The way it would work now, if the Board chooses to, is that the applicant would apply early with the Board and the Board would screen the applicants. If it meets the Board's criteria, then the applicants can take the Part 1, at the point where the Board designates.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy said it would be before the applicant goes to internship, because it would be when all the course requirements would be completed for most programs.

Dr. Turner said that would make the most sense. But the applicants will not have to and can choose to take it later. If the Board as a jurisdiction would allow this, ASPPB would hope that all the jurisdictions that are going forth with the part 2 will do the same, so that universally it will move in this direction.

Dr. Adam-Terem said that some jurisdictions don't require postdoc, and asked Dr. Turner if this is still true?

Dr. Turner responded that it is true. He's not sure on the exact count, but there are 12-13 jurisdictions that do not require postdoctoral experience.

Dr. Adam-Terem said that hypothetically, that someone could be here in Hawaii; finish their course work and apply through this Board for access to the EPPP; be granted by this Board and then go up to Alabama and get licensed.

Dr. Turner said that this is already happening right now. There are several states that have a supervised practice license, such as, Kentucky, North Carolina and Texas. Some people are not even finished with their course work and they apply in Kentucky; take the EPPP and get the score that they need, then simply have it transferred over, and no one ever asks that question. There have been a couple of jurisdictions that will make people take the EPPP again because they did not take it as a candidate for licensure for independent practice. But, he only heard of this being caught that one time.

Dr. Pedro asked Dr. Turner if he knew which states have adopted the part 2.

Dr. Turner said that there are about six states that have adopted the part 2:

- Alabama
- Georgia
- New Hampshire (still discussing using the exam)
- Nevada
- Canadian Jurisdictions (2)

Dr. Turner went on to say that there about 15 total jurisdictions that are looking at adding the EPPP2 and ASPPB may have about 10 jurisdictions by launch time. He further stated that none of the jurisdictions are huge states, such as:

- California
- New York
- Texas

Dr. Pedro asked if there is already a pass/fail rate.

Dr. Turner said there is not. The way the exam works is not like a WISC where you would have some normative data. It is strictly set on a criterion. Come launch time, ASPPB will have a beta testing window to gather all the data and throw out the items that did not work well. The form will be created using the best psychometrically

performing items. There is a standard setting procedure that involves about twelve psychologists that are licensed, most of which are newly practicing psychologists. They would review the exam, item by item and give ASPPB their ratings based on the minimally qualified practitioner. Using the ratings in this Angoff procedure [the Angoff method relies on subject-matter experts to examine the content of each test question], ASPPB and their psychometrician will essentially create the pass point. This is how ASPPB does it with the EPPP and it is basically expert driven, meaning that the practitioners will let ASPPB know what the pass point is. No one has taken it yet. The beta testing will be a delayed score, the first group that will take the exam will have a greatly reduced cost of \$100.00, Part 2 will be \$450.00. Couple of years down the road for the people that will move forward in the early adoption phase, the fee will be \$300.00.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy asked if there are only practice test for the EPPP part 2, the same way as for part 1, in terms of study guides or prep courses.

Dr. Turner said that he had calls from some of the prep companies that want to put some study tools together. Dr. Turner said that ASPPB does not do this. ASPPB can give them sample items and may have an abbreviated practice test, so people can get used to the format and to try it out and get acclimated to what it is. He imagines that there may be several companies that are producing practice materials. ASPPB does not want to do the practice materials, because it is a conflict of interest to prepare candidates vs. also doing the exams. Dr. Turner said he had spoken to some individuals that makes the practice materials to let them know where ASPPB is at, and they will be producing some materials as well.

Dr. Sutherland-Choy asked Dr. Turner if ASPPB has tracked candidates that are taking the EPPP who fail it multiple times and is there any data on the individuals who try to take it several times and continues to fail.

Dr. Turner said that ASPPB has done an analysis at one of their administrator's annual meetings, and a question was asked: Is there a recommended limit on the number of times a person should take the exam? ASPPB had talked to other organizations and looked at their own data, and it looks like people were having a hard time passing the exam. Some jurisdictions have a rule against a limit.

Dr. Turner said that he has spoken to an individual who may have had a head injury, and they took the exam 19 times and failed. He keeps taking it, but he is not coming anywhere near close to passing. Money is continually being taken from people that are failing multiple times, and in all likelihood, are not going to pass. But, based on ASPPB's data, six is the point where very few are passing after six attempts.

Dr. Sutherland-Choy was wondering if there is a way to identify these individuals? Are they having problems early on in school? Does the school have an obligation to identify these people?

Dr. Turner believes that the pass rate will go up tremendously because all of the items in the new exam have a reference, and almost always is from a graduate level text book. But, ASPPB does not know what is happening early on in the program. Because by the time ASPPB sees this, they are already at the point of licensure. He informed the Board that it is a small portion of people that are not passing.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy said that here in Hawaii, we tend to have a very high failure rate on the EPPP. The Board is concerned and sees this quite a bit and is trying to figure out what is happening. This higher failure rate seems to come from one particular school.

Dr. Turner said that there was an article published on their data showing that a couple of the schools, that tend to be very large schools, had some low passing grades. He said that he would be happy to talk more with the Board about this and collaborate. The feedback takes so long because we are talking about seeing somebody years after school and it is a little late in the process. Some should be weeded out of school and they are not.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy said she was approached by Dr. Scanlan, the previous Dean of Argosy in Hawaii, and was asked if there was a way that the Board could track these students; go back and look at data to see if they were having problems early-on in the program, and to see if there was a trend.

Dr. Turner said his only issue is the privacy concern. Sometimes ASPPB are asked by programs for data and ASPPB have not released it because of this concern.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy said that what if the applicants were asked to willingly disclose the information that they are failing multiple times.

Dr. Turner said that it would be reasonable to him, but it would need to go in front of the committee.

EO Fernandez asked Dr. Turner if in their research, do they make a distinction between PsyD. and PhD. Programs when it comes to the order of the exams? Previously, the Board has identified PsyD. programs as having a difficult time with part 1. These individuals would not even get an opportunity to be tested in a more positive light based on the emphasis of training in their own degree which will be part 2. Is this being taken into account?

Dr. Turner said that there is not a huge PsyD. and PhD. difference.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy asked if it is based more on the caliber of the school.

Dr. Turner said that there is a difference if you factor out some of the programs. It is difficult to train everyone at the same standard.

Chairperson Sutherland-Choy asked Dr. Turner where the APA is on this and whether they are seeing that these people are not passing the EPPP. Is APA putting pressure on these institutions to reduce the number of students they take?

Dr. Turner said he does not know, but he said that the APA had asked for ASPPB's beta which is part of their evaluation process. It seems to be that this has always been a deal breaker for programs.

As there were no more questions from the Board, Dr. Turner thanked the Board and said that he would be happy to answer any follow up questions.

Approval of the
Meeting Minutes:

It was moved by Dr. Pedro, seconded by Dr. Adam-Terem, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2019 meeting as circulated.

Amendments to
Agenda:

None.

Executive Officer's Report:

a. Record of Candidates Examined: For the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology ("EPPP")

Executive Officer Fernandez reported that during the period of June 16, 2019 to June 30, 2019, two candidates took the EPPP exam; two failed.

b. DCCA Disciplinary Actions Through May 2019

None.

Executive Session:

It was moved by Vice Chairperson Oliphant, seconded by Dr. Adam-Terem, and unanimously carried to enter into executive session at 2:36 p.m. to consider and evaluate personal information relating to individuals applying for professional or vocational licenses in accordance with HRS §92-5(a)(1), and to consult with the Board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the Board's powers, duties, immunities and liabilities in accordance with HRS §92-5(a)(4).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 2:49 p.m., it was moved by Dr. Pedro, seconded by Dr. Adam-Terem, and unanimously carried to return to open session.

Applications:

a. Examination

- i. Bernadette Heid
- ii. Matthew Milette-Winfrey

It was moved by Dr. Adam-Terem, seconded by Dr. Pedro, and unanimously carried to approve the applications of Drs. Heid and Milette-Winfrey pursuant to HRS § 465-7 HAR §§ 16-98-8 and 16-98-9.

b. Examination Waiver

- i. Charles Valadez
- ii. Heike Kholooci
- iii. Elizabeth Romero

It was moved by Vice Chairperson Oliphant, seconded by Dr. Pedro, and unanimously carried to approve the applications of Drs. Valadez and Kholooci pursuant to HRS § 465-7 and 465-10 and HAR §§ 16-98-9, 16-98-16, 16-98-23, 16-98-25, and 16-98-30.

It was moved by Dr. Pedro, seconded by Vice Chairperson Oliphant, and unanimously carried to defer the application of

Dr. Romero pending receipt of original documents pursuant to HRS § 465-7 and 465-10 and HAR §§ 16-98-9, 16-98-16, 16-98-23, 16-98-25, and 16-98-30.

c. Ratification(s)

Senior Psychologist

i. Alexander Piekarski

It was moved by Dr. Adam-Terem, seconded by Vice Chairperson Oliphant, and unanimously carried to ratify the application of Dr. Piekarski pursuant to HRS § 465-7.

New Business: None.

Legislative Matters: a. Research: possible future legislation planning

None.

b. PSYPACT

Updates regarding ASPPB's Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact regarding telehealth and temporary in-person, face-to-face practice of psychology.

None.

Public Comments for items Not on the Agenda:

Comments from the public are accepted at this time on topics not specifically addressed elsewhere on the agenda. The public may comment by signing-in before speaking during the Public Comment section. The Board is precluded from discussing or acting on items raised by Public Comment that are not already on the agenda, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting. **Public Comment will be limited to 5 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chairperson.**

Next Meeting:

Friday, August 9, 2019
1:30 p.m.
Queen Liliuokalani Conference Room
King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, 1st Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Due scheduling conflicts there will be no quorum for the August 9, 2019 planned meeting. Therefore, this meeting will be cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled to take place on:

Friday, September 13, 2019
1:30 p.m.
Queen Liliuokalani Conference Room
King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, 1st Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

Adjournment: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Sutherland-Choy at 2:50 p.m.

Reviewed and approved by:

Taken and recorded by:

/s/ Christopher Fernandez
Christopher Fernandez
Executive Officer

/s/ Susan A. Reyes
Susan A. Reyes
Secretary

CF:sar

09/18/19

[] Minutes approved as is.
[X] Minutes approved with changes; see minutes of 09/13/19.