may be useful in determining if tests are administered properly. We received 867 responses but 50 had to be eliminated when we noted that 51 envelopes appeared to come from the same individual. Specifically, this subsample had identical envelopes, stamps, postmark locations, mailing labels, and other important similarities, and all responses in this group advocated against the use of observers. Eighty-six percent of postmarks from this conspicuous group were on the same day and all were postmarked across three specific dates. The final sample included 817 respondents. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated it is acceptable to have either a neuropsychologist or trained technician observe examinations while 30% were opposed. Sixty-three percent of respondents indicated that it is acceptable to have the examination videotaped, whereas 37% were opposed. Results of this 1999 survey suggest that approximately two thirds of this rather large sample of U.S. NAN members find the use of observers and video recordings of examinations to be acceptable practice. Our incidental finding of what appeared to be an individual sending duplicate responses had the potential of swaying results approximately 4% points in each direction. Future survey research in this area should thus utilize methods to control for such attempts.

Reynolds, C. R., Hays, J. R., & Ryan-Arredondo, K.
When Judges, Laws, Ethics, and Rules of Practice Collide: A Case Study of Court Restriction of Assent and Disclosure in Assessment of a Minor.
In a recent lawsuit, liability of a defendant was principally dependent upon the correct diagnosis of a minor child. The parents had brought a suit for damages they incurred due to the failure of an agency to release information related to the diagnosis of psychopathology of the child. The child was not a party to the suit. Since a correct, accurate diagnosis of the child’s cognitive and behavioral status was the major issue in determining both liability and damages, the defense requested and the court ordered (over objections of the parents) a neuropsychological examination by defendant’s expert. However, the minor teenager did not know of the lawsuit. The court ordered, on motion of the parents, that the minor not be informed of the purpose of the exam or of the judge’s order that the mother be allowed to observe the exam through one-way glass and videotape the exam. In making his rulings, the judge issued a finding of fact that it was not in the best interest of this minor teenager to be informed of those matters. An examination by a psychologist under these conditions may violate multiple ethical principles of the APA and other psychological organizations. The Rules of Practice of many state licensing boards also appear to conflict with the court’s orders. Members of state licensing boards, psychologists with many years of experience in forensic psychology and who conduct training workshops in the field, as well as psychologists with a law degree, were consulted. All gave different advice on how to or even whether the neuropsychologist should proceed with the examination. This paper presents the many legal and ethical issues from multiple perspectives and explores potential resolutions.

PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

Neblett, J. C., & Peck, E. A. III
Insurance Reimbursement of Pre-Approved Units for Psychological and Neuropsychological Evaluations.
Many changes pertaining to insurance reimbursement for mental health services have occurred during the past several years. These changes have included an apparent in-