

American College of Forensic Psychology
39th Annual Symposium
March 14-16, 2024
San Diego • The Westgate Hotel

OVERVIEW

The American College of Forensic Psychology is approved by the American Psychological Association to sponsor continuing education for psychologists. The American College of Forensic Psychology maintains responsibility for this program and its content. This program will offer a maximum of 21 hours of Continuing Education credits. To earn CE credit for each session, attendees must attend the entirety of the session and sign in and out at the registration desk.

Goal: The goal of this symposium is to keep forensic psychologists abreast of important issues which lie within the interface of psychology and law, recent developments in psychology that require new knowledge for expert witnesses, and new case law affecting forensic practice. **Target Audience:** The program is intended to benefit practicing forensic psychologists, psychologists in other subspecialties, and attorneys who litigate civil and criminal cases involving psychological evaluations and expert testimony. **Objectives:** Participants should improve their knowledge and skills in the following areas: (a) evaluation or treatment of forensic litigants and individuals with other forensic psychological issues; (b) new and ongoing research and developments in the field of forensic psychology; (c) relevant concepts useful in testifying and educating the court on mental health issues, and in working within the legal system; (d) changes in the law that affect clinical and forensic practice; (e) legal and psychological aspects involving inmates in correctional facilities with psychological disorders. Please see below for the learning objectives for each individual CE session. All CE sessions are taught at an intermediate level, building upon psychologists' foundational knowledge in a content area.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest or Relevant Financial Relationships: The American College of Forensic Psychology does not receive financial or commercial support. All instructors were asked to disclose potential conflicts of interest, or relevant financial relationships with any commercial interest. All instructors reported that they have nothing to disclose.

The meetings each day will be in the Versailles Ballroom. Registration and continental breakfast each day will be outside the meeting room. Thursday night's welcome reception will be in the Riviera Room and Terrace, and the student poster session will be held in Ambassador Room, Riviera Room, and the surrounding hallways.

Although no changes are anticipated, it is possible that changes will be necessary to the program.

PROGRAM

Wednesday, March 13

4:00-5:30 PM **Early check-in for registrants; late registration** — Grand Lobby

Thursday, March 14

7:00-7:55 AM **Registration Check-in and Sign-in**

7:00-7:55 AM **Continental Breakfast** – outside of Versailles Ballroom

7:55-8:00 AM **Welcome and Announcements** – Versailles Ballroom

8:00-12:15 Forensic Assessment: Mitigation and Neuropsychology – Versailles Ballroom

8:00-9:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Post-Traumatic Distress Disorders as a Mitigating Factor in Forensic Psychological Evaluations

Rebecca Smith-Casey J.D., Psy.D., Erica Jennett, M.A., Hilary Good, B.A.

A national study of adults in the United States demonstrated that 89.7% had experienced at least one DSM-5 Criterion A traumatic event and that many had experienced more than one type of trauma, yet the lifetime prevalence rate for PTSD is about 8.3% (Kilpatrick et al., 2013). Despite a relatively low incidence of PTSD among those who have experienced trauma, individuals who have experienced traumatic events are likely to be overrepresented in forensic populations. Research has consistently demonstrated links between childhood traumatic experiences and various negative outcomes in adulthood, including physical health concerns, mental health disorders, aggression, functional brain changes, sexually risky behaviors, substance abuse, and incarceration (Baglivio et al., 2014; Reavis et al., 2013). Additionally, complex trauma, especially recurring childhood trauma within family contexts, leads to diverse challenges such as affect regulation, identity development, and relational issues (Rocchio, 2020). Over the past three decades, research has consistently highlighted the prevalence of traumatic experiences across all populations, indicating a high likelihood of encountering individuals who have undergone significant trauma in forensic settings (Rocchio, 2020). In forensic evaluations, an assessment of post-traumatic distress is necessary, particularly if the goal of the evaluation includes identification of mitigating factors. Evaluators may be in the position to provide information to the courts related to the ways a defendant's trauma history and experience of PTSD may influence their participation in the legal system, their interactions with the world at large, and the potential links between the offense and the trauma history. Interestingly, research has shown that courts are reluctant to grant appeals for ineffective assistance of counsel for failure to investigate trauma in capital cases (Hiromoto et al., 2022), which highlights the need for a thorough evaluation of mental health symptoms prior to trial in capital cases. When reviewing ineffective assistance claims, federal courts of appeals seem willing to accept a low bar for mental health investigations, even if they are rushed or contradicted by later examiners after conviction, with courts also seeming to be skeptical that mental health evidence, even if it should have been looked into, would have made a difference in capital mitigation case (Hiromoto et al., 2022).

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Identify and list the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) described in the ACE Study.
2. Explain the potential links between PTSD and criminal behaviors.
3. Plan an assessment of PTSD in the context of a variety of criminal and civil evaluations.

Rebecca Smith-Casey, J.D., Psy.D. is a licensed clinical psychologist in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, a certified school psychologist, and a current professor in the Master's in forensic psychology program at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. She is the author of the New Jersey Competency Assessment Tool (NJ-CAT). She has research interests in topics related to the impact of trauma across the lifetime, competency to stand trial, and the insanity defense. Rebecca is the principal psychologist at River Valley Psycholegal Consulting, where her work focuses on assessment in civil and criminal forensic matters, trauma, law enforcement evaluations, educational testing, diagnostic clarity, and providing gender affirming care.

Erica Jennett is based in Gallatin, TN as a Criminal Justice Liaison serving Sumner, Cheatham, and Robertson counties where she conducts comprehensive biopsychosocial assessments for incarcerated individuals, crafts release plans, and offers treatment recommendations to courts. Erica completed dual bachelor's degrees in criminal justice & political science and psychology from Austin Peay State University in 2017, followed by a master's degree in forensic psychology from The Chicago School of Professional Psychology in March 2021. Currently, she is engaged in an internship at Mental Health Cooperative where she contributes to individual and group therapy and provides support at emergency psychiatric services.

Hilary Good obtained her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Ithaca College in 2011. She has worked in the field of psychiatric rehabilitation since 2014 and obtained her Certified Psychiatric Rehabilitation Practitioner certificate in 2017. Hilary is currently in a Master's program for Forensic Psychology at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology and is in her internship year. She is a member of the Psi Chi Honors Society as well as the Society for Collegiate Leadership and Achievement. She is also a student member of the American Counseling Association, American Psychological Association, American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, and the National Council.

9:00-10:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Intellectual Developmental Disorder and the IDD Adjudications: "A Rainy Night in Georgia"

Jonathan Venn, Ph.D.

Intellectual Developmental Disorder (IDD) is that rarity among mental disorders where the mere presence of the disorder is sufficient to trigger the appropriate judicial remedies. An effort by the State of Texas -- in *Ex parte Briseño* (Texas 2004) -- to parse defendants with IDD into those who do and do not merit capital punishment was rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Moore v. Texas* (U.S. 2017, U.S. 2019). Other relevant cases are *Bowden v. Francis* (11th Cir. 1985), *Penry v. Lynaugh* (U.S. 1989), *McCarver v. North Carolina* (U.S. 2001), *Atkins v. Virginia* (U.S. 2002), *Schofield v. Palmer* (Georgia 2005), *Hill v. Humphrey* (11th Cir. 2011), *Hall v. Florida* (U.S. 2014), and *Young v. Georgia* (U.S. 2022). The American Psychological Association, American Psychiatric Association, and American Academy on Psychiatry and the Law submitted an *amici curiae* brief in *McCarver* arguing that persons with IDD have diminished culpability. This reasoning prevailed in *Atkins*, where the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that executing a person with IDD would violate the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. The debate shifted from whether persons with IDD could be executed to (1) how IDD would be defined, (2) whether IDD can be parsed into subcategories that do and do not merit capital punishment, and (3) who gets to make these determinations. This presentation reviews the developments in three States: Florida, Texas, and Georgia.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the difference between strength-based and deficit-based approaches to the evaluation of persons with IDD.
2. Explain the roles of professional organizations interacting with the legal system.
3. Describe the role of standard of evidence in determinations of IDD.

Dr. Jonathan Venn has provided psychological services since 1971. He has evaluated thousands of adult defendants, juvenile delinquents, and convicted felons. He has testified under oath in hundreds of litigated proceedings. He earned his Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology at Northwestern University in 1977. He is licensed to practice psychology in four states. He has Board certifications in Clinical Psychology and in Forensic Psychology from the American Board of Professional

Psychology. His book – Crime and Psychology: Foundations of Forensic Practice – was published by Routledge in 2024 and received high praise from reviewers.

10:00-10:15 AM **Coffee Break**

10:15-12:15 PM (2 CE credits)

Distinguishing Cognitive and Emotional Symptoms Associated with Neurological and Psychiatric Disorders

Arnold D. Purisch, Ph.D.

This presentation discusses the features that brain injuries, PTSD, and somatic symptom disorder have in common and approaches to distinguish them during the clinical neuropsychological forensic evaluation. The advantages and disadvantages of neurodiagnostic assessment techniques (neurological evaluation, structural imaging, functional imaging, and electrophysiological methods), personality assessment, and neuropsychological profiles in this differential diagnostic process will be reviewed. Neuropsychiatric syndromes associated with focal brain injuries will be presented.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Explain the clinical and diagnostic features that differentiate brain injuries, PTSD and somatic symptom disorders.
2. Describe common profiles on personality and neuropsychological tests related to traumatic brain injuries.
3. Identify the different neuropsychiatric manifestations associated with injuries to different parts of the brain.

Arnold D. Purisch, Ph.D., is board certified in neuropsychology by both the American Board of Clinical Neuropsychology and the American Board of Professional Neuropsychology. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association Division 40 and the National Academy of Neuropsychology and has been a practicing forensic neuropsychologist for 40 years. Dr. Purisch has been Faculty of the Neuropsychology Specialty Postdoctoral Program at Fielding Graduate University for almost 30 years. He is the co-author of the Luria Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery and co-author of Neuropsychology for Psychologists, Health Care Professionals, and Attorneys (Third Edition).

12:15-1:30 PM **Lunch Break** (on your own)

The afternoon session has presentations in two rooms:

ROOM 1: 1:30-4:45 PM Professional Practice and Assessment Issues – Versailles Ballroom

1:30-2:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Conceptualizing and Practicing Forensic Psychology through a Human Science Lens

Susan G. Goldberg, J.D., Ph.D., Dasha Kotalik, MSW, and Giovanna Martinez, B.S.

Various factors have affected the mainstream practice of forensic psychology in recent decades, particularly in court settings. We will argue that some of these factors have negatively affected forensic work and undermined human science understandings; the “human science” aspect of psychology involves rich description of the person being assessed to provide a fuller understanding and to guide their treatment. The factors we will discuss are: 1) the demand for the use of only valid and reliable assessment instruments and empirically supported treatments; 2) the requirements in the legal system for scientific evidence that meets the standards of “natural science” research, e.g. that it is testable and falsifiable; and 3) economic pressures. The goal to omit bias appears reasonable. Avoiding bias in forensic areas, such as criminal law, seems crucial, with so much at stake. Yet there are risks that are rarely addressed. Some of these perils and their implications for the field of psychology will be described in the presentation. We contend that psychologists often provide less complete descriptions of people being assessed. This in turn affects the decisions for custody and in treatment provided to people being assessed. We propose a procedure that will ensure that the assessment instruments are valid and reliable and that the treatment is empirically supported but that also maintains a human science attitude towards the process. We will also suggest larger societal changes that could have a positive impact on criminal justice, such as providing more resources to assessment and treatment of mental issues and trauma.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe a holistic style of forensic psychological assessment.
2. Perform forensic psychological assessment in a more comprehensive manner to understand fully the person being assessed.
3. Apply human science approaches in forensic psychological assessment in addition to natural science ones and to understand the reasons and importance of doing so.

Susan Goldberg is a lawyer and forensic clinical psychologist. She is a Core Doctoral Faculty member at Fielding Graduate University. Her Ph.D. is from Fielding and her J.D. is from Georgetown University. Her fields of specialty include forensic psychology, law and ethics, and qualitative research.

Dasha Kotalik and Giovanna Martinez are doctoral students in the Clinical Psychology Ph.D. program at Fielding. Dasha received her Master’s in Social Work from the University of Denver in 2013 and has ten years of experience in a county jail setting as a Licensed Clinical Social Worker. Giovanna Martinez has also worked in the correctional system.

2:30-3:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Male Sex Offender Transitioning to Transgender - Impacts of Safety and Recidivism Risk

Thomas F. Haworth, Ph.D.

In the past decade or so, the public has become increasingly aware that gender is better described in a wider frame than the traditional dichotomy of male and female. Though other gender identities have existed across the centuries, much of the time secretively, transgender individuals have suffered greatly with internal struggles as well as finding acceptance in the general community as well as the LBG communities. In more recent times, acceptance has increased, but transgender individuals have continued to suffer discrimination as well as threats, physical harm, and death. A small percentage of biological males and females are coming to realize that their internal appreciation of their gender identity is not what they have been dealt biologically. In this presentation, we will briefly examine some of the factors and barriers associated with gender transition, especially in the criminal justice system. Likewise, we will discuss the early impact of gender confusion or difficulties in gender acceptance on behavior including criminal sexual

behavior. Though internationally, transgender transition has become more discussed, recognized, and accepted in the mainstream, prejudice, prohibition, and discrimination continue both in the community as well as in institutions, with the latter being organized around the concept of a male and female dichotomy. A niche where little has been discussed in the literature are male sexual offenders transitioning to transgender women, post offense. In this presentation, we will examine the current literature and the available science and discuss the impacts on the transitioning person's life while incarcerated, in treatment, in civil commitment, and their return to the community. Two case studies of transitioning individuals who were originally categorized as SVPs (Sexually Violent Predators) will be highlighted. Their paths through offending, incarceration, treatment and their individual processes of recognizing, accepting, and ultimately beginning the process of transitioning while in civil commitment and incarceration will be discussed. Further, we will follow them into the community post release from civil commitment.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Analyze and describe the current scientific literature regarding male sex offenders transitioning.
2. List barriers and facilitative factors with individual in transition in this unique group.
3. Analyze case studies to develop a deeper understanding of the underlying psychological issues, implications to their offense histories, and impacts of community response.

Dr. Haworth is a licensed psychologist in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. He has provided behavioral health and addiction services for the past 30 years. He earned a Ph.D. from Bryn Mawr College in Clinical Developmental Psychology in 2000 and was licensed in Pennsylvania in 2002. Dr. Haworth is the past Executive Director of The Joseph J. Peters Institute (JJPI), a nationally recognized center for the evaluation, treatment, and prevention of sexual violence. He spent 15 years at JJPI providing evaluation and treatment of sexual offenders and survivors of sexual abuse and other traumas, both adult and juvenile. Dr. Haworth was a member of the Pennsylvania Sexual Offender's Assessment Board in 2002 – 2016, where he was the prosecution's expert in SVP cases in multiple counties in Pennsylvania. Dr. Haworth left JJPI and the Sex Offender Board in 2016 to pursue a fuller private practice. He is a faculty member at Rutgers University in the Department Psychology, where he has taught for the past 20 years. He also served on the faculty of University of Pennsylvania Graduate School, and Medical College of Pennsylvania. Dr. Haworth presents training at annual conferences and other venues. In private practice, he is a consultant and expert witness for defense attorneys, courts, and prosecutors. He provides consultation to individuals, organizations, other mental health professionals, attorneys, and courts. He provides forensic evaluation, consultation, and serves as an expert witness. He has been qualified in clinical and forensic psychology and issues related to sexual violence in courts across Pennsylvania and in the U.S. Federal Court since 2003. He consults on a variety of matters including questions related to: sexual offense and victimization, competency, insanity, aggression, trauma, homicide, juvenile lifers, embezzlement, psychodiagnostics, Internet offenses, substance abuse, affective disorders, autism spectrum disorder, and other clinical and forensic areas. He works with adults and juveniles.

3:30-3:45 PM **Break**

3:45-4:45 PM (1 CE credit)

Forensic Assessment of Sexual Recidivism: Research Update and Practical Implications
Brian R Abbott, Ph.D.

Evolving research continues to shape forensic assessment of sexual recidivism risk. The presentation will discuss the strengths and limitations of two risk assessment approaches, including unstructured adjusted actuarial risk appraisal and structured adjusted actuarial risk assessment methods. Research on the accuracy and reliability of individual static and dynamic risk tools and the combination of static and dynamic risk tools will be reviewed along with their implications in forensic practice for such tasks as determining the likelihood of sexual reoffense, risk management, and sexual offender treatment planning.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Identify three strengths of the structured adjusted actuarial risk assessment approach in forensic evaluations.
2. Explain two reasons why the unstructured adjusted actuarial risk assessment method is not suited for forensic practice.
3. Describe how the legal issues addressed in the forensic risk assessment determines the appropriate sexual recidivism risk methodology.

Brian R. Abbott, Ph.D. holds a doctorate in psychology and a master's degree in social work. He is licensed by the states of California and Washington as a clinical psychologist and as a clinical social worker in California, as well as a licensed sexual offender evaluator in Illinois. Dr. Abbott is in independent practice based in San Jose, California and he has worked forensically in nine states and the Federal Eastern District of North Carolina. Over his 44-year career, Dr. Abbott has performed more than 2,400 forensic evaluations for criminal, civil, dependency, delinquency, and family courts in a wide variety of areas. For the past 20 years, Dr. Abbott has conducted sexually violent predator ("SVP") evaluations and he has provided consultation and training to forensic practitioners and attorneys. Dr. Abbott has been sought out to testify as an expert in Daubert and Frye admissibility hearings in multiple states related to diagnosis and risk assessment issues with sexually violent predators. He has conducted research and published peer reviewed journal articles related to risk assessment of sexually violent predators.

ROOM 2: 1:30-4:45 PM Prisoner Mental Health and Psychology of Crime – Regency Room

1:30-2:30 PM (1 CE credit)

The Impact of Solitary Confinement on Prisoner Mental Health

Rebecca Smith-Casey J.D., Psy.D., Hilary Good, B.A., Stephanie Thierer, B.S., and Erica Jennett, M.A.

Solitary confinement is a practice whereby individuals who are incarcerated are locked alone in a cell for 22 hours or more per day, with limited access to human contact and communication. Research on the health consequences of solitary confinement initially focused on the physical repercussions of sensory deprivation, however, in recent years research has focused on the psychological impacts of solitary confinement. Solitary confinement is associated with increased mental health symptoms, including anxiety, depression, paranoia, aggression, insomnia, anger, obsessive thoughts, cognitive disturbances, psychosis, and post-traumatic distress (Hagan et al., 2018; Lovell, 2008; Luigi et al., 2020; Reiter et al., 2020). Research has shown that prisoners who spent time in solitary confinement during their incarceration were three times more likely to display symptoms of PTSD as compared to those prisoners who had not spent time in solitary confinement (Hagan et al., 2018). In addition, research consistently demonstrates that among prisoners held in

solitary confinement there are increases in self-harm, suicide attempts, and suicidal ideation (Dye, 2010; Kaba et al., 2014; Kupers, 2008). For individuals with a prior history of mental health concerns, solitary confinement can exacerbate existing symptoms, with impacts that linger even following release from incarceration. Research has further noted that solitary confinement is disproportionately used among incarcerated people of color, suggesting that the short- and long-term consequences of this practice are more likely to impact these populations (Strong et al., 2020). Implications for the consequences of solitary confinement transcend prisoner containment issues, with wide ranging physical health and mental health consequences, which can be pertinent in the process of appeals, human rights considerations, and in the context of forensic evaluations in the event of re-offending behaviors.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Identify various mental health symptoms associated with solitary confinement.
2. Assess the long-term implications of solitary confinement and implement strategies related to evaluation and assessment.
3. Explain the disproportionate impact of solitary confinement practices on people of color, along with associated mental health impacts.

Rebecca Smith-Casey, J.D., Psy.D. is a licensed clinical psychologist in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, a certified school psychologist, and a current professor in the Master's in forensic psychology program at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. She is the author of the New Jersey Competency Assessment Tool (NJ-CAT). She has research interests in topics related to the impact of trauma across the lifetime, competency to stand trial, and the insanity defense. Rebecca is the principal psychologist at River Valley Psycholegal Consulting, where her work focuses on assessment in civil and criminal forensic matters, trauma, law enforcement evaluations, educational testing, diagnostic clarity, and providing gender affirming care.

Hilary Good obtained her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Ithaca College in 2011. She has worked in the field of psychiatric rehabilitation since 2014 and obtained her Certified Psychiatric Rehabilitation Practitioner certificate in 2017. Hilary is currently in a Master's program for Forensic Psychology at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology and is in her internship year. She is a member of the Psi Chi Honors Society as well as the Society for Collegiate Leadership and Achievement. She is also a student member of the American Counseling Association, American Psychological Association, American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, and the National Council.

Stephanie Thierer completed a B.S. in Psychology with a minor in Neuroscience and a concentration in Behavior Analysis of Developmental Disabilities from Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa. She is presently in her final year of the Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology, Professional Counselor Licensure program at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. Stephanie is currently a mental health therapist intern at Eyerly Ball Community Mental Services in Des Moines where she provides individual and group counseling from a Trauma-Informed approach, as well as assists with diagnostic assessments and evaluations to clients in the Assertive Community Treatment program. Stephanie is an active member of the Psi Chi Honor Society and a student member of the American Psychology-Law Society. She is on track to complete her graduate studies with honors in July of 2024, at which time she intends to work in a correctional setting providing assessments, evaluations, and treatment to offenders and applying for a doctorate program to obtain her Psy.D.

Erica Jennett is based in Gallatin, TN as a Criminal Justice Liaison serving Sumner, Cheatham, and Robertson counties where she conducts comprehensive biopsychosocial assessments for incarcerated individuals, crafts release plans, and offers treatment recommendations to courts. Erica completed dual bachelor's degrees in criminal justice & political science and psychology from Austin Peay State University in 2017, followed by a master's degree in forensic psychology from The Chicago School of Professional Psychology in March 2021. Currently, she is engaged in an internship at Mental Health Cooperative where she contributes to individual and group therapy and provides support at emergency psychiatric services.

2:30-3:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Capturing Serial Killers: Is it Science, Profiling, the Public, or Their Own Delusional Thinking?

John H. White, Ph.D.

There is no doubt that serial and mass murderers think and act differently than the majority of society. Although serial and mass murders comprise a small number of homicides, the impact these events have on a community can be devastating. Recall the panic in New York City during the "Son of Sam" killings, or Wichita, Kansas as "BTK" taunted police with various communications to demonstrate his feelings of superiority. Baton Rouge, Louisiana once had two serial killers working in their jurisdiction at the same time, while that scenario has also plagued the Los Angeles area on more than one occasion. Mass murderers are usually caught quickly, either at the crime scene or shortly thereafter. Serial murderers are more elusive. The public demands swift action on the part of the police to catch serial murderers who may methodically move freely throughout a community, striking at any moment. Various television shows depict the capture of serial killers using new science protocols (e.g., *Forensic Files*) while others fictionalize criminal profiling techniques (*Criminal Minds*, *Silence of the Lambs*). Are these new advances really working? Although some serial killers have gone decades without being caught, are the total number of years and victims per serial killer now declining? The presenter has analyzed 448 serial murderers to determine how the police were able to track them down. Not only were law enforcement techniques analyzed, but the presenter also studied the killers' own bizarre and non-bizarre delusional thinking relative to their identification as serial killers. Could those delusions have been identified and addressed in counseling prior to the murders? The presenter will explore the neuroscience of delusions and how these delusions may influence the concept of free will, private logic, and insanity.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Differentiate a serial killer from a mass murderer by listing the characteristics of each.
2. List the top five ways a serial killer comes to the attention of law enforcement.
3. Describe both bizarre and non-bizarre delusions experienced by serial killers.

John H. White, Ph.D., is a former Dallas, Texas police sergeant where he was assigned to patrol, Internal Affairs, Psychological Services Office, and the Fugitive and Special Investigations Section. He is currently a professor of psychology at Stockton University in New Jersey and he has a private practice treating sex offenders. He also consults on cold case homicides with the VIDOCQ Society in Philadelphia.

3:30-3:45 PM **Break**

3:45-4:45 PM (1 CE credit)

No One Is Coming For You.... A Conceptualization of Crime and its Causes

William K. Marek, Ph.D.

This workshop will present fact- and analogy-based disputes of the common nature/nurture reasons/excuses/justifications/mitigations/rationalizations offered by well-meaning, but incorrect, observers for why criminals do their "crime-ing." Commonly stated "reasons for crime" include poverty (the absolute most popular, least sensical, most easily disputed "reason"), child abuse, racism, lack of education, school to prison pipeline, low self-esteem, a malformed superego, bad childhood, bad parenting, bad peers, and many other hoary nature/nurture offerings. The presenter will describe a personal responsibility framework for an accurate conceptualization of crime and its cause (criminals). Because there are no necessary and sufficient conditions for the acquisition and perpetuation of any disorder, our clients should learn that they are fully responsible for all aspects of their lives. As psychologists, we should recognize that accurate cognitions are the *raison d'etre* of a psychologist. No one is coming for you.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. List inaccurate beliefs about what causes crime.
2. Explain why formulating beliefs, theoretical perspectives, case formulations and policy based on exceptions, rather than the rule, is inadvisable.
3. Describe why motivated reasoning might be responsible for errors in clinical judgment, case conceptualization and treatment formulation.

William K. Marek, Ph.D., retired from the Federal Bureau of Prisons as a psychologist. Dr. Marek has a private practice as an online psychologist and provides geriatric counseling. He is an adjunct instructor at California State University - East Bay and Napa Valley College.

5:30-6:30 PM **Student Poster Session** - Ambassador Room (not eligible for CE credits)

5:30-7:00 PM **Welcome Reception** - Riviera Room and Terrace (not eligible for CE credits)

Friday, March 15

7:15-8:00 **Registration Sign-in** – outside of Versailles Ballroom

7:15-8:00 **Continental Breakfast** – outside of Versailles Ballroom

8:00 AM - 12:15 PM **Competency Assessment and Ethics in Forensic Psychology** – Versailles Ballroom

8:00-9:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Emerging Issues in Competency and Restoration

Michael Ditsky, Ph.D.

Competency to stand trial evaluations and restoration to competency programs are currently a system in crisis due to a number of factors. The civil liberties of defendants have stalled especially with those defendants suffering from major mental illnesses and intellectual disabilities. There has been a substantial increase in demands for pre-trial court-ordered competency evaluations. There is a wide variability in where defendants go to get restored, for how long they might remain in the

programs, and how savvy are local courts in referring them to appropriate facilities. To address this crisis, several proposals have been adopted but again these solutions vary from state to state. This presentation examines three emerging issues: 1) the bias and unreliability associated with competency to stand trial evaluations, 2) issues surrounding the variability of restoration programs, and 3) the use of telepsychology and the ethical issues involved with conducting evaluations by videoconferencing.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the ethical, legal, and procedural issues including evaluator bias and unreliability of results surrounding competency to stand trial evaluations.
2. Assess the complications and problems regarding the restoration of defendants to competency.
3. Evaluate the use of video conferencing in conducting competency to stand trial evaluations.

Michael Ditsky, Ph.D., is in private practice in Sugarland, Texas, and is a Fellow of the American College of Forensic Psychology. He has conducted hundreds of pretrial competency evaluations and has evaluated defendants who have allegedly been restored to competency.

9:00-10:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Competence Assessment--Collaborating with A Lawyer Expert

John Philipsborn, J.D., M.Ed., M.A.S.

Competence to stand trial assessments remain the most frequently conducted criminal case related mental health assessments. Notwithstanding the development of the 'second generation' assessment tools including the MacCAT-CA, and the ECST-R, and the training available on the subject-matter, there remain cases in which a mental health expert is unlikely to produce a fully defensible competence opinion--and in these cases, consultation with a lawyer expert is a useful option.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the case law and literature that describes the role of lawyer experts in competence assessments.
2. Explain the factors that will weigh in favor of consultation with a lawyer expert prior to the completion of a report or prior to testifying.
3. Identify the subject matters that can be addressed in consultation with a lawyer expert, and what subject matters are reserved for the psychologist or psychiatrist.

John Philipsborn, J.D., M.Ed., M.A.S., has been a criminal defense lawyer for 45 years, during which he has defended cases around the United States, including many that have involved mental health issues. As pertinent here, John has litigated competence issues in State and Federal courts, and has also qualified as a lawyer expert on competence to stand trial issues in both courts.

10:00-10:15 AM **Coffee Break**

10:15 AM - 12:15 PM (2 CE credits)

Forensic Skills Workshop: Addressing Ethical and Practice Issues in Forensic Psychology

Mark Ackerman, Ph.D. (Moderator), Mark Burdick, Ph.D., April Harris-Britt, Ph.D., John Philipsborn, J.D., M.Ed., M.A.S.

This forensic skills forum focuses on issues in civil and criminal law that interface with psychology and expert testimony by psychologists. This is an interactive session involving moderator, panelists, and audience on advanced ethical and practice issues confronting the forensic psychologist. Vignettes submitted to the panel by practicing forensic psychologists are read aloud and discussed. The vignettes describe problems and experiences that forensic psychologists often confront in their practices and in court. Attendees are exposed to a wide variety of forensic cases and problems in civil and criminal areas.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe how to approach ethical and professional issues in practice and in court.
2. Explain how to address ethical dilemmas that arise in difficult cases.
3. Analyze forensic case dilemmas from an ethical perspective.

Mark D. Ackerman, Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist in Georgia and Florida. His practice emphasizes forensic assessment and psychological testing and treatment. Dr. Ackerman holds adjunct faculty status with the Department of Veterans Affairs - Atlanta and Emory University School of Medicine.

Mark A. Burdick, Ph.D., AFBsS is an international expert in education and psychological matters before courts in the U.S., E.U., and U.K. He provides consult and litigation support in both private and public court matters. He is past Chair of California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

April Harris-Britt, Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist who conducts forensic evaluations and provides expert forensic services. Areas of expertise include trauma, ADHD & autism spectrum disorders, risk and resilience across the lifespan, and multicultural issues. Dr. Harris-Britt is on faculty at Fielding Graduate University where she serves as the Lead Faculty for the Forensic Concentration. She is currently a member of the APA Board of Professional Affairs, the AFCC Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, and previously the AFCC Task Force which revised the 2022 Guidelines for Parenting Plan Evaluations. She is currently President for the North Carolina Chapter of AFCC.

John Philipsborn, J.D., M.Ed., M.A.S., has been a criminal defense lawyer for 45 years, during which he has defended cases around the United States, including many that have involved mental health issues. As pertinent here, John has litigated competence issues in State and Federal courts, and has also qualified as a lawyer expert on competence to stand trial issues in both courts.

12:15-1:30 PM **Lunch Break** (on your own)

1:30-4:45 PM **Forensic Assessment** – Versailles Ballroom

1:30-2:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Police Evaluations: Impression Management Considerations in Pre-Employment and Fitness for Duty Evaluations for Law Enforcement

Rebecca Smith-Casey J.D., Psy.D.

Recent statistics show that there are 15,328 law enforcement agencies in the United States, and these agencies employ an estimated 701,000 full-time, sworn officers (U.S. Department of Justice, 2018). Psychological evaluations for police typically focus on determining the suitability of an officer to return to work or a candidate to begin work as a law enforcement officer, with suitability typically defined as demonstrating the requisite psychological traits and characteristics to be a police officer (Corey & Zelig, 2020), however, there is some variability in what evaluators may consider suitable in various contexts. In recent years, increasing scrutiny of police officers and police candidates has come to the forefront of consideration for psychologists engaged in police assessment work, particularly in light of the #BLM movement and excessive force cases described in the media. When police officers' ability to fulfill requirements of the job is in jeopardy due to a mental illness or behavioral concerns, a psychological fitness for duty evaluation is performed. The underlying purpose of these evaluations is to determine if the officer poses a risk to the community. Typical reasons for referral may be job concerns, citizen complaints, discharge of weapon, return to duty following mental health or substance abuse treatment, allegations of domestic violence, use of force, aggression, and re-evaluation following a probationary period. Available research has shown that many fitness referrals are for domestic violence (Coopersmith, 2009; Scharf, 2014), although in recent years evaluations related to police violence have come to the forefront of public attention. It notable that impression management has long been recognized as an expected aspect of preemployment evaluations (Moon et al., 2023), and specifically well documented among police candidate evaluations (Wilhelmy et al., 2021). This effort towards impression management may become more pronounced in fitness for duty evaluations, as examinees are aware of increased potential consequences of the evaluation related to job security. As such, evaluators need to be aware of the context of impression management in law enforcement examinees, with specific assessment tools creating standardization samples for law enforcement populations.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Explain the purpose and components of a fitness for duty evaluation for law enforcement officers.
2. Describe impression management and its implications for police employment evaluations.
3. Evaluate various assessment tools that would be useful in conducting a fitness for duty evaluation for law enforcement officers, especially considering research on impression management.

Rebecca Smith-Casey, J.D., Psy.D. is a licensed clinical psychologist in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, a certified school psychologist, and a current professor in the Master's in forensic psychology program at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. She is the author of the New Jersey Competency Assessment Tool (NJ-CAT). She has research interests in topics related to the impact of trauma across the lifetime, competency to stand trial, and the insanity defense. Rebecca is the principal psychologist at River Valley Psycholegal Consulting, where her work focuses on assessment in civil and criminal forensic matters, trauma, law enforcement evaluations, educational testing, diagnostic clarity, and providing gender affirming care.

2:30-4:45 PM (2 CE credits) – break from 3:30-3:45 PM

The End of Suicide Risk Assessment? A Research Update

Joseph Obegi, Psy.D.

Suicide risk assessment is a universally accepted practice among mental health clinicians, but is it an evidence-based practice? Using meta-analyses and systematic reviews published over the past ten years, this presentation examines the evidence for existing beliefs about suicide risk assessment, beliefs such as: certain risk factors are associated with suicides, combinations of risk factors can predict suicide, and clinicians can identify high-risk individuals. Via a live survey, participants will be invited to share their opinions about the evidence. Finally, the presentation will review alternatives to suicide risk assessment discussed in the literature.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the role of meta-analysis and systematic reviews as the basis for evidence-based practice.
2. Explain the implications of recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews for suicide risk assessment.
3. Identify three alternatives to traditional suicide risk assessment.

Joseph Obegi, Psy.D., completed his education at the California School of Professional Psychology and his postdoctoral training in the Department of Psychiatry at UC San Diego. Dr. Obegi is a Senior Psychologist with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation where he supports suicide prevention efforts in the Northern Region. In the community, he provides training and consultation in topics related to suicide and has part-time practice working with adults. He writes about clinical suicidology and is the co-editor of Attachment Theory and Research in Clinical Work with Adults.

3:30-3:45 PM **Break**

5:00 PM **Advisory Board Meeting** – Fleur de Lis (for Advisory Board members only – no CE credits)

Saturday, March 16

7:15-8:00 **Registration Sign-in** – outside of Versailles Ballroom

7:15-8:00 **Continental Breakfast** – outside of Versailles Ballroom

8:00 AM - 12:15 PM **Mental Health Courts and Culture & Diversity in Forensic Psychology** – Versailles Ballroom

8:00-9:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Lock up or Treat Out? How Mental Health Diversion can be used in Protecting California communities by use of an Effective Evaluator Model

Mark Burdick, Ph.D.

Overly impacted California courts deal daily with offender motivation and applying ethical standards to the law. Courts balance the use of incarceration of offenders to protect local citizens

and property, against offering treatment within community to offenders with mental health diagnoses that impair their decision-making ability. An example might be one of an otherwise law-abiding individual who is diagnosed with schizophrenia who engaged in a criminal act of homicide when "the voices told me to." Now the court must decide what is most useful: Lock up or Treat Out. This presentation explains mental health diversion legislation and parameters and provides a model for performing effective mental health evaluations for the court.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the history of mental health diversion legislation and likely future legislation.
2. Explain mental health diversion parameters, and the reasonable use (and misuse) of diversion treatment.
3. Outline an effective evaluator model to help determine for the court if a mental health disorder plays a significant role in the act of the crime.

Mark A. Burdick, Ph.D., AFBsS, is an international expert in education and psychological matters before courts in the U.S., E.U., and U.K. He provides consult and litigation support in both private and public court matters. He is past Chair of California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

9:00-10:00 AM (1 CE credit)

Considerations Related to Mental Health Courts in Rural Communities

Rebecca Smith-Casey, J.D., Psy.D., Erica Jennett, M.A., and Hilary Good, B.A.

Mental health courts presently exist in nearly every state in the United States, with more than 450 mental health courts servicing adults and an increasing number of juvenile related programs emerging in recent years. Mental health courts are traditionally defined as court programs specifically designed to work with defendants who have been diagnosed with a mental illness, with a focus on providing appropriate treatment rather than incarceration. Research has demonstrated that participation in mental health courts reduces recidivism rates when compared to traditional criminal processing, with reduction in jail time, reduction in charges, and positive impacts post-program completion (Lowder et al., 2018). While agencies exist to provide oversight and guidance on best practices in these courts, there is no universal model that exists for these courts, meaning there are wide variations by state and within states by county on how programs are administered. This is especially true when programs in rural areas are examined related to opportunities for program engagement and access to services. Approximately 20% of the US population lives in rural areas, with around 6.5 million individuals in these regions experiencing a mental illness (Morales et al., 2020). Yet residents in rural communities in the U.S. have been consistently shown to experience significant disparities in access to mental health services and in mental health outcomes, despite the fact that the prevalence rates of various mental health conditions are similar to those of individuals residing in urban areas. There are several factors that are consistently identified as impacting access to mental health services in rural areas, including low population density, remoteness, isolation, poverty, religion, social support, stigma, and lack of trained and certified providers. Research has demonstrated, for example, that stigma related to various mental health conditions, including substance abuse, may impact those in rural communities at higher rates, due in part to decreased anonymity for services, limited access to resources, and resistance to information (Ezell et al., 2021). In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted disparities in access to care that exist in county health systems, which led to significant gaps between populations in the ability to engage in adequate mental health services, particularly among vulnerable populations, including those in rural communities (Ojha & Syed, 2020). Additionally, in rural communities traditional counseling session delivery format and standard practices may need to be altered to meet the needs of individuals in rural, impoverished

communities (Crumb et al., 2019). As such, in considering recommendations for mental health court participation, factors related to access to care in rural communities may yield barriers to program participation.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe mental health courts and the typical services offered in these programs.
2. Discuss the limitations of mental health courts in rural communities and the impact these limitations may have on participant outcomes.
3. Identify and plan for differing needs of those in rural communities who are recommended for placement in mental health courts.

Rebecca Smith-Casey, J.D., Psy.D. is a licensed clinical psychologist in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, a certified school psychologist, and a current professor in the Master's in forensic psychology program at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. She is the author of the New Jersey Competency Assessment Tool (NJ-CAT). She has research interests in topics related to the impact of trauma across the lifetime, competency to stand trial, and the insanity defense. Rebecca is the principal psychologist at River Valley Psycholegal Consulting, where her work focuses on assessment in civil and criminal forensic matters, trauma, law enforcement evaluations, educational testing, diagnostic clarity, and providing gender affirming care.

Erica Jennett is based in Gallatin, TN as a Criminal Justice Liaison serving Sumner, Cheatham, and Robertson counties where she conducts comprehensive biopsychosocial assessments for incarcerated individuals, crafts release plans, and offers treatment recommendations to courts. Erica completed dual bachelor's degrees in criminal justice & political science and psychology from Austin Peay State University in 2017, followed by a master's degree in forensic psychology from The Chicago School of Professional Psychology in March 2021. Currently, she is engaged in an internship at Mental Health Cooperative where she contributes to individual and group therapy and provides support at emergency psychiatric services.

Hilary Good obtained her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Ithaca College in 2011. She has worked in the field of psychiatric rehabilitation since 2014 and obtained her Certified Psychiatric Rehabilitation Practitioner certificate in 2017. Hilary is currently in a Master's program for Forensic Psychology at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology and is in her internship year. She is a member of the Psi Chi Honors Society as well as the Society for Collegiate Leadership and Achievement. She is also a student member of the American Counseling Association, American Psychological Association, American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, and the National Council.

10:00-10:15 AM Coffee Break

10:15-11:15 AM (1 CE credit)

Adjusting Our Lens: Exploring Cultural Biases in Family Court

April Harris-Britt, Ph.D.

Our society has become increasingly aware of the broad diversity within and across families. Factors related to race, ethnicity, gender identification, sexual orientation, ability differences, age, religious beliefs, and nationality, along with other facets of identity are present in every case, whether immediately visible or not. Aspects of these cultures may be the subject of legal, mental

health, and dispute resolution processes, and in the multitude of interactions among professionals and family members. This workshop will explore the necessity and challenges of providing culturally informed services for court-involved families. We will focus on understanding the myriad of ways that cultural variables can present in our work, including but not limited to recognizing and avoiding biases, developing a cultural biography of the family system, and maximizing the cultural safety of our work within family law to provide high-quality services to all families.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe how culture, broadly, can impact parenting practices, values, and family dynamics from a systems perspective.
2. Apply the concepts of cultural safety, cultural humility, and cultural responsiveness to working with families in the family court realm.
3. Identify one's biases and ways in which those biases may impact decision-making and service provision in family law matters.

April Harris-Britt, Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist who conducts forensic evaluations and provides expert forensic services. Areas of expertise include trauma, ADHD & autism spectrum disorders, risk and resilience across the lifespan, and multicultural issues. Dr. Harris-Britt is on faculty at Fielding Graduate University where she serves as the Lead Faculty for the Forensic Concentration. She is currently a member of the APA Board of Professional Affairs, the AFCC Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, and previously the AFCC Task Force which revised the 2022 Guidelines for Parenting Plan Evaluations. She is currently President for the North Carolina Chapter of AFCC.

11:15 AM - 12:15 PM (1 CE credit)

A Primer on Differentiating Religious and Psychological Experience

Robert W. Evans, Ph.D., Ph.D.

Religious convictions and spiritual experiences are often attended by profound shifts in one's sense of identity, meaning, values, priorities, views, and behavior. With the establishment and rise of psychodynamic theories over the past century, and subsequent and rapidly-expanding behavioral neurocognitive and neuroethical interpretations of religious experiences, an increasing number of psychologists and neurocognitive researchers are, unconsciously or otherwise, embracing reductive materialism and regarding religious convictions and spiritual experiences as evidence of psychopathology or as an emergent property of brain states. Among the consequences of those shifts, are the reluctance of some patients to report to mental health professionals religious views or spiritual experiences that they fear might be interpreted as psychologically aberrant, and the challenge to mental health professionals to distinguish between "normative" spiritual experiences and psychopathology. The purpose of this workshop is to offer a brief primer that will sample a commonly-encountered array of religious denominations and attendant spiritual beliefs and experiences with a view to constructing a clinical framework to evaluate the same for purposes of distinguishing between "normative" religious experience and psychopathology.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe various religious and spiritual experiences and their attendant beliefs and behaviors that may appear "abnormal" to the clinician.
2. Construct a clinical framework for evaluating self-reported experiences that may otherwise be construed as evidence of psychopathology.

3. Demonstrate a more sensitive, informed, and ethical understanding and approach toward the religiously-confirmed patient that might facilitate more open disclosure and awareness of integrative issues and concerns.

Robert W. Evans holds a Ph.D. in clinical psychology and a Ph.D. in systematic theology and is a Fellow of the American College of Forensic Psychology. Dr. Evans has been a licensed psychologist for over 30 years and is an ordained minister who has experience in teaching, research, testifying, and writing on issues that lie at the intersection of psychology, theology, law, and ethics.

12:15-1:30 PM **Lunch Break** (on your own)

1:30-4:45 PM **Culture & Diversity in Forensic Psychology and Forensic Assessment** – Versailles Ballroom

1:30-2:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Best Practices for Mitigating Racial Bias in Forensic Diagnosis and Report Writing

Lisa Faille, Ph.D., MPH, ABPP

Racial bias is an impediment in the accuracy and objectivity of the diagnostic and assessment processes within forensic psychology, which often leads to people from minoritized groups being either incorrectly pathologized or inaccurately described. This bias insidiously intrudes upon forensic judgment in assessment and report writing in both overt and subtle ways, which can adversely impact assessment outcomes as well as treatment. Implicit bias functions unconsciously (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006). Thus, mitigating bias involves an increased awareness of it in order to engage in more effortful cognitive processing regarding race in psychological diagnosis and assessment with a forensically involved population. For example, Schwartz et al. (2019) found that African Americans are more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia while European Americans with the same symptoms are more likely to be diagnosed with a mood disorder. Indeed, racial bias is pervasive throughout mental health diagnosis and assessment (Garb, 2021; Londono-Tobon et al., 2021). Racial bias also occurs specifically in forensic psychological assessment (Neal et al., 2022; Perry et al., 2013), which can particularly affect risk assessment (Eckhouse et al., 2019). Further, forensic mental health professionals may underestimate both the presence and influence of their own biases on their decisions (Maclean et al., 2019). The purpose of this presentation is to highlight common patterns of racial bias in forensic diagnosis and report writing and to provide useful skills for avoiding such bias. I will present strategies for increasing awareness of racially biased language and racially biased forensic judgment in diagnosis and assessment and offer unbiased verbiage. Examples of racial bias in assessment and diagnosis will be juxtaposed with inclusive phrasing as well as a race neutral framework to increase accuracy and objectivity in diagnosis and assessment.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe the insidious nature of racial bias in forensic assessment and report writing.
2. Explain some of the myriad of ways that racial bias can impede objectivity in forensic assessment and report writing.
3. Demonstrate specific strategies on how to mitigate racial bias in forensic assessment and report writing.

Lisa Faille, Ph.D., MPH, ABPP is a board certified licensed clinical psychologist who specializes in forensic psychology. She holds a bachelor's degree in psychology, master's degree in counseling psychology, doctorate in clinical psychology, and master's in public health. In her clinical work in forensic settings, she has conducted therapy and assessments on violent and sexual offenders. Dr. Faille's professional presentations focus on the awareness and reduction of both gender and racial bias in research, report writing, clinical, and educational contexts. She teaches online graduate level psychology courses at Fielding Graduate University to support talented students in their journeys to become professional helpers. She currently enjoys living in Rhode Island with her husband and two children.

2:30-3:30 PM (1 CE credit)

Forensic Psychological Accountability Perspective on the Decertification of Police Officers and Law Enforcement Agencies: An Anti-Diversity Paradigm

Ronn Johnson, Ph.D., ABPP

Forensically, through federal, state, and local municipalities, sworn weapons-carrying officers are legally authorized to execute powers. Their powers include executing lethal force whenever scene management circumstances warrant such actions based on applicable department policies, laws, or statutes. Therefore, the certification standards for selecting and retaining a peace officer are significantly higher than other civilian pursuits. However, across two centuries, federal investigative reports (e.g., Christopher Commission, Ferguson, and Minneapolis police findings after George Floyd's killing, etc.) revealed a troubling pattern of practice reinforcing a much delayed need to reexamine the decertification criteria. Independent decertification reviews must occur at the level of law enforcement agencies, individuals functioning as peace officers, and anyone seeking police positions. This presentation uses International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) ethical codes and empirically based studies to outline a forensic psychological accountability paradigm for decertification in law enforcement.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Describe some of the current research on motivating factors related to police decertification initiatives.
2. Explain procedural and legitimacy policing issues with respect to diverse communities.
3. Identify a paradigm based on IACP ethical codes and empirical studies that could be applied to buttress independent decertification efforts at the level of agencies as well as individuals seeking or functioning in sworn peace officer positions.

*Ronn Johnson, Ph.D., ABPP, is a tenured professor at Creighton University Medical School where he is the Senior Associate Dean for Diversity, Inclusion & Belonging and is Director of Team Based Care at Creighton University Medical Center. Dr. Johnson has worked with over 50 police agencies and conducted thousands of psychological evaluations for a variety of peace officer positions. He has substantial peer-reviewed scholarly works in law enforcement. His latest book, *First-Line Approaches with Active Duty Service Members and Veterans*, has just been published by Routledge. He is a member of the Nebraska Risk Assessment Cadre and faculty member of the Critical Incident Training for Nebraska and Iowa peace officers.*

3:30-3:45 PM **Break**

3:45-4:45 PM (1 CE credit)

Four Short Symptom Validity Tests You (Probably) Haven't Heard Of (But Should)

James W. Schutte, Ph.D., and Christopher W. Schutte, A.B.

In some forensic settings, time and reimbursement pressures may place limits on the number of tests used to complete an evaluation. As assessment of response bias is critical in any high-stakes assessment, forensic psychologists would be wise to be familiar with a variety of test instruments which can be used in a psychometrically sound manner, without adding excessive time and/or cost burdens. It is also worth being familiar with more recently developed tests, with less possible exposure in the public domain, and probably at lesser risk for coaching. The Inventory of Problems (IOP-29 and IOP-M), Test of Memory Malingering-TOMMe10, Word Choice Test-10, and the Morel Emotional Numbing Test for PTSD (MENT) represent psychometrically sound and fairly recent measures which can offer solid evidence with respect to symptom presentation validity. Attendees will become familiar with the need for brief and recent response validity measures, be able to discuss the psychometric advantages and disadvantages of these and learn of four instruments which can be useful in forensic practice. A discussion will also be made of the distinction between frequently confused terms such as dissimulation and malingering, and the need for accurate presentation of what symptom validity testing can and cannot say about a forensic examinee.

At the end of this workshop, the learner will be able to:

1. Explain the need for symptom validity testing in forensic settings.
2. Discuss the need for brief and recent symptom validity measures.
3. Describe four symptom validity measures which are brief and recently developed.

James W. Schutte, Ph.D., is a bilingual psychologist in private practice in El Paso, Texas. His practice primarily involves psychological evaluations in Social Security disability and Child Protective Services matters, as well as civil and criminal litigation.

Christopher W. Schutte, A.B. is a counseling psychology doctoral student at Fordham University. He earned a bachelor's degree with honors from Brown University and completed a postgraduate assistantship in computational psychiatry at Yale University.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

PO BOX 1774

ESCONDIDO, CALIFORNIA 92033

www.forensicpsychology.org

Contact: +1- 805-613-7090 | ACFP@forensicpsychology.org