



# ASPPB

Association of State and  
Provincial Psychology Boards

## **An Update on the EPPP from ASPPB: A Factual Overview**

The following information is provided to address misinformation and misunderstandings currently being circulated by communities outside of the regulatory community. First, ASPPB is committed to the development, refinement, and maintenance of a valid, fair, and equitable examination of competence to practice. ASPPB has taken the last five years, since the initial introduction of a two-part national examination in 2017, to listen, learn and move forward thoughtfully. Moreover, we anticipate positive collaboration in the years to come, with various members of the psychology community in these efforts. This document addresses the issues raised in a recent mass email campaign initiated by some in the education and training community. Please take a moment to review the information below and contact ASPPB with any questions, suggestions, or concerns you may have.

**ASPPB is committed to addressing concerns raised by stakeholder groups regarding the examination of an individual's competence to practice psychology. ASPPB has taken many specific action steps to respond and will continue to do so on behalf of its members and the public they serve.**

In 2020, ASPPB established the Examination Stakeholder Technical Advisory Group (ESTAG). ESTAG was charged with (a) providing information on issues/questions raised by the training community and collaborating on methods to address such issues/questions, (b) serving as an additional voice and resource to inform more substantive policy questions from or before EPPP committees, (c) serving as informal liaisons to and from their respective communities regarding the ASPPB Examination Program, and (d) serving as a "think tank" that provides potential research ideas for examination-related matters.

ASPPB intentionally established ESTAG membership to include sharp critics of the EPPP, representatives from the education and training community, representatives from the regulatory community, and experts in test and measures development. There are 11 advisory members on ESTAG with the majority representing the school, counseling, and clinical education and training communities.

ESTAG met numerous times over the course of the last 2 years and conducted extensive work during and in between meetings. Over the summer months of 2022, the members worked to prepare and finalize a report with recommendations to the ASPPB Board of Directors (Board) regarding research options and communication strategies for the EPPP (Part 1- Knowledge) and (Part 2-Skills). Concurrently, ASPPB held four town hall meetings explicitly inviting regulatory, education, training, ethnic identifying, and other professional stakeholder groups to listen to updates regarding the Examination Program and to bring questions and concerns. Attendees asked questions and raised any concerns either during a live Q & A or by an option to send questions or concerns by email. Notably, very few concerns were raised either during, or in response to, these town hall meetings.

Unfortunately, during the town hall presentation, a remark was made indicating that the ESTAG had come to a consensus that the EPPP "met the Standards" [for Educational and Psychological Testing], when in fact the ESTAG's

discussion on this issue was more nuanced and complex. Moreover, the ESTAG had not yet submitted its formal report to the ASPPB Board and, therefore, the remark was a premature one. Board President Alan Slusky apologized (see Appendix) to the education and training community. A video recording of the town hall giving a comprehensive review of the status of the EPPP that had been distributed, was revised to remove this misstatement, and then redistributed: <https://vimeo.com/743463541/0991a45ead>. Unfortunately, two members of the ESTAG elected to resign following this misstatement.

The ESTAG submitted its final report on August 22, 2022 and it was reviewed by the ASPPB Board at its October Meeting. The ASPPB Board greatly appreciates the work of ESTAG and is moving to promptly implement actionable, detailed recommendations. The Board will nominate people to fill the two vacant positions as it expects ESTAG's ongoing work to contribute greatly to the evolution of the EPPP.

The ASPPB Examination Program's procedures and evidence are rigorous and align with all generally accepted licensure examination development standards, including critical and foundational standards outlined by the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*.<sup>1</sup> An independent evaluation was recently conducted by the California Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) as part of its mandate to ensure that all examination programs used in the California licensure process comply with psychometric and legal standards for the development of professional licensure exams. **This thorough independent review clearly stated that the EPPP (Part 1- Knowledge) and (Part 2- Skills) meets the Standards:**

OPES found that the procedures used to establish and support the validity and defensibility of the above examination program components of the EPPP Part 1 and Part 2 appear to meet professional guidelines and technical standards outlined in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014) (Standards) and in California Business and Professions (B&P) Code § 139.

[https://psychology.ca.gov/about\\_us/meetings/materials/20211022\\_materials.pdf](https://psychology.ca.gov/about_us/meetings/materials/20211022_materials.pdf) pp. 103-143

**A two-part examination will not create new barriers to practice. Rather, it promises to smooth the road to licensure amidst a national mental health crisis.**

Amid a national mental health crisis driven in part by mental health provider shortages, the need for qualified providers has never been more important. ASPPB is committed to supporting an accessible, navigable, and efficient path to licensure for all qualified candidates. The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) was developed to assess the skills of individuals who desire to practice psychology. In other words, it assesses the work with which practitioners are actually tasked at the point of licensure. The methodology undertaken to develop the exam is sound, it involved over one hundred licensed psychologists in direct development, and it reflects the *minimum* level of skills that should be demonstrated to safely practice. Although all would agree that more mental health services are needed, the notion that the public should not expect these services to be delivered by individuals who have empirically demonstrated minimally competent knowledge and skills is dangerous.

Furthermore, prior to the development of the EPPP (Part 2- Skills), numerous jurisdictions had created their own versions of skills exams which varied significantly in terms of development, method, and content. Still other jurisdictions utilized oral examinations to assess skills, which risk being more subjective and subject to legal challenges. The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) provides for consistent assessment of skills across jurisdictions, based on industry standards. It is expected to *replace* current steps to licensure, *not* add to them. Nevada, for example, eliminated a state-specific skills exam by replacing it with the EPPP (Part 2-Skills).

Moreover, in service of supporting a streamlined approach to licensing qualified individuals, ASPPB’s recommended timing for delivery of the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) is as soon as foundational coursework is completed and prior to or during internship. This timing allows candidates to take Part 1 of the exam at the point of knowledge acquisition (when pass rates are highest) <sup>2</sup> as is done with other doctoral level health professions. Part 2 would then be delivered at the point of licensure (as is currently the case). Therefore, no additional delays in achieving licensure are anticipated.

### **The development of a fair, equitable, and accessible exam is a core value of ASPPB.**

Significant time, energy, and resources have been put in place to develop processes and practices that reduce the chances of bias influencing exam performance <sup>3</sup>. These efforts have included:

- Intentional inclusion of a diversity of backgrounds, including race, ethnicity, and other identities; areas of expertise; and training backgrounds on all examination committees
- Training all item-writers to consider, among other things, cultural and linguistic issues
- In-person implicit bias training for all EPPP (i.e., Part 1- Knowledge and Part 2- Skills) item writers
- Repeated subject matter expert review of each item prior to appearing on an exam form, at multiple levels by several independent committees
- Pre-testing and statistical evaluation of *each* item prior to use as a scored item
- A statistical analysis, Differential Item Functioning (DIF), for each item across demographic variables
- Creation of an Item Review Committee (IRC) in 2020 to review those items identified by the DIF analysis for possible bias

Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analysis has been conducted since 2018 on each form of the EPPP. So far, over 1300 EPPP items have been subjected to DIF analyses. This process identifies items that perform differentially across demographic groups.

Next, any items that have been identified or flagged by the DIF analysis are reviewed by the 10-member Item Review Committee (IRC), an independent committee of psychologists with expertise in cultural competence, and experience working with underrepresented and marginalized populations. This committee was selected from well over 150 applicants. Items are reviewed blindly by committee members, and those that they deem potentially biased are removed from the exams.

To date, more than 1,300 items have been reviewed by DIF analysis; 34 items were flagged for review by the IRC. Committee members conducted a blind review of these 34 items and determined that 7 items should be omitted from the exam and item pool. This is an ongoing process, and DIF analyses will be conducted on every EPPP exam form going forward.

Although the current data suggest limited evidence of bias, ASPPB recognizes its responsibility in ensuring fair and equitable exams. This work must be multifaceted, ongoing, and expanded to eliminate inequities along the entire professional journey, beginning at recruitment, continuing through admissions and training, and ending in licensure. ASPPB will conduct future research on factors that may influence performance on the exam, will support test-takers in giving their best test performance, and will truly partner with stakeholders on research aimed at elucidating “the why” of differential performance across demographic groups.

ASPPB has also demonstrated its responsiveness to diversity and equity through a number of other actions. Although the ASPPB Board recognizes that these actions only represent a starting point, we wish to highlight examples of this work here:

- Regular education and outreach to the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS) to assist students from diverse groups in understanding the licensure and examination process, including three presentations in 2022
- Consultation to A. Mihecoby and J. Thomas, authors of “*Lighting the Path*” to Psychology Licensure: *EPPP Handbook for Native Candidates*” published by The Society of Indian Psychologists
- Active participation in, and financial support for, the conference that culminated in the development of the Council of Chairs of Training Councils (CCTC) *Socially Responsive Toolkit* (2020)
- Ongoing work with CCTC to develop a network of PSYPACT holders to provide low-cost mental health services to graduate students in health service psychology programs
- Consistent with its commitment, approving financial support for students and early career psychologists through the:
  - 2022 National Multicultural Conference and Summit
  - 2022 Inez Beverly Prosser Scholarship for Women of Color, sponsored by PsiChi, The International Honor Society in Psychology

The ASPPB Board is actively exploring additional avenues to support successful licensure of candidates from under-represented racial and ethnically diverse backgrounds.

**A two-part examination of knowledge and skills ensures a thorough assessment of competence and is good for the protection of public health and welfare.**

At the point of licensure, regulatory boards have the responsibility to assess each individual applicant in real-time, to determine if they can safely practice psychology. Psychology has been an outlier among health care professions in not having had a standardized assessment of competency. Skills are not measured universally or in a standardized manner but instead through other methods such as supervisor ratings and letters of recommendation. The EPPP (Part 2-Skills) does, in fact, finally provide the measure that has been lacking. No better universal measure currently exists to ensure that a candidate demonstrates the minimal level of skills to practice independently, at a single point in time, across all expected profession-wide competencies (e.g., intervention and assessment, professionalism). This is particularly important given notable concerns raised by the training community that psychology trainees’ development of skills has been increasingly inconsistent. Recent concerns expressed by the Association of Psychology Internship and Postdoctoral Centers (APPIC) over the lack of adequate preparation of students for internship highlight these concerns and further argue for the need for an independent measure of competence to safely practice psychology.

**ASPPB is a non-profit organization that is mindful of cost and of responsibly stewarding its resources on behalf of the health and welfare of the public.**

We agree that the cost of education, and subsequent substantial educational debt, are enormous problems for students and may disproportionately impact first generation and low-income candidates. In response to concerns raised by stakeholders, students, and member jurisdictions, the Board has taken steps over the past 3 years in service of reducing the financial burden for test-takers. These actions have included:

- A 25% reduction in the EPPP (Part-2 Skills) fee, with no current plans to increase that fee
- Practice examinations that are now provided at-cost, so that candidates may access both in-person and on-line exams at minimal expense

ASPPB also expects that administering the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) at the point of knowledge acquisition (as is now recommended) will result in significant cost-savings for students who would otherwise pay for expensive third-party test-preparation materials. As noted above, the two-part format will allow for early admittance to the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) exam at the time of knowledge acquisition, a time when our research shows that pass-rates are higher <sup>2</sup>. Higher initial pass rates and less reliance on expensive test preparation companies are expected to mitigate costs substantially. ASPPB also expects that students who do not pass the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) at the time of knowledge acquisition will benefit from remediation while they are still in the training phase, while still in their programs with access to that remediation. Further, training programs will benefit from real-time feedback regarding students' preparation in the foundational knowledge required for internship readiness at the individual level, and accreditation at the program level.

ASPPB appreciates this opportunity to outline these changes which we believe will serve the public interest and benefit the profession of psychology. We invite you to share additional questions or concerns you may have via email at [asppb@asppb.org](mailto:asppb@asppb.org) or telephone at (678) 216-1175. Thank you.

---

## References

1. American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, eds. (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Lanham, MD: American Educational Research Association.
2. Schaffer, J., Rodolfa, E., Owen, J., Lipkins, R., Webb, C., & Horn, J. (2012). The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology: New data–practical implications. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*. 6. 1-7. 10.1037/a0026823.
3. Turner, M. D., Hunsley, J., & Rodolfa, E. R. (2021). Appropriate validation standards for licensure examinations: Comment on Callahan et al. (2020). *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 165–166.



Supporting member jurisdictions in fulfilling their responsibility of public protection

**President**

Alan B. Slusky, PhD, CPsych

**Chief Executive Officer**

Mariann Burnett-Atwell, PsyD

**Past President**

Tomás R. Granados, PsyD

**President-Elect**

Herbert L. Stewart, PhD

**Secretary-Treasurer**

Cindy Olvey, PsyD

**Members at Large**

Michelle G. Paul, PhD

Hugh D. Moore, PhD, MBA

Jennifer C. Laforce, PhD, CPsych

**Associate Executive Officer****Member Services**

Janet P. Orwig, MBA, CAE

**Senior Director of Examinations****Services**

Matt Turner, PhD

**Director of Educational Affairs**

Jacqueline B. Horn, PhD

**Director of Professional Affairs**

Alex Siegel, JD, PhD

**Business Director**

Lisa M. Fagan, MBA

August 31, 2022

Dear Examination Stakeholder Advisory Group Members,

I am writing on behalf of the ASPPB Board of Directors to apologize for the recent incorrect and ill-timed statement made in ASPPB's video regarding the status of the EPPP. In one segment of the video, a remark was made that the ESTAG had come to consensus that the EPPP "met *The Standards*"<sup>1</sup>, when in fact the ESTAG's discussion on this issue was more nuanced and complex. Moreover, the ESTAG had not yet submitted its formal report to the ASPPB Board and, therefore, the remark was a premature one. We also recognize that the names and affiliations of ESTAG members were displayed in the video without providing the courtesy of advance notice. Lastly, we recognize that some have expressed concern that a response recently issued from ASPPB fell short of an apology. We are hopeful that this letter clearly communicates our sincere apology over what has happened.

Understandably, the trust that is so critical for collaboration between ASPPB and members of the ESTAG (and the stakeholder groups they represent) has been fractured. While we believe that this remark was not ill intentioned or malicious, we nevertheless take responsibility and regret the subsequent negative impact on ESTAG's membership and cohesion. In response to these concerns the video in question was immediately taken down, edited, and reposted without the statement or names and affiliations of ESTAG members. Further, we are committed to improving our processes to ensure that the work of ASPPB's committees and advisory groups is fully considered and represented before actions are taken.

The ESTAG was born out of ASPPB's desire, and the wishes of the psychology education and training community, to collaborate and advise the ASPPB Board on the ongoing development and validation of the EPPP. ASPPB did its best to intentionally constitute this working group with those who have expertise in psychometrics and those who are most critical of the examination. While advisory in nature, it was (and continues to be) our hope that the ESTAG would provide valuable outside perspectives on the exam, to ensure it continues to be a valid, reliable, and fair assessment of entry level knowledge and competence, so essential to the safe and ethical practice of psychology. Toward this end, we hope this error will not jeopardize ESTAG's continued work to meet its goals.

We understand that two members of ESTAG have elected to withdraw from the group in response. While we certainly respect their decisions, we

sincerely hope that they might either reconsider their decision or support their respective organizations in nominating individuals to take their place on this advisory group. ASPPB values the contributions that ESTAG has made and, we hope, will continue to make to the development and maintenance of the EPPP.

Finally, we remain open to dialogue with all members of the ESTAG over this or any other concerns it may have with regards to its efforts. We sincerely hope our efforts to acknowledge the error will facilitate rebuilding trust with this very important advisory group as well as the stakeholder communities it represents.

Sincerely,



Alan Slusky, Ph.D., C. Psych.  
President, ASPPB Board of Directors

CC:

Danielle Keenan-Miller, PhD  
Association of Psychology Training Clinics Council of Chairs of Training Councils  
Timothy Strauman, PhD  
Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology

<sup>1</sup>American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: Author.