

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF REGULATION & LICENSING



Wisconsin Department of Regulation & Licensing Access to the Public Records of the Reports of Decisions

This Reports of Decisions document was retrieved from the Wisconsin Department of Regulation & Licensing website. These records are open to public view under Wisconsin's Open Records law, sections 19.31-19.39 Wisconsin Statutes.

Please read this agreement prior to viewing the Decision:

- The Reports of Decisions is designed to contain copies of all orders issued by credentialing authorities within the Department of Regulation and Licensing from November, 1998 to the present. In addition, many but not all orders for the time period between 1977 and November, 1998 are posted. Not all orders issued by a credentialing authority constitute a formal disciplinary action.
- Reports of Decisions contains information as it exists at a specific point in time in the Department of Regulation and Licensing data base. Because this data base changes constantly, the Department is not responsible for subsequent entries that update, correct or delete data. The Department is not responsible for notifying prior requesters of updates, modifications, corrections or deletions. All users have the responsibility to determine whether information obtained from this site is still accurate, current and complete.
- There may be discrepancies between the online copies and the original document. Original documents should be consulted as the definitive representation of the order's content. Copies of original orders may be obtained by mailing requests to the Department of Regulation and Licensing, PO Box 8935, Madison, WI 53708-8935. The Department charges copying fees. *All requests must cite the case number, the date of the order, and respondent's name as it appears on the order.*
- Reported decisions may have an appeal pending, and discipline may be stayed during the appeal. Information about the current status of a credential issued by the Department of Regulation and Licensing is shown on the Department's Web Site under "License Lookup." The status of an appeal may be found on court access websites at: <http://ccap.courts.state.wi.us/InternetCourtAccess> and <http://www.courts.state.wi.us/wscca>.
- Records not open to public inspection by statute are not contained on this website.

By viewing this document, you have read the above and agree to the use of the Reports of Decisions subject to the above terms, and that you understand the limitations of this on-line database.

Correcting information on the DRL website: An individual who believes that information on the website is inaccurate may contact the webmaster at web@drl.state.wi.gov

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE PSYCHOLOGY EXAMINING BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF THE DISCIPLINARY	:	
PROCEEDINGS AGAINST	:	
	:	FINAL DECISION AND ORDER
SHEILA J. FIELDS, Ph.D.,	:	LS0410051PSY
RESPONDENT.	:	

The parties to this action for the purposes of Wis. Stat. § 227.53 are:

Sheila J. Fields, Ph.D.
2503 Santa Maria Court
Middleton, WI 53562

Division of Enforcement
Department of Regulation and Licensing
1400 East Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935

Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board
Department of Regulation and Licensing
1400 East Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties in this matter agree to the terms and conditions of the attached Stipulation as the final decision of this matter subject to the approval of the Psychology Examining Board. The Board has reviewed this Stipulation and considers it acceptable.

Accordingly, the Board in this matter adopts the attached Stipulation and makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Sheila J. Fields, Ph.D., Respondent, date of birth May 14, 1950, is licensed by the Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board as a psychologist in the state of Wisconsin pursuant to license number 1267, which was first granted December 12, 1986.
2. Respondent's last address reported to the Department of Regulation and Licensing is 2503 Santa Maria Court Middleton, WI, 53562.
3. At the time of the following events, the Jefferson County Wisconsin Family Court attempted to limit the costs and trauma of family court disputes by requiring an initial attempt at mediation when custody or placement was at issue in a family court matter. As part of the mediation, the court would appoint a team made up of the guardian ad litem, a family court counselor and a psychologist to make recommendations regarding custody and placement in a somewhat simplified process. The court would order a full custody evaluation to be done only if one or both parties declined to accept the recommendation of the team.
4. Mr. A and Ms. B were divorced and had joint custody and 50/50 placement of their two children. On September 21, 1997, Mr. A filed a motion in Jefferson County Family Court seeking a change in physical placement so that he

would have primary physical placement of the children, who were then 4 and 7 years old. As part of the mediation, on October 16, 1997, a Family Court Commissioner ordered a “team custody and placement study.”

5. Respondent was named the psychologist on the team to perform this custody and placement study. On November 18, 1997, Respondent began her portion of the evaluation of Mr. A and Ms. B to be used by the team in arriving at the team’s recommendations.

6. As part of the evaluation, Respondent administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – Second Edition (MMPI-2) to Mr. A and Ms. B. The MMPI-2 is an empirically based measure of adult psychopathology, which is used to assess psychopathology and to help identify personal, social, or behavioral problems in adults. It is often used in family court cases to provide personality information on the parties and provides descriptions of people’s problems, symptoms, and characteristics.

a. Respondent had Mr. A complete his MMPI-2 in her waiting room area where there were distractions and no supervision or monitoring. While Mr. A was completing the test, Respondent left him alone and told him she was leaving to run some errands. She told him someone would be dropping off some tapes and asked Mr. A to tell the person where to leave the tapes.

b. Respondent allowed Ms. B to take the MMPI protocol booklet home to complete the test.

c. Respondent did not note in her report that Mr. A was unsupervised while completing the MMPI or that Ms. B was allowed to take the MMPI home and complete it unsupervised.

d. By allowing Mr. A and Ms. B to complete the MMPI-2 tests in unsupervised settings, Respondent could not determine if they were the individuals who answered the questions or whether they received unauthorized assistance in answering the questions.

e. By failing to note in her report that Mr. A and Ms. B completed the MMPI-2 tests in unsupervised settings, Respondent failed to make individuals reading and relying on the report aware of a circumstance that could have an effect on the validity of the test results.

f. By allowing Mr. A and Ms. B to complete the MMPI-2 tests in unsupervised settings, Respondent could not assure that the security of the tests were maintained. Test security is necessary to assure their continued validity.

7. Respondent administered the verbal portion of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, revised version (WAIS-R) to Ms. B. The WAIS-R is commonly known as an IQ test and measures the intelligence of the subject.

8. Respondent did not follow the procedures for administering the test described in the WAIS-R manual. The accepted practice is to administer the WAIS-R using the forms provided by the test publisher, which organize the administration of the test and assist in scoring the test. Instead of using the forms, Respondent wrote Ms. B’s raw responses on the back of Respondent’s notes of her interview of Ms. B.

9. Respondent administered the WAIS-R to Ms. B in a non-standard manner that decreased the validity of the results:

a. On the Information sub-test, Respondent started at number 5, and did not record the answers to 11, 12, and 13.

b. The accepted practice in administering the Arithmetic sub-test is to begin with item 3 and administer the test until the test-taker has four consecutive errors. Respondent started the Arithmetic sub-test at item 10 and finished at item 12. The Arithmetic sub-test cannot be scored as administered by Respondent.

c. The accepted practice in administering the Comprehension sub-test is to begin with item 1 and

administer every item in the sub-test. Respondent started the Comprehension sub-test at item 16 and worked backwards towards item 1. Respondent continued until Ms. B got two in a row correct and stopped administering that sub-test at item 8.

d. On the Similarities sub-test, Respondent did not record answers for items 12 and 13.

e. The accepted practice in administering the Vocabulary sub-test is to begin with item 5 and administer the test until the test-taker has 5 consecutive errors. Respondent began administering the sub-test with question 12 and ended it too early.

10. Respondent made the following errors in recording Ms. B's scores and computing her Verbal IQ:

a. On the lower right hand corner of the paper upon which Respondent wrote the answers to Ms. B's WAIS-R, Respondent also wrote the following scores for Information, Digit Span, Vocabulary, Arithmetic, Comprehension, and Similarities, without labeling the columns as "raw" or "scale" scores:

info	9	6
DS	16	10
vocab	10	26
arith	8	16
comp	11	11
sim	8	53

b. In computing the IQ, Respondent added together some raw scores and some scale scores and arrived at a total which Respondent then used to calculate a Verbal IQ of 99, which she included in her report.

c. Adding raw scores and scale scores results in a meaningless number which cannot be used in computing Verbal IQ.

d. Because Respondent did not enter the scores on the published form, which organizes the responses and scores, it is likely that Respondent became confused in adding the scores and this led to her reporting an incorrect IQ score for Ms. B.

e. Had Respondent correctly added the scale scores, which had been obtained through an inappropriate administering of the WAIS-R, it would have indicated a Verbal IQ of 91 and not 99 as Respondent reported.

11. The WAIS-III was administered to Ms. B approximately one year later by another psychologist, using accepted procedures, and Ms. B's Full IQ (Verbal and Performance) was determined to be 86 and her Verbal IQ was 88.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Psychology Examining Board has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 455.09 and authority to enter into this stipulated resolution of this matter pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 227.44(5).

2. Respondent, by engaging in the conduct set out above, performed professional services inconsistent with training education, or experience in violation of Wis. Adm. Code § 5.01(4) which subjects Respondent to discipline pursuant to Wis Stat. § 455.09(1)(g).

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Respondent, Sheila J. Fields, Ph.D., is hereby Reprimanded for the conduct set out above.

2. Respondent shall, within 90 days of the date of this Order, pay to the Department of Regulation and Licensing the costs of this proceeding in the amount of \$250.00 pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 440.22(2).

3. All requests, notifications, reports and payments shall be mailed, faxed or delivered to:

Department Monitor
Department of Regulation and Licensing
Division of Enforcement
1400 East Washington Ave.
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935
Fax: (608) 266-2264
Telephone: (608) 267-3817

Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board

By:	Donald Crowder	2-9-05
	A Member of the Board	Date