

MINNESOTA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

Minutes of the 384th Meeting

November 3, 2006

Members Present: M. Fulton, S. Hayes, G. Jensen, J. Lee, J. Romano, M. Seibold, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf

Members Absent: T. Nguyen-Kelly

Others Present: N. Hart, Assistant Attorney General, L. Berberoglu, G. Fischler

PUBLIC SESSION

Board Vice Chair, J. Lee called the public session of the meeting to order at 1:15 PM, in the Psychology Board Conference Room, at 2829 University Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and a quorum was declared present. At 1:19 PM, Board Chair M. Seibold arrived and presided over the meeting.

1. Minutes of the Board Meeting of October 6, 2006.

S. Ward moved, seconded by J. Wolf that the minutes of the Board meeting of October 6, 2006 be approved as submitted. Voting “aye”: M. Fulton, S. Hayes, J. Lee, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting “nay”: none. Abstaining: G. Jensen, J. Romano, and T. Thompson. There being five “ayes” and no “nays”, motion carried.

2. Administrative Matters.

- a. Psychology Board’s Representative to the Program Committee for the Health Professionals Service Program (HPSP).** Each year, Monica Feider, HPSP’s Program Manager, requests that the Health Licensing Boards appoint a representative and an alternate to their Program Committee.

J. Wolf moved, seconded by M. Fulton, that the Board re-appoint the current representatives to continue to represent the Board of Psychology on the Program Committee during 2007. The representative is S. Ward and the alternate representative is S. Hayes. Voting “aye”: M. Fulton, S. Hayes, G. Jensen, J. Lee, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting “nay”: none. There being eight “ayes” and no “nays”, motion carried unanimously.

- b. Presentation on the Health Professionals Service Program (HPSP) in December.** Each year, Monica Feider, Program Manager for HPSP, or her designee, gives the Board an overview of the Program and statistical information. This agenda item was a

reminder to the Board that an HPSP representative will appear at the Board meeting on December 8, 2006 at 9:30 AM.

- c. **Board Officer Elections in December.** The Board will hold its election of officers for calendar year 2007 at the Board meeting on 08 December 2006. Board officers are: **Chair**, who conducts the meetings, represents the Board at meetings and other functions, makes decisions, when necessary, in conjunction with the Executive Director, on behalf of the Board, signs documents on behalf of the Board, supervises the Executive Director, appoints members of Board committees, and etc.; **Vice Chair**, who serves in the absence of the Chair, and performs other duties, as assigned by the Chair; and **Secretary**, who is responsible for Board meeting minutes, signs documents on behalf of the Board, and performs other duties, as assigned by the Chair. All three officers comprise the membership of the Administrative Committee, which functions, as needed, to formulate recommendations to the Board regarding fiscal and other governance-types of issues.

The incumbents are:

- o M. Seibold, Chair, whose second term on the Board expires in 2010.
- o J. Lee, Vice Chair, whose second term on the Board expires in 2008.
- o S. Hayes, Secretary, whose second term on the Board expires in 2007; she can be re-appointed.

- d. **Report from ASPPB Annual Meeting Attendees.**

Presented by Pauline Walker-Singleton

Wednesday, October 25, 2006

The Board Administrators, Executive Directors, and Registrars of the state and provincial psychology Boards have now been officially recognized by the ASPPB Board of Directors. Ronald Ross, PhD, Executive Director of the Ohio Board was elected Chair of the group last spring and Kathy Cawood, Board Administrator of the Alabama Board was elected to represent the group as the Board Administrator's Liaison to the ASPPB Board. The Board Administrator's group held a day long meeting on Wednesday. The purpose of the meeting was to network and to share jurisdictional updates and to receive updates from ASPPB and the Professional Examination Service (PES).

PES Presentation

Robert Lipkins, PhD, from the Professional Examination Service (PES) presented to the group on PES' development of on-line applications for candidates who have been admitted to the EPPP by the jurisdictions. He expects the system to be completed by October 2007. It is called the Psychology Information Management System (PsyIMS, *pron. sims*).

Examination candidates will be able to go on the ASPPB website and choose the exam version they wish to take. They can pick from the EPPP, EPPP (bilingual French), Practice Exam, Practice Exam at the Prometric Center. All have a cost associated with them. They would complete a series of information. PES will send us an alert that a

candidate from MN has applied for the EPPP. Jurisdictions would have access to their candidates' questionnaires.

If the candidate applies for a Special Accommodation because of a disability, the jurisdiction is notified so the jurisdiction makes sure that documentation of the disability has been collected. After the Special Accommodation has been approved by the jurisdiction, we would complete a form on-line verifying that and the candidate can take the examination.

PES would send out the EPPP scores on-line twice per month and the jurisdiction has the choice of whether we want to release the scores to the candidates on line or by letter.

Thursday, October 26, 2006

- ASPPB's Executive Officer, Stephen DeMers, Member of ASPPB's Finance and Audit Committee, Gib Condie, and ASPPB's Financial Officer Mark Russell, provided reports on the strength of ASPPB's current financial situation. They have overcome some budget difficulties and have recovered so well that the Board of Directors instructed staff to pay off the Association's mortgage on their new building, which they have occupied for the past seven or so years. ASPPB, however, operates on a break even budget.
- Joan Grusec, Chair of the Examination Committee reported that test preparation materials are not created by ASPPB, but rather by test preparation companies. There have been some reports that scenarios featured in the exam have shown up in the practice tests. She cleared up a misconception: ASPPB and PES are not profit making organizations. There is an Item Development Committee of ASPPB. (ASPPB Board Member-at-Large, Jack Schaffer, PhD, LP of MN is a member.) The Committee consists of individuals with item writing experience. They consult with experts in the various content areas of the EPPP, in an effort to increase the number of acceptable questions for the item bank.
- I. Leon Smith, PhD, President and CEO of PES reported that Prometric Testing Centers are being sold; selling price: \$5 billion.
- Jack Schaffer, PhD, LP is a member of the Item Development Committee of which Lynn P. Rehm, PhD is the Chair. Jack reported that the Committee is charged with improving "the quality of the EPPP and the item bank by developing more items at higher cognitive levels, increasing the training and experience of item writers, developing a cadre of continuing item writers, and focusing item development efforts in areas of greatest need." He stated that the Committee wants to develop items that test candidates' ability to problem solve using their psychological knowledge, as opposed to just having candidates recall components of their education, training, and experiences. They believe that this shifts the focus of the test on competency as opposed to rote learning.
- Kim Jonason, PhD reported on ASPPB's Mobility Programs: Certificate of Professional Qualifications (CPQ), Reciprocity Agreements, and Credentials Bank. He said the CPQ no longer requires that applicants complete an oral examination in order to qualify. The number of jurisdictions that accept the CPQ is 36; 16 jurisdictions have voted to change laws/rules allowing them to accept the CPQ, including MN. Twelve jurisdictions have Reciprocity Agreements. The ASPPB Board has authorized the Mobility Committee to begin a Credentials Bank. For a one-time fee of \$200, licensees can bank with ASPPB their transcript, supervision verification, licensure status, and ASPPB/NR status. For an additional \$50, ASPPB will send the information to a jurisdiction. For an additional \$25, licensees can bank additional accomplishments, such as an ABPP, etc.

- Barb Van Horne, PhD, MPH reported on the Inter-jurisdictional Practice Certificate (IPC). After seeking input from jurisdictions on her original proposal, Barb found that there were a variety of approaches by Boards and Colleges to address short-term practice. Items of concern expressed include natural disasters and the need for emergency services, concerns by APA Divisions 13, 14, and 41 about practice across jurisdictional lines, and conflicts between regulatory and other laws, like emergency service laws. Using the feedback, the IPC concept has been re-written and endorsed by the ASPPB Board in April 2006 as a vehicle for short-term practice. Changes made following feedback include the IPC now allows only 30 days of unlicensed practice in a jurisdiction, not 60; disaster and emergency relief services are now allowed under the Certificate, and so are health care services, including assessment, diagnostic procedures, and specialty treatment and evaluation. A handout of the presentation compares the IPC to the CPQ and gives the requirements for the IPC.

Presented by Jean Wolf, PhD, LP

October 27, 2006

Keynote Speaker: Paul Nelson, APA, Education Directorate

Nelson traced the history of the field of psychology. Professional psychology took hold in the 40's and for the next 30 years the professionals and the educators lived in different spheres. Professional psychology was often seen as mysterious and amorphous. Then in mid to late 70's the two groups began connecting. APA met with education and training boards and more meetings followed.

In 1965 the EPPP was developed. And for the next two decades, analysis of the EPPP continued. It was deemed to be psychometrically sound with content validity. It was not until the 80's that a core curriculum was developed. A primer for competence was developed in 2000. This primer defined common competency domains such as supervision, family and children, assessment. This tended to be knowledge rather than practice based.

Beginning in the 90's and ongoing, the issues of **quality** of internships and **assessing professional** competency have come to the fore. With that, the **developmental** nature of competency emerged. That is, at each stage of training we should expect building on former competencies. The gold standard for this would be an **evidence based practice**. As a profession we are exploring these things. Possibilities for changes include a 1 year intensive internship, testing maintenance and growth, continuous assessment, and interaction between professionals and educators.

The general zeitgeist of the field seems to be that the lifelong learning needs to be more rigorous than it is.

APA wants to see the internship as primary. This would mean less debt for students, improved supervision and holding the graduate program more accountable. They see the public as protected because the amount of education and supervision would not be changed.

Also addressed in the conference were two Approaches to Assessing Competence:

1. Leon Smith from PES, developers of EPPP, described the use of assessment technologies. Other professions use sequential exams, i.e. multiple assessments throughout training. Some are practical and more realistic, such as a dental student bringing in a patient for the exam. Other more realistic models include exams that use graphics or video items. These assessments would measure a broader base of skills, simulated cases and multiple assessments across training.
2. Rick Morris, a practitioner in Ontario, presented a self-assessment model. He also emphasized that assessment needs to be continuous. To accomplish this more interaction between the trainers and the professionals would be necessary.

Presented by Myrla Seibold, PhD, LP

Saturday, October 28, 2006

The day began with a panel presentation on changes in accreditation. Doctoral programs in clinical psychology began to be accredited in 1947 in the U.S. Canadian programs have often been both CPA and APA approved. Canada has now decided to do its own accreditation, and is calling for accreditation that will truly be multi-national recognition. "One country accrediting the rest of the world is not international accreditation," stated the panel.

A major trend in graduate education in psychology is for more emphasis on student learning outcomes and accountability which presumably are linked to practitioner competence. As of January 1, 2007 graduate programs will be required to publish more information on their programs which will help prospective students make more informed choices.

Tom O' Connor who was the Executive Director of the California Board of Psychology from 1987 to 2005 spoke on the history of professional regulation in his state. In 1988 half of the complaints against psychologists in CA were related to improper sexual behavior. In that year they created a booklet called "Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex" and over the next ten years the rate of sexual misconduct reported to the Board went down significantly. CA takes a zero tolerance position toward sexual misconduct, and revocation is mandatory.

When there was a rise in complaints against psychologists over child custody evaluations, CA developed a pool of psychologists with expertise in family court issues to review complaints. Tom stated that this procedure has worked well in the Board's response to these "very volatile cases."

CA has used the EPPP since 1977 and has weathered several waves of challenges to the validity of the exam. CA's notoriously difficult oral exam faced even bigger attacks and as of January 1, 2002 the state stopped using the oral exam as part of its licensure requirements. They now offer a computer-based exam on laws and ethics which the current Executive Director told me has too high of a pass rate and needs to be adjusted. CA allows applicants to take the EPPP before they complete all their post-doctoral requirements.

CA has taken a stance toward supervision away from “micro-managing.” They presently require the applicant to have a supervision plan which includes goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes, along with an emergency plan. The supervisor must be “available” to the supervisee but in this age of technological advances in communication, they have stopped requiring that all supervision be face-to-face.

The next major issue presented at the ASPPB meeting had to do with the development of the National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) which is designed to keep people from crossing borders without disclosing past professional problems. There is a second data bank which has been developed called the Healthcare Integrity and Protection Data Bank (HIPDB) which allows additional information to be deposited. For example, the NPDB only takes information related to the professional practice. The HIPDB would record things that might be of concern but did not involve one’s professional activities (e.g., murdering one’s wife).

Timely filing of board information is important and not currently happening consistently. Only 48% of boards filed within 30 days, resulting in the data bank not being as up-to-date as it should be.

A new development is the National Provider Identifier (NPI), a number the HIPAA requires as of May 2007 for all individual practitioners and agencies/organizations that fall under HIPAA regulations. It is suggested that boards start collecting that number from their licensees as future reporting to data banks will ask for the NPI. Reportedly students can be issued an NPI even before they are licensed.

A related issue discussed that day was the publishing of disciplinary data. Reasons to do that include: 1) deterrence, 2) education of licensees and the public regarding practice standards, and 3) showing the public that the regulatory body is acting to protect them. It is proposed that for a fee the public could search a national database to find out if there has been disciplinary action against a particular psychologist. There was much discussion about what disciplinary data is allowed by state or provincial law to be published. Right now ASPPB does not publish disciplinary data to the public; it is only available to member boards.

Sunday, October 29, 2006

Matthew Bean is the new attorney-advisor for ASPPB. He spoke about legal and legislative changes that boards should know about. He made the observation that generally ethical problems, rather than lack of knowledge, lead to complaints filed against psychologists.

Cases of note include the fact that Iowa’s refusal to grant licensure to a distance-education applicant was upheld by the Court of Appeals in Iowa. Another interesting case was where North Carolina’s Board of Psychology attempted to take action against an LPA (master’s-level psychology license) who was also licensed as an LPC. NC’s Board of Psychology said the licensee should have been under supervision for his professional activities but the licensee claimed he could practice independently with his LPC license. The court upheld the licensee.

A medical board case in Kansas led to the conclusion that it is not necessary to prove that a patient suffered actual injury for the Board to discipline a licensee.

One board chose to suspend a licensee's license for 30 years, which will be more effective than revocation by which the licensee could have reapplied within a few years. Matthew also expressed his opinion regarding what Boards can do if they believe a past Board action should be overturned.

Jurisdictional updates provided us with some items of note. South Carolina has done away with requiring licensees to declare a specialty area. Louisiana began allowing psychologists to prescribe medications in 2004 and reports no problems or complaints so far. Newfoundland is requiring licensees to have malpractice insurance. In California there is an attempt to merge the Board of Psychology with the Board of Behavioral Sciences.

There were also some summation statements about the main issues discussed at the annual meeting. A big question to resolve is whether competence refers to "readiness to practice psychology" or being "minimally competent." Another big issue is what to do about APA's recommendation to remove the requirement for post-doctoral supervised experience for licensure. Because there are no agreed-upon practicum standards, there is the problem of who will decide what the practicum standards should be. I agree with Emil Rodolfa, member-at-large from California, who said that we need to move carefully with regard to any licensure changes and not allow piecemeal legislation. We need a comprehensive, well-planned structure for graduate practicum and internship requirements which are realistic and mutually acceptable. We also need a uniform approach to defining and assessing competence. This will require licensure boards, educators, supervisors and professional associations to dialogue and cooperate together in determining standards.

e. Outstate Practica and Internships. G. Jensen submitted a memorandum to the Board for review and discussion. Mr. Jensen requested that the Board brainstorm some possible partial solutions designed to "increase the quality of psychological and mental health services in 'outstate' Minnesota." He clarified that he is talking about problems in rural Minnesota (not cities like, St. Cloud, Duluth, Rochester), rather than outstate Minnesota, which includes the larger, non-metro area cities. Mr. Jensen wanted to discuss ways of increasing the quality of psychological and mental health services in the areas of the state where shortages exist.

Mr. Jensen reported that Cass and Crow Wing counties, among others, are designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSA) because of shortages of primary medical care and dental and mental health providers. He roughly estimates that in the area, "the percentage of mental health providers is as follows: LPC = 15%, LMFT = 15%, LICSW = 50%, LP = 19%." Because this Board is eliminating master's level licensure, he expects a further reduction to come.

The Board discussed options for working on increasing the numbers in the field of psychology: opening a dialog with placement offices at educational institutions, soliciting interest and assistance from the Minnesota Psychological Association and the Minnesota Department of Human Services; talking to state legislators about

authoring a piece of legislation to offer incentives to practice in rural areas of the state; and forming an internship consortium in the area.

- f. Presentation by the Ethics Committee of the Minnesota Psychological Association (MPA).** Two representatives from the MPA Ethics Committee made a presentation about the work of the Committee. They were Gary Fischler, PhD, LP, Ethics Committee Chair and Linda S. Berberoglu, PhD, LP, Ethics Committee Assistant Chair.

They reported that MPA was inspired by the Utah Board and the Utah Psychological Association to work towards a more collaborative relationship with the Minnesota Board of Psychology. One initiative in that direction was to invite someone from the Board (J. Wolf) to attend one of their meetings and to, in turn, attend a Board meeting, the purpose being to share information about what each organization does in regards to complaint handling or ethical consultations.

MPA members stated that their Ethics Committee uses the APA Code of Conduct to handle complaints from consumers and psychologists. They do not adjudicate complaints. Any complaints that need adjudication are forwarded to the Board. They process ethical, legal, and practice issues. They assist members and non-members of MPA.

- g. Continuing Education (CE) Planning Committee Update.** J. Wolf presented an update on the progress of the Committee. Dr. Wolf explained that the program has been planned to include three speakers, one being a keynote speaker, followed by a panel discussion in the afternoon. The Committee is busy interviewing and making decisions about who the speakers and panelist will be. It is looking for individuals with expertise in the culture of poverty as it relates to the provision of psychological services. The Committee is also paying attention to cultural and gender balance in selecting speakers and panelists.
- h. Mental Health Task Force.** M. Seibold has been representing the Board on a task force formed by the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS). The task force is trying to reach a consensus of what are the minimal standards that would form the foundation for mental health practice. DHS would use this information as a basis for how much they will reimburse for services in the areas of psychology, marriage and family therapy, social work, professional counseling, and psychiatric nursing.

Dr. Seibold attended a meeting held just before this Board meeting. The topic for the day was evidence-based practice and included a presentation on the subject from the adult and children mental health practice staff of DHS. They would like to establish core competencies. There are six evidence-based treatments DHS is planning to reimburse for; the Federal government has five more. DHS expects that individuals in the mental health field will have to get training in their educational programs to be proficient in these treatments. They want to establish the evidence-based practice requirements within three years as they are trying to reimburse for services from a high quality mental health work force.

The task force's report is due to the legislature on January 15, 2007. The first draft will be released in December. Dr. Seibold asked that Board members review the draft

report carefully. Gary Cox, DHS' main representative on the task force stated that any group can submit a minority report.

3. **Waivers/Variances.**

- a. Each of the following licensees requested approval of a six-month time-limited variance to complete requirements for continuing education (CE). Each licensee has submitted the required CE plan in compliance with MN Rule 7200.3400, subpart 2.

Hovander, Deborah, MA, LP	LP0937	03-31-06
Lexau, Benjamin J., PsyD, LP	LP4406	10-31-06

J. Wolf moved, seconded by S. Ward that the variance requests be approved on the basis that the licensees met the burden to prove that adherence to the rule would impose an undue burden on the licensees, that granting the variances will not adversely affect the public welfare, and that the alternatives proposed meet the rationale for the rule. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, G. Jensen, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being seven "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

- b. Applicant 06C-401 applied for licensure as a Licensed Psychologist. The applicant was originally licensed in the State of Idaho from May 18, 1976 to May 24, 2001 and is currently licensed in the State of Colorado. The applicant's previous supervisor is medically unavailable to complete this Board's Supervisory Verification form or to verify the supervision provided to the applicant. The Board received documentation directly from the State of Colorado Board of Psychologist Examiners on their Postdoctoral Experience and Supervision form and from the State of Idaho Board on their Professional Work Experience form documenting that the applicant does meet Minnesota's requirements of one year of post doctoral supervised experience. Applicant requested a variance from MN Rule 7200.0600D requesting that the Minnesota Board accept the documentation sent directly from the other state Boards as acceptable documentation that Applicant meets Minnesota's supervision requirements.

The Application Review Committee moved approval of the variance request on the basis that Applicant met the burden to prove that adherence to the rule would impose an undue burden on the applicant, that granting the variances will not adversely affect the public welfare, and that the alternatives proposed meet the rationale for the rule. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, G. Jensen, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being seven "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

4. **Admit to EPPP.**

Application Review Committee moved that the following applicants be admitted to the national standardized examination on the basis that Applicants' degrees meet the educational requirements for licensure. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, G. Jensen, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being seven "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

07C-013	06C-240	04C-119	06C-103
06C-232	07C-021	05C-144	06C-277
06C-108	07C-014	06C-248	06C-305
07C-033	06C-267	07C-034	06C-142
07C-026	06C-269	06C-224	

5. Admit to PRE.

Application Review Committee moved that the following applicants be admitted to the PRE on the basis that Applicants' degrees meet the educational requirements for licensure. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being six "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

06C-270	07C-100	04C-119	06C-216
06C-245	06C-137	06C-218	04C-084
07C-012	06C-232	05C-032	06C-376
06C-297	07C-019	06C-134	96B-294
05C-144	06C-220	06C-277	07C-024
05C-029	06C-380	06C-045	06C-305
05C-070	07C-006	07C-002	06C-042
07C-028	06C-287	06C-364	07C-026
03C-025	06C-224	94B-013	06C-311

6. Licensure as Licensed Psychologists.

Application Review Committee moved that the Applicants listed below be granted licensure as Licensed Psychologists based upon doctoral degrees, having performed successfully on both parts of the examination and having fulfilled all of the requirements of MN. Stat. 148.907, Subd. 2. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being six "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Blackburn, Richard Anthony	PhD
Broderick, Debra Jean	PsyD
Connell, Katie Elizabeth	PhD
Curry, Kyle Thomas	PhD
Hildebrandt, David E.	PhD
Listug-Lunde, Lori Beth	PhD
Miller, Pamela Kay	PsyD
Montgomery, Janeen Mary	PsyD
Osborn-Redington, Leah Marie	PhD
Reisetter, Tressa Kay	PhD
Rodlund, Mark Jon	PhD

7. Licensure as Licensed Psychological Practitioner.

Application Review Committee moved that the Applicants listed below be granted licensure as Licensed Psychological Practitioners based upon master's degrees, having performed satisfactorily on both parts of the examination and having fulfilled all of the requirements of MN. Stat.148.908, subdivision 2. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being six "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Christensen, Kimberly Ann	MA
Gifft, Tammy Ann	MA
Hegland-Smith, Melissa Ann	MA
Massmann Sweeney, Wendy Ann	MA
Rippel, Rachel Suzanne	MA
Scharr, Michael James	MS
Wetterlund, Melissa Kay	MA

8. Termination of License for Non-Renewal.

The following licensees were properly notified by certified mail according to Rule 7200.3510. The Board voted to approve the termination of the licenses for the following individuals who failed to renew:

O'Neal, Kevin F., MS, LPP	September 30, 2005	LPP0034
Perrino, Geovanna M., MA, LP	January 31, 2006	LP3926
Peterson, Dennis A., MSED, LP	December 31, 2005	LP0612

J. Romano moved, seconded by S. Ward that the licenses of the above licensees be terminated. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, S. Hayes, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being six "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

9. Adjournment.

J. Romano moved, seconded by T. Thompson that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

SUSAN HAYES
Board Secretary