

**Responses to Survey - Board of Psychologists** Total responses:\* 14

<p><b>Highest Compliment</b></p>	<p><i>Monitoring profession on behalf of licensees - 5 Helps avoid criticism because of bad actors - 2 Helps to streamline CE -- 1 None - 1 Other: Ability to ensure a minimum quality of professionals. - The Board of Psychologists should have an educated, unbiased approach to all applicants who have completed an APA approved graduate clinical or counseling PhD program and take a reasonable, rather than imperious approach to their gatekeeping role. - Protection of the public (and profession) by carefully &amp; fairly investigating complaints about professional conduct. - Ability to ensure that licensees are qualified to provide services and to monitor the profession for the benefit of public safety.</i></p>
<p><b>Biggest Complaint</b></p>	<p><i>Licensing fees too high - 6 Renewal times too rigid - Lack of Information - Regulations too strict - 2 Board's response to unlicensed practice - 2 None - 1</i></p> <p><i>Other: The board of psychology has been known to be far too punitive, arrogant and harsh toward practitioners for even minor infractions. - The Board of Psychologists has a well-deserved reputation for holding applicants to standards not exercised by other state boards. There are several mental health settings in Montana that are wary of hiring psychologists because of the board's unreasonable standards and often capricious and high-handed attitude toward applicants for licensure. In my years as a psychologist I have never heard anyone express a generally positive view of the board and I've heard many, many complaints. - Very user-unfriendly, hard to access necessary information; requirements not clearly laid out and somewhat outdated. - A conflict between the timing of meetings and the timing of postdoc years and the EPPP exam make the licensure process onerous and expensive. - Would suggest that licenses be inactivated, rather than terminated, when not renewed (and professional is actively licensed in another state). - I have lived and worked in 5 other states. I have been licensed in 2 other states. NEVER have I had such a difficult time getting licensed as I have in MT. The Board here needs another Board to regulate them. Almost every psychologist I have come in contact with in MT feels the way I do about our Board, and the psychologists with whom I remain in contact in other states and tell how the Board in MT treats psychologists and prospective psychologists are, to put it mildly, horrified. The MT Board puts up numerous and unnecessary roadblocks to getting licensed, and their behavior borders on being emotionally abusive. I cannot say enough negative things about the MT Board. - I have heard the psychology board can be unreasonable to psychologists applying for licensure. - Does not adequately present simplification of state rules relevant to licensure &amp; practice of psychology.</i></p>
<p><b>Reasons the board is important:-</b> - It is important for the board to determine whether or not applicants have had adequate and appropriate education and training to allow them to practice independently in their field. It is important for the board to ensure that licensees obtain continuing education so they are current in the field. It is important for the board to investigate complaints to determine whether or not there has been unethical practice and to protect the public from unethical practice. The requirements for licensure are reasonable to ensure competence. Only to make sure we obtain necessary continuing education units and to deal with ethical issues. - They provide essential accountability for the profession, maintaining high standards and keeping professionals informed of best practices. - After years of hearing complaints about the board and witnessing a great deal of the unnecessary misery experienced by licensure applicants, I think the board's general treatment of applicants should be scrutinized by professionals who are independent of the practice of psychology in Montana. In some recently begun and ongoing examination of the requirements by other state boards of psychologists, I find that few other states require work samples, few have oral exams, and none so far have had differing requirements for counseling vs clinical psychologists for submitting course transcripts and the syllabus for certain courses. The vast majority of states, but not Montana, have a reciprocity for psychologists licensed in states that have similar licensing requirements. I received my degree from the University of Montana's clinical psychology program and it was clear to me that I received somewhat preferential treatment, compared with what psychologists from out-of-state or from counseling PhD programs have received. While this was relieving at the time, I now realize it wasn't fair to other applicants undergoing a virtual hazing process. - I cannot imagine my profession without a licensing board; it's unrealistic.</p>	

**Reasons the board is important:** (continued) - Ensures practitioners are qualified, ethical, practice within scope of professional and individual boundaries. Keeps other professions within scope of practice that fits their preparation. - Protecting the public from unlicensed practitioners. - Gives legitimacy to professionals who practice in the state. Montana is already perceived as the Wild West and if we did not have boards regulating these activities, it would lower the perception of the quality of practitioners in the state.

<b>Public Health -</b>	<b>Public Welfare-</b>	<b>Public Safety - 1</b>	<b>All or combination - 7</b>	<b>None of these - 3</b>
<b>Scope of Practice:</b>	<b>Too Narrow - 2</b>	<b>Too Broad -</b>		<b>Just Right - 20</b>

**Problems with other professions' scope of practice?** No - 10 Yes - 2 Board of Social Workers/Professional Counselors (1) Board of Barbers & Cosmetologists (1)

**Regarding scope:** I am especially concerned about Montana's severe restrictions on licensing psychologists who earned their doctoral degree via distance learning or blended learning. I think the requirement that applicants must have spent a full year in residence on campus is outdated given the quality of training opportunity that can be made available through new technologies. I agree that there are some distance learning programs which are diploma mills and we must monitor that, but to have an overarching guideline that effectively prohibits anyone who earned a degree through a distance learning program is grossly misguided in my opinion. - Recent legislation has allowed encroachment upon the designation of psychologist. Psychologists receive very specific and extensive training and the rigid standards for being called a psychologist protect the public against untrained people with inadequate credentials making conclusions from testing that they are not qualified or trained to make and from calling their evaluations "psychological." Yet the term psychological has been allowed to mean having to do with mental health. There are strict criteria about who can perform a psychiatric assessment (psychiatrist) or a nursing assessment (a nurse) or a legal assessment (a lawyer). Yet psychological assessment has been watered down such that anyone with mental health training can be said to perform one. - Our scope of practice as psychologists can include a wide range of reimbursable psychotherapy approaches, psychological assessment, and supervision of other mental health professionals. While the pursuit of the privilege of being able to prescribe medication seems to be important to many psychologists, it has never been a goal that interests me or that I've been willing to support. - "Just right", with the exception that I would like to see Psychologists be given a pathway to prescription authority, albeit with solid requirements for additional training and some additional oversight to keep them from oozing over into professional activity that can only be adequately carried out with advanced medical training.

**What laws/regulations have caused the most problems?** -- None - **Other:** Potentially: allowing other, less-qualified professions to conduct psychological assessments. - The licensing fee. It is outrageous. - The laws allowing the watering down of the term "psychologist" and "psychological." Psychologists have very specific and extensive training that allows them to administer and accurately interpret psychological assessments. If someone with a Ph.D. is not allowed, because of inadequate training or supervision, to be called a psychologist in Montana, it is typically with good reason. Extension of the term "psychological" to anyone with mental health training waters down the product and is confusing to the populace. - For me, the requirement of the provision of three work samples, one including projective testing, was the requirement that was the most tedious and unnecessary. I graduated from an APA- approved graduate program that had met the training requirements. I had also graduated from an APA-approved internship during which I had ample assessment experience. I also did a great deal of assessment during the accumulation of the hours required for applying for licensure. Submitting work samples seemed redundant and there were several members of my examination panel who had no experience at all with psychological assessment. Additionally, requiring license applicants to submit samples including projective testing is patently absurd, given that few programs devote much, if any, training time to projective testing. This requirement puts otherwise highly qualified applicants in the awkward and ethically dubious position of either using an instrument with which they have only modest familiarity or getting training for testing that, at best, is now viewed by most psychologists with a jaundiced eye. - - The licensure process was 2-3 times more burdensome than it was in the first state where I pursued and attained licensure, in part due to a lack of clarity in the requirements. Individual applicants for licensure should not have to search through state codes and try to interpret them. Licensing boards should translate and summarize pertinent law, at least in writing, if not person-to-person. Another example of unclear requirements (in how the psychology board interprets state law) involves continuing education: the other state where I am licensed explicitly states how much continuing education credit can come from studying printed material that substantively deals with pertinent issues.

**What laws/regulations have caused the most problems?** (continued) - - I have not had a problem with the Board of Psychology. I am concerned that licensed social workers and counselors are able to call the evaluations they do "Psychological Evaluations" when many of those licensees have not had adequate training in administering and interpreting psychological tests. In addition, I feel that it is a misrepresentation, since they are not psychologists. - Allowing inadequately trained professionals (i.e. not trained as a psychologist) to provide "Psychological Evaluations". [ It's] more appropriate to provide service under their own professional names, within the limits of their education and experience. - The main thing is to streamline the boards. Make things as simple as possible so they can protect and regulate without excess time wasting hassles for the professionals and for the boards themselves. - My understanding in talking with some former board members is that some of the outdated practices of the Board of Psychologists are mandated by the legislature. I would say that the ongoing unreasonable dictates of a board that may be adhering to old and outdated standards because of strictures of law would be my biggest concern. - Regulations around the timing of the various elements of the licensing process.

**Consumer complaints filed:** No 10 Yes - 2 **Board effective?** Yes - 1 No - 1 **Other comments:** *Effective:* 1. A practitioner who is not a psychologist was calling himself one. I filed a complaint and that person ceased the practice. 2. A psychologist rebuked a colleague for asking for his credentials and the credentials of a psychologist in training. Credentials should be readily provided. I filed a complaint and it was addressed immediately. *Not effective:* I don't think it was an official consumer complaint, but after licensure I wrote a letter suggesting alternatives to the current structure so that the licensing process would be less burdensome for candidates. The board dropped the matter.

**Nonlicensee comments**

Not calculated yet

\*as of 4/4/2012