

NCPA Survey of Psychologists regarding Title and Scope of Practice of Master's-Level Psychologists

Executive Summary. All psychologists in North Carolina were asked if they agreed that (a) master's-level psychologists in independent practice should have a distinct title and (b) master's-level practice of highly specialized areas like neuropsychology or forensic psychology should be supervised. About one in five psychologists responded. Taken as a whole, psychologists licensed in North Carolina strongly favor both propositions. Licensed Psychologists overwhelmingly support both. Licensed Psychological Associates show much more division; only a plurality of LPAs oppose both propositions.

Context. For years, there has been agreement between the North Carolina Psychological Association (NCPA), the North Carolina Association of Professional Psychologists (NCAPP), and the North Carolina Psychology Board about the need for a path to independent-practice licensure for master's-level psychologists with appropriate training and experience. NCPA and NCAPP disagreed over details about draft legislation that NCAPP put forward. The most prominent disputes were in two areas: the need for a title, and the scope of practice for independent practice at the master's level.

To measure the attitude of North Carolina psychologists, NCPA put forward a survey on these questions.

Participants. NCPA obtained the email addresses of every Licensed Psychological Associate and every Licensed Psychologist in North Carolina from the North Carolina Psychology Board.

Method. We invited all licensees to participate in the survey by sending an email out on Thursday afternoon 12 June 2025. The email asked participants to identify themselves as an LP or LPA. It briefly stated NCPA's position on two issues, and asked if the psychologist agreed, disagreed, or wasn't sure. To encourage participation, we offered one \$50 Amazon gift card; if participants were interested, they wrote in their email addresses. That survey can be found below as Appendix A.

In less than four hours, someone identifying themselves as "NCAPP@NCAPP.Org"¹ sent out an email accusing NCPA of presenting "disinformation" in "a misleading narrative that deserves correction." The email went on to say "we encourage you to complete the survey with 'NO'." That email can be found below as Appendix B. While we believe this email was sent to all LPAs, we are not sure, as no individual has claimed authorship of this email.

¹ This email was unsigned. Dr. Rumer sent an email at lunch time on 13 June to ncapp@ncapp.org (the address listed in NCAPP's Facebook page) asking if the email was authentic, and who wrote it. There was no response. On 15 June, Dr. Rumer sent an email to Dr. Williams and Ms. Truman-Schram, the co-presidents of NCAPP, at Dr. Williams' office email address, repeating this request. As of 30 June, there has been no response.

Given the gravity of those accusations, NCPA responded the next morning by again emailing all psychologists in the original list. We responded to the allegations, again encouraged participation in the survey, and noted there would be a second \$50 Amazon gift card. We also noted that, if respondents had changed their minds about their vote, they could email our Executive Director to correct their votes. No one did this. This email is below in Appendix C.

The survey asked participants to respond by Monday 16 June, as the relevant legislation could be voted on later that week. On Tuesday morning, NCPA Director of Communications and Marketing, Karen Gray harvested the data from SurveyMonkey and forwarded that file to Dr. Richard Rumer, the primary author of this report.²

Results

Question One

I am a:	Responses	Percent of Responses	# Licensees in North Carolina ³	Responses as % of Licensees
North Carolina Licensed Psychologist	635	71.3%	3,309	19.2%
NC Licensed Psychological Associate	244	27.4%	980	24.9%
Neither (Please stop). This is only for LPs and LPAs.	2	0.2%	n/a	n/a
Did Not Answer	9	1.0%	n/a	n/a
Total	890	100%	4,289	20.8%

About one in five North Carolina psychologists responded to this survey, with LPAs responding at a higher rate than LPs. NCPA's current membership includes 635 LPs and 36 LPAs. We understand that NCAPP has about 150 members. The current survey did not ask about association membership, so we don't know if all the LPs who answered the survey were NCPA members, but it is apparent that more LPAs answered than there are NCAPP members.

Question Two

HB 67 does not include a distinct title for master's level psychologists who are approved to practice independently. NCPA's position is that independently practicing master's level psychologists *should* have a distinct title to better inform and protect the public.

² I used Excel Software to prepare the summary you see below. If there are any errors or omissions, the fault is mine alone (see Job 19:4). Note that I immediately deidentified the data set before analyzing it.

³ As of 6 February 2025, from the North Carolina Psychology Board Register.

I agree with NCPA that independently practicing master's level psychologists *should* have a distinct title.

	All	%	LPs	%	LPAs	%
Yes	693	78.0%	589	92.8%	102	41.8%
No	156	17.4%	31	4.9%	117	48.0%
I am not sure	40	4.5%	15	2.4%	25	10.2%
Did not respond	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	890	100.0%	635	100.0%	244	100.0%

Respondents as a whole strongly favored having a distinct title. When viewed by level of licensure, LPs overwhelmingly favored this proposal. Despite the apparent efforts of NCAPP, the LPAs were much more divided; only a plurality of LPAs oppose having a separate title for master's-level psychologists in independent practice.

Question Three

The NC Psychology Board's stated position to the General Assembly is that master's level psychologists should engage in neuropsychology and forensic psychology only under supervision. NCPA agrees with this position which is consistent with current national standards recognizing these areas as postdoctoral level specialties. HB 67 directly contradicts this public position and requires the Psychology Board to determine individual master's level psychologists' qualifications to practice independently in these highly specialized areas. NCPA has raised concerns about the Psychology Board taking on a responsibility that no other State or Provincial Psychology Board currently has.

I agree with the Psychology Board's public position that master's level psychologists should only practice under supervision in the highly specialized areas of neuropsychological and forensic assessment.

	All	%	LPs	%	LPAs	%
Yes	698	78.4%	599	94.3%	99	40.6%
No	136	15.3%	18	2.8%	109	44.7%
I am not sure	54	6.1%	17	2.7%	36	14.8%
Did not respond	2	0.2%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%
Total	890	100.0%	635	100.0%	244	100.0%

Again, psychologists as a whole strongly favored supervised practice by master's-level psychologists in specialized areas like neuropsychology and forensic psychology. As in the prior question, LPs overwhelmingly favored this idea. A plurality of LPAs opposed this idea, but the opposition was not quite as strong as it was on the question regarding professional title (45% vs. 48%).

Appendix A – The Survey

This was published at 15:00 on 12 June 2025

Subject: Take A Quick Survey: Master's Licensure in NC

[NCPA Logo]

Hello, North Carolina psychologist,

We are writing to tell you about a bill that affects your licensure as a psychologist, and to ask what you think about two important details about that bill. The bill (now Section III of House Bill 67, originally Senate Bill 171) is under active deliberation.

Please respond to this survey below no later than Monday, June 16. It is important that the General Assembly know now what you think.

You may click on this link below to go to the survey and answer three brief questions:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/masterslicensure2025>

You may want to keep this open while you look at the survey questions. We have provided background information below for your convenience to help inform your selections.

Psychologists who complete the survey will be eligible for a \$50.00 Amazon gift card.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Dale Mann, Ph.D. President, NCPA

Mary Evers, PhD, Co-Chair, Legislative, Governmental Affairs and Policy Committee

Dick Rumer, PhD, Co-Chair, Legislative, Governmental Affairs and Policy Committee

Martha Turner-Quest, Executive Director, NCPA

[Black box titled "survey" with same link as above]

[Blue box with text: Background Information]

This year's **Senate Bill 171** link is below:

<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2025/Bills/Senate/PDF/S171v2.pdf>

Its successor, **Section III of House Bill 67**, can be read below, beginning on page 16.

<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2025/Bills/House/PDF/H67v4.pdf>

The 2023 predecessor of this bill, **SB 570** is below.

<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2023/Bills/Senate/PDF/S570v1.pdf>

And its text also showed up beginning on page 4 of the 2024 Health Care Omnibus **Bill 287**

<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2023/Bills/House/PDF/H287v5.pdf>

The 2021 predecessor of these is here as **House Bill 881**

<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2021/Bills/House/PDF/H881v1.pdf>

All these bills originated with the North Carolina Association of Professional Psychologists.

Association of State and Provincial Psychology Board Model Language regarding independent practice by Master's-level psychologists

<https://asppb.net/news/asppb-shares-update/>

[Blue Box with Text: North Carolina Psychology Board Letters to the General Assembly]

Click the black buttons below to review the letters.

[Black button link] Dr. Hurt's April 2025 letter to Senator Burgin. (The Board moved to send a highly similar letter to the primary sponsors of HB 67 in June 2025.

[Black button link] Dr. Brantley's April 2023 letter to Senator Burgin. (NCPA's highlight emphasis on page 2)

[Black button link to web page] NCPA's A Thoughtful Path to Independent Practice for LPAs.

Appendix B – Email from NCAPP.Org

From: **NCAPP** <ncapp@ncapp.org>
Date: Thu, Jun 12, 2025, 6:52 PM
Subject: Clarifying Facts About HB 67 – Your Voice Matters
To: [sic, apparently in “bcc” format]

Good afternoon colleagues

We're reaching out today to clarify disinformation circulating about **House Bill 67 (HB 67)** and to encourage your informed participation in the recent NCPA survey (see the questions below). The way the survey questions are framed—particularly around title designation—presents a misleading narrative that deserves correction. One might expect that psychologists—presumably trained in psychometrics and experienced in research design through at least a thesis, if not a dissertation—would demonstrate greater care and precision in crafting survey questions. As such, we encourage you to complete the survey with "NO" based on the following:

Claim: *HB 67 does not include a distinct title for independently practicing master's-level psychologists.*

Fact: The **North Carolina Psychology Board** has already addressed this. A distinct title—**Licensed Psychological Associate – Level 3 (LPA-3)**—has been designated and is used to differentiate those authorized for independent practice from those still under supervision. This is a transparent, searchable, and effective solution that mirrors how LPs (doctoral-level psychologists) are categorized—regardless of supervision status. There is no added title for supervised vs. unsupervised LPs, making this critique of LPA-3 both inconsistent and inequitable.

Claim: *HB 67 inappropriately requires the Board to judge competency in complex areas like neuropsychology and forensic psychology.*

Fact: The **Board already evaluates competencies** across all areas of practice. HB 67 does not create new responsibilities—it reinforces the Board's existing authority to protect the public by assessing individual qualifications, just as other states do. Other states license independently practicing master's-level psychologists to work in specialty areas when properly trained. No federal rule mandates a doctoral degree to practice in these areas.

Why This Matters:

The NCPA's survey implies that supporting HB 67 means compromising public safety or transparency. This is false. In truth, **HB 67 enhances access to care**, aligns with national standards, and promotes **equity in licensure based on competency—not just degree level**.

We encourage you to complete the survey and vote **“No”** to the misleading title-based question. Doing so sends a strong message that:

- Competence, not title inflation, should guide practice.
- Public protection is best ensured by Board oversight, not unnecessary barriers.
- North Carolinians deserve greater access to mental health services—not fewer providers.

Let your voice reflect facts—not fear.

Thank you for your continued advocacy for accessible, ethical, and equitable psychological services across North Carolina.

Question Title

HB 67 does not include a distinct title for master's level psychologists who are approved to practice independently. NCPA's position is that independently practicing master's level psychologists should have a distinct title to better inform and protect the public.

I agree with NCPA that independently practicing master's level psychologists should have a distinct title.

Yes

No

I am not sure

Question Title

The NC Psychology Board's stated position to the General Assembly is that master's level psychologists should engage in neuropsychology and forensic psychology only under supervision. NCPA agrees with this position which is consistent with current national standards recognizing these areas as postdoctoral level specialties. HB 67 directly contradicts this public position and requires the Psychology Board to determine individual master's level psychologists' qualifications to practice independently in these highly specialized areas. NCPA has raised concerns about the Psychology Board taking on a responsibility that no other State or Provincial Psychology Board currently has.

I agree with the Psychology Board's public position that master's level psychologists should only practice under supervision in the highly specialized areas of neuropsychological and forensic assessment.

Yes

No

I am not sure

Join us and/or Donate at ncapp.org via Credit Card or PayPal

Use the Cash App: \$ncapp3

Direct PayPal: <http://paypal.me/ncapp3>

Check or money order to:

NCAPP, P.O. Box 416, Butner, NC 27509

919-694-3911

LPAs NEED independent practice

SUPPORTED: NC Psychology Board APPROVED a path to Independence in 2020

(meaning, an end to LIFETIME supervision) for LPAs

SAFE: Evidence shows LPAs practice with NO increase risks of harm

LPAs are well qualified practitioners as required by the NC Psychology Practice Act

LPAs have been providing the same psychological services as LPs for more than 40 years!

NEEDED: Mental Health Crisis! Not enough psychological services providers

Expands services by increasing the pool of insurance authorized providers

LPAs unfairly burdened with LIFETIME supervision – unlike any other MH provider

FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE: Early intervention reduces burden on state hospitals & EDs

LPA fees average 25% less than LP fees

Appendix C – NCPA Response (emailed 14 June 2025 @ 08:07)

This was published at 8:07 on 14 June 2025

Subject: A Response to Our Previous Email as Disinformation

[NCPA Logo]

Hello, fellow psychologists,

We are following up on the earlier invitation to participate in a survey

[\[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/masterslicensure2025\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/masterslicensure2025). We provided background information related to the questions, and since then, we know that at least some of you have received an email claiming that we provided “disinformation.” That message offers conclusions that it describes as “facts.” The email did not name the individual(s) who wrote it. We have reached out to try and find out who the authors are, but as of this writing, we have received no response.

With respect, we think the description of our email as “disinformation” is wrong. Below you will find this other email’s statements, and our responses.

[Blue Box] Title

The other email states:

Fact: The North Carolina Psychology Board has already addressed this. A distinct title—Licensed Psychological Associate – Level 3 (LPA-3)—has been designated and is used to differentiate those authorized for independent practice from those still under supervision. This is a transparent, searchable, and effective solution that mirrors how LPs (doctoral-level psychologists) are categorized—regardless of supervision status. There is no added title for supervised vs. unsupervised LPs, making this critique of LPA-3 both inconsistent and inequitable.

Our response:

The Board’s web page encourages folks to read the regulations on supervision. Go to https://ncpsychologyboard.info/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Board-Rules_0522.pdf and search for “.2008”. This will take you to 21 NCAC 54 .2008. Psychological Associate.

Section (h) of Rule .2008 specifies three levels of minimum supervision requirements, based on the LPA’s level of experience in combination with the LPA’s EPP score. Level 3 is available for LPAs with at least three calendar years (4500 hours) of post-licensure experience OR five calendar years if the LPP did not achieve a score of at least 500 on the EPPP. At Level 3, the LPA shall have supervision, a minimum of one hour every three months.

However, there is NO provision in the current rules for an LPA providing Rule .2006 services to go to Zero supervision. **This is the whole point of the new legislation – to allow for independent practice by master’s-level psychologists with appropriate training and experience.** *In no way does LPA-Level 3 describe independent practice. LPA-3 is in no way a “distinct title” like LPA, LP, or the proposed Licensed Practitioner of Psychology.*

There is a difference in title between Licensed Psychologists under supervision, *where they must attach “Provisional” to their title*, and Licensed Psychologists in independent practice, where there is no such modifier. See, e.g., Rule .2001(c), Rule .2009(b), and Rule .2705(a). See also <https://ncpsychologyboard.info/licensee/applications/provisional-to-permanent-licensure/>

[Blue Box] Scope of Practice: Neuropsychology and Forensic Psychology

The other email states:

Fact: The Board already evaluates competencies across all areas of practice. HB 67 does not create new responsibilities—it reinforces the Board’s existing authority to protect the public by assessing individual qualifications, just as other states do. Other states license independently practicing master’s-

level psychologists to work in specialty areas when properly trained. No federal rule mandates a doctoral degree to practice in these areas.

Our response:

The NC Psychology Board does not certify specialty competencies. To quote from the Board's web site: "North Carolina, in common with most other states, has adopted generic standards for the statutory licensing of psychologists. This position recognizes a common core of scientific knowledge from which professional practice is derived. However, professional psychology specialties have emerged from the generic practice of psychology. *The Board does not license in any specialty area*, [italics added] but does issue health services provider certification to licensees who provide health services.

See <https://ncpsychologyboard.info/law-and-codes/related-statutes-other-info/related/>

Again, if the Board were already engaged in reviewing and certifying psychologists' competence to practice neuropsychology and/or forensic psychology, this section of the proposed legislation would be unnecessary. This, in fact, would be a new task for our Board.

[Blue box] Conclusion

We understand our Code of Conduct, including the Ethical Principal regarding avoiding False or Deceptive Statements (APA Ethics Code 5.01).

We have explained our reasoning and cited our sources.

We stand by our previous email.

Finally, we note that this other email urged you to vote "NO" on the questions we posed. We asked what you thought, and stated NCPA's position (already available), but did not tell you to vote one way or the other.

If you have not already completed the survey, please click below and tell us what you think. Please vote no later than Monday, June 16.

Link to survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/masterslicensure2025>

If you have already filled out the survey and, after reading this, have changed your mind about your prior selections, please email Martha Turner-Quest at martha@ncpsychology.org

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Dale Mann, Ph.D. President, NCPA

Mary Evers, PhD, Co-Chair, Legislative, Governmental Affairs and Policy Committee

Dick Rumer, PhD, Co-Chair, Legislative, Governmental Affairs and Policy Committee

Martha Turner-Quest, Executive Director, NCPA