

# **MINNESOTA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY**

## **Minutes of the 394<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**November 2, 2007**

**Members Present:** M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, M. Seibold, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf

**Members Absent:** S. Hayes

**Others Present:** N. Hart, Assistant Attorney General

### **PUBLIC SESSION**

Board Chair, M. Seibold called the public session of the meeting to order at 9:15 AM, in the Psychology Board Conference Room, at 2829 University Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and a quorum was declared present.

#### **1. Minutes of the Board Meeting of October 5, 2007.**

T. Thompson moved, seconded by T. Nguyen-Kelly that the minutes of the Board meeting of October 5, 2007 be approved as submitted. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

#### **2. Administrative Matters.**

##### **a. Rules Committee Update.** P. Walker-Singleton provided the Board with an update on the progress of the rules.

- The Rules Committee will meet on Wednesday, 07 November 2007 to review the Rules of Continuing Education.
- In September 2007, P. Walker-Singleton sent to the Revisor's Office an email requesting that they change their version of the Rules of Licensure to conform to changes originally requested by the Rules Committee. Having received no response, Ms. Walker-Singleton followed up with the Office and was told that they never received the email. The email was re-sent on November 2, 2007.

##### **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. An HPSP representative will appear at the Board meeting on December 7, 2007 at 10:30 AM.

- c. **Board Officer Elections in December.** The Board will hold its annual election of officers for calendar year 2008 at the Board meeting on 07 December 2007. 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 third term on the Board expires in 2010.
- o T. Thompson, Vice Chair, whose second term on the Board expires in 2011.
- o S. Hayes, Secretary, whose third term on the Board expires in 2011.

Nomination ballots were given to Board members in preparation for the actual election in December. M. Seibold explained to the members she is not running for the office of Board chair for 2008 and that nominations will be accepted next month. Dr. Seibold encouraged members to begin thinking about who they would like to nominate for each office. She stressed that they can nominate themselves.

- d. **Report from ASPPB Annual Meeting Attendees.** Following are the reports of the meeting attendees in their own words:

Presented by P. Walker-Singleton

### ***Wednesday, October 17, 2007***

The Board Administrators and Registrars Committee (BARC) held our second meeting of the year. Jurisdictions represented are Ohio, Saskatchewan, Wyoming, Missouri, Montana, Arkansas, New York, California, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Maryland, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Minnesota. The meeting is staffed by Janet Pippin and is lead by the group's chair, Ronald Ross, PhD of Ohio.

The ASPPB Board of Directors requested that they meet with BARC at the 2008 Midyear Meeting in Vancouver, BC. Because some of the jurisdictions are only able to send administrators to ASPPB Annual meetings (and because the next midyear meeting involves international travel for most of us, which may not be approved), the Administrators and Registrars present asked staff to recommend to the Board that we meet together at the 2008 Annual Meeting instead.

### **Jurisdictional Issues or Concerns**

*Ronald Ross, PhD- Ohio*

- The Board has not made a decision to eliminate the post-doctoral employment requirement in response to the APA decision.

- They are proposing to regulate Applied Behavioral Analysts. The Board formed a task force made up of individuals in mental health treatment + parents to study the practice in Ohio. They are considering having Behavioral Analysis practiced only by psychologists or individuals practicing under the supervision of psychologists. Ron encouraged us to Google the Behavioral Analysis Certifying Board in Florida and find out how many providers there are in our jurisdictions and to find out more about the practice of Behavioral Analysis.

*Lorraine W. Smith, MA-Maryland*

- The state's current requirement is one year pre- and one year post-doctoral supervised experience. They are looking at doing away with that and requiring two years of supervised experience, which may be pre- or post-degree.
- They are studying adding a Health Service Provider (HSP) designation. One Board member believes that it is necessary to make sure licensees confine their practice to clinical services, if that is what they are competent to practice. Currently, they have generic licensure. Ms. Smith is not sure this change will materialize.
- They are also spending some time researching prescription authority.
- They are dealing with counselor testing issues. The Board has agreed on a bill to allow counselors to do testing-advance assessments with specific training requirements.

*Gayle Fidler-Colorado*

- The Board has ignored the post-doctoral supervision issue.
- They register unlicensed psychotherapists. Each therapist has to give to the Board a disclosure statement that the client has to sign by the second session. The statement must disclose that they are not licensed, but must follow certain specific guidelines in order to continue practice. Colorado is very strict with enforcement of laws governing psychotherapists.

*Jeff Scanlan-Wisconsin*

- They are writing rules to govern psychometric testing. Social Workers, Marriage and Family Therapists, Licensed Professional Counselors, and Psychologists were required by their legislature to jointly promulgate rules to regulate master's level psychometric testing. Master's level psychometrists are required to have a certain amount of coursework and post-graduate supervision under a psychologist.
- They are discussing assessment of competency among psychologists.

*Patricia Glenn-South Carolina*

- The Board used to issue licensure in certain specialty designations, but that was eliminated on July 1, 2007 in favor of generic licensure.
- They are considering issues involving licensure for applicants from certain online schools, such as Walden and Capella Universities.
- Licensed Professional Counselors, Social Workers, and Psychologists are meeting to sort out which tests are appropriate for each profession to administer.

*Kathleen Doyle-New York*

- Twelve Executive Directors administer a variety of professions under the umbrella of the New York Board of Regents.
- New York neuropsychologists are trying to get the authority to use bachelor's level individuals to do their testing, but that is illegal in New York.

- New York does not allow psychologists to prescribe, except for qualified psychologists who work in VA hospitals.
- The Board of Psychology writes "practice alerts" to advise professionals and consumers of unprofessional and unethical practices. They are moving into web-based questions and answers.
- The state will not accept any association's rules as meeting NY's licensure requirements (such as APA). Reasons: The associations can change their rules at anytime and the associations represent the licensees.
- Visit their website: [www.nysed.gov](http://www.nysed.gov)

*Janet Welsh-Arkansas*

- The Board granted independent licensure status to master's level licensees who were licensed before December 31, 1997, except in neuropsychology and one other area, which I did not catch. After December 31, 2013, the state will cease to issue master's level licenses to practice psychology.
- Arkansas does not have guest licensure or a temporary licensure. However, it allows for one time only in the psychologist's lifetime, practice in the state without licensure for as long as the one case lasts.

*Cheryl Brandt-Montana*

- Their legislature proposed prescribing authority for psychologists, however it did not pass. The medical lobby killed it.
- The Board amended their practice act to protect the use of psychological testing. However, the legislature required a joint meeting with other professions about psychological testing.

*Pamela Goose-Missouri*

- Prescribing privileges are a huge issue right now. A bill made it through both houses, but did not make it to the floor of the legislature. The Board is not taking a stance on the issue.

*Karen Messer-Engel, MA, R.Psych.-Saskatchewan*

- The Saskatchewan College of Psychologists has no affiliation to the government, until they need legislation passed.
- They raise their own revenue for operation from licensure and other fees.
- They accept for licensure programs that are CPA or APA accredited only. Applicants from distance education institutions are not licensable.
- They are facing a membership crisis, because 60% of the members of the college (licensees) are 50 or older.
- The College is looking to limiting declared competencies to one competency commensurate with the member's education. Supervisors should have the same competency.

*Tom Vaughn-Oklahoma*

- Oklahoma is being placed in a position, according to Vaughn, where they will have to take out of their statute that they will license based on graduation from an APA accredited program. They have had trouble obtaining information about the APA accreditation standards from the organization, so they no longer trust that the standards adequately meet their licensure needs. They have no such concerns about CPA, and will

not remove CPA accreditation from their law. Vaughn claims that when they repeatedly asked APA questions about the standards they use to make decisions about accreditation, APA says "it's a secret", so Oklahoma is removing reference to accepting APA accredited programs from its law. OK does not license applicants from Fielding Institute, even though their program is APA accredited. They will not license applicants from Alliant, because that program is removing the requirement for internships.

*Pauline Walker-Singleton-Minnesota*

- LPP's are mostly licensed and working towards conversion to master's level LP licensure. LPP licensure will sunset in 2011.
- Prescribing authority is of interest to a group of licensees, but the Board has not studied the issue nor has it taken a stance on it.
- Currently, the rules allow that an applicant who graduated from an APA-accredited program is deemed to have met the educational requirements for licensure. Proposed new rules have a similar provision for ASPPB/NR designation.
- The Board has not taken a position on changing the supervised practice requirement. Currently, the law requires a 2000-hour pre-doctoral internship and 1 full year of post-doctoral experience.
- The Board already has a Guest licensure provision and has not taken a position on the IPC.

**APPIC Issues and Comments**

*Emil Rodolfa, PhD, ASPPB Board of Directors*

- Dr. Rodolfa gave an overview of feedback that he has received from interns commenting on their experiences with psychology Boards/Colleges.
- After providing us with the interns' concerns, he asked for our comments and advice, which was free-flowing by that time.
- Some of our comments include:
  - ✓ Email is not always the best way to get answers from Boards. Although we answer our emails, it takes longer than a phone call, because emails have to be so carefully worded to answer what we think the writer is asking and it is more time consuming because we have to make sure we are not making promises on behalf of our Boards. There is no opportunity for give and take and clarifying questions.
  - ✓ It is very easy to call one number in some states (MN. for example) and get transferred to the exact person to answer the questions.
  - ✓ We work on courtesy to phone callers, but many individuals call the Boards with a preconceived notion that they must be adversarial and they present with a bad attitude.
  - ✓ Boards are busy and understaffed. We receive many, many phone calls that are asking us to verify that we received the application, the transcript, etc. that they just put in the mail, or asking us to verify whether they are licensed yet. We have a lot of calls to return and we do so as quickly as we can.
  - ✓ We are not allowed to give legal advice. We *can* quote and explain the regulations and procedures.

We thanked Dr. Rodolfa for the positive feedback and provided him with some explanations and recommendations for callers/emailers.

**ASPPB Interjurisdictional Practice Certificate (IPC)**

*Kim Jonason, PhD, ASPPB Board of Directors Mobility Committee*

- Dr. Jonason presented the purpose, definition, benefits, need for, terms of and eligibility requirements for the IPC.
- His focus on behalf of the ASPPB Board is to get jurisdictions to commit to adopting the IPC and amend their regulations so that IPC holders may use their certificates as a basis for practice in states and provinces.
- ASPPB has adopted the IPC and plans to begin issuing certificates in January 2008. The certificates will cost the holders \$200 to apply to ASPPB, but will be of little value to them unless the jurisdictions agree to accept them.

Presented by M. Seibold

***Thursday, October 18, 2007***

This year's annual meeting was especially stimulating and rewarding, due to the visible leadership of Minnesota's Board of Psychology in the formal presentations put on by our own Pauline Walker-Singleton, Jerry Jensen, and Jack Schaffer, as well as the marvelous fact that Pauline Walker-Singleton was awarded the Ming Fisher Award.

My report focuses on the program on Thursday, October 18<sup>th</sup>. This day was devoted to ASPPB and member board business. There was the roll call of delegates, and it is always exciting to see people from all over the U.S. and Canada, as well as associated countries such as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

We were welcomed by Mac McManus, a Colorado judge who is a member of the CO Board of Psychology and is its current chair. He told us the story of how "America the Beautiful" was written by Katherine Lee Bates in the very hotel where the annual meeting was being held.

New ASPPB officers will be: President—Alex Siegel of Pennsylvania, President-elect—Emil Rodolfa of California, and Member at large—Carol Webb of Georgia.

We learned that EPPP scores are highest immediately after graduation, and decline the longer a person is out of school. Scores improve with more hours of study, up to about 200 hours of study, beyond which there is little additional benefit. The majority of candidates pass the first time they take it. No data is available on scores of those who take a formal study course and those who don't.

ASPPB and the Professional Examination Service (PES) tried to dispel the rumors that they somehow have a connection to the commercial study/exam preparation companies. There was discussion on how it is unethical to disclose EPPP test items and that applicants sign a statement that they will not disclose anything from the test. All test items are copyrighted and the property of ASPPB, so it is also illegal to disclose them. However, there are still concerns about breaches of security.

Robert Lipkins of PES spoke of the lengthy process involved in choosing test items. The focus is on emphasizing higher order, complex thinking skills and the application of knowledge, not just

rote memory and recall. ASPPB expects to have an online application system in place for the EPPP in January 2008.

Jack Schaffer and Emil Rodolfa reported on the ASPPB committee formed to study the APA proposal to eliminate post-doctoral training as a requirement for licensure. A major issue is the quality of the practicum training that will then be more formalized. Currently there are no standards universally required for practicum training experiences. The committee is attempting to propose some guidelines, like defining a training year as at least 1500 hours, and requiring that a minimum of 50% of those hours be in direct service. They also suggest a minimum of 15 hours per week for at least 30 weeks. More widespread dialogue is needed to bring together the professional, regulatory, and training communities to work out many details on this topic.

Matthew Beam, ASPPB's legal counsel shared some updates on legal issues. He told of one ALJ reprimanding a board for not acting timely enough in its disposition of a case. In another case, when a board departed from an ALJ recommendation, it became clear that a board must provide sound justification for deviating from an ALJ's findings. Another case determined that a board cannot take action based on a pending criminal case until the criminal case is decided.

Janet Pippin gave legislative updates. Nine states had bills in 2007 regarding prescription privileges for psychologists, but none of them passed. She said, "Rome was not built in a day and neither will prescription privileges for psychologists."

Finally, we learned that ASPPB is sponsoring research on character issues that relate to eventual disciplinary action and also they are looking into how to evaluate diploma mills and fraudulent degrees.

As a member of the Complaint Resolution Committee, I always find the ASPPB meetings very helpful to me in learning how other jurisdictions have handled problems and the types of cases that have had to be litigated. I very much appreciate the Board sending me to the meeting in Colorado Springs.

Presented by S. Ward

*October 19, 2007*

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION- COMPETENCY ASSURANCE

(Know it. Show that you know it. Show that you know how to do it.)

David Swankin from the Citizens Advocacy Center (CAC) began with a presentation on Assessment & Evaluation of Licensed Healthcare. As a response to the Pew Commission and the report from the Institutes of Medicine on preventable medical errors, there has been an increased demand to require periodic assessment and demonstration of competence for re-licensing. The CAC, in conjunction with AARP, have developed a model for assessment that includes: 1. Routine periodic assessment; 2. Developing a personal plan; 3. Implementing the personal plan; 4. Documentation and; 5. Demonstrating and evaluating competence. Some of the issues with attempts to demonstrate continuing competence are: 1. Continuing Education is only a means to demonstrate continuing competence and certainly does not equate with continuing competence.

2. One formula does not fit all, and in determining competency, such things as peer review, consumer satisfaction surveys, records/chart reviews, written and oral examinations, performance evaluations, and portfolios can be utilized.

Dr. Catherine Yarrow presented two examples of national governments' involvement in consumer safety by instituting regulations. In Great Britain, following surveys and extensive studies, the goal is to establish by the year 2012 a program for health professionals to revalidate their license every 5 years only after evidence of continuing competence is verified. This evidence can be drawn from employer appraisals, clinical audits, simulator tests, knowledge tests, patients' feedback, continuing professional development, peer review, observation of practice, and 360-degree feedback. The intensity and frequency of revalidation for non-medical healthcare will be based in proportion to the risks inherent to the patient by profession. In Australia, the impetus for regulatory changes is driven by workforce shortages across the health professions, especially in rural areas. The proposal is to implement an over-arching national accreditation board that will register healthcare providers.

Dr. Andrea Kowaz provided an overview of the Continuing Competence in Alberta which, among other things, includes the intent of acquiring new knowledge and being able to articulate what is learned. One of the concerns brought out in this session is as the average age of providers gets older, there is the question of cognitive competence.

#### IN SUMMARY:

1. Continuing education does not guarantee assured competency. There is a wide spectrum of what is required in different jurisdictions for continuing education depending on what they deemed effective. Some jurisdictions require up to 100 hours per renewal; others have done away completely with CEUs.
2. There are a variety of ways to determine continuing competence.
3. If professions or licensing boards don't require demonstrated competence, centralized governments are going to impose it.
4. Competency assurance does not necessarily equate to consumer protection. Most complaints result not from incompetence but from violations of the practice act. An example was provided by a delegate from one of the Canadian Provinces who said that they had revoked the license of one of the professors of ethics at their university for an ethics violation.

#### COMPETENCE IN DISCIPLINE

(You like what you are used to!)

In the afternoon session there were presentations on how the discipline process is handled in different jurisdictions. Pauline did a superb job of explaining the Minnesota model. Then there were the extremes. Barry Gang from Ontario explained their process which involves the Board doing everything (investigating, referring allegations, conduction hearings, evaluation evidence, making findings and setting penalties) This presents challenges in maintaining confidentiality and firewalls between the separate steps of the discipline process. In Colorado, all regulatory boards come under the umbrella agency, The Department of Regulatory Agencies, which conducts the discipline process for all the boards. The individual boards do not have the authority or staff and resources.



## INCOMING ASPPB PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Alex Siegel presented his goals for his upcoming presidency. He would like to increase ASPPB's visibility by: 1. Offering exemplary exams and evaluation programs; 2. Gathering current and effective information; 3. Communicating that information to appropriate shareholders; 4. Working on the sequence of training (pre/post doc internships and supervision.)

Presented by T. Thompson, MEq, LP

*Saturday, October 20, 2007*

My report is a summary of the program for Saturday October 20th, 2007. The focus for the day was Assessment for Licensure.

In the morning session, we heard information relevant to evaluating international degrees. Kevin Caldwell spoke. He is the Director of the Federation of State Medical Boards Credentialing Verification Service (FCVS). This organization verifies over 20,000 physicians each year. His organization focuses on several issues:

- 1) Education equivalency to U.S. education
- 2) Length of study
- 3) Curriculum
- 4) Oversight (who grants authority to the institutions)
- 5) Substantiation (comparative support information, i.e. exam scores, interviews with other students, disciplinary history)

When information is in a foreign language, that information is referred to a trusted independent agency for translation.

There was a second presentation by Kevin Rolwing, who is the assistant director at World Education Services (WES). WES was founded in 1974. They evaluate credentials, with a focus on Latin America and European countries. They prepare over 50,000 evaluations for a wide variety of regulatory boards, employers and attorneys. They look at issues such as:

- 1) Does the institution really exist
- 2) What is the status of the institution
- 3) What kind of institution is it
- 4) Who accredits the institution
- 5) How does this institution compare to other institutions in the country

They also specialize in uncovering fraudulent credentials. Mr. Rolwing talked about the evolving sophistication of diploma mills, given advances in computer technology.

The last presentation of the morning was a panel discussion representing some rules and procedures in different jurisdictions. California, New York and Texas were represented. Texas uses a particularly interesting system. Applicants' documents are submitted to the University of Texas at Austin. They make the designation as to who is eligible for licensure rather than the Texas Board. The Board then acts on that decision. Texas has about 7600 Licensed Psychologists. Applicants must graduate from regionally accredited (not state) institutions. California mentioned that they currently use the NACES (National Association of Credentials Evaluation Service), however they are considering using WES instead.

Saturday afternoon began with a panel presentation by representatives from Minnesota Missouri and Pennsylvania. The discussion centered on the issues and benefits associated with Distance Education. Several issues were discussed:

- 1) Is it cost-effective
- 2) Does it allow flexibility in time and place
- 3) Is it accessible to disadvantaged people by location
- 4) Does it allow for self pacing

The point was made, that all students, regardless of their location, should be able to access education. The objective is for Distance Education to enable any student to benefit from educational opportunities without jeopardizing educational quality. During the session, we discussed transfer credits, residence requirements and the need to verify the identity of the applicant, as compared against their computer "signature". Our own Jerry Jensen (MN Board) provided a lively presentation which highlighted the need for multiple vehicles for education, especially in a state which tends to locate the major institutions close to major cities, while the state covers a much broader geographic area.

The last presentation in the day was a small group workshop, led by Emil Rodolfa. The group discussed international trained applicants and distance education. There was engaging discussion on the issue of the determination of competence. Questions were raised regarding the balance between service delivery, which requires a degree of proficiency in interpersonal communication skills and academic proficiency. While the group affirmed the idea that interpersonal proficiency was very important, there was also agreement that more solid research was needed to support that concept.

The day was successful in bringing several perspectives from different jurisdictions into view, and allowed for lively cross talk through the panels and discussion.

Presented by G. Jensen, MA, LP

### ***Sunday, October 21, 2007***

Sunday's agenda for the ASPPB meeting in Colorado Springs is below in italics. My comments are in regular type.

#### ***1). Psychologists with Personal and Health Issues: Assistance for Psychologists and a Proposed Resource for Regulatory Boards.***

Two members of APA's Advisory Committee on Colleague Assistance presented the topic of colleague assistance. Colleague Assistance programs are like Minnesota's Health Professionals Service Program (HPSP).

Minnesota's Gary Schoener and John Gonsiorek are noted for encouraging a culture shift from seeing psychologists with personal issues as "bad apples" to "it can happen to anyone". Like Minnesota, these programs seem to be strong in substance abuse interventions and not as strong in other areas (e.g. mental health) as substance abuse was the original focus. Not many suggestions were made about how to strengthen HPSP-like programs to be stronger in other areas.

The presenters (James Oraker and Len Tamura) suggested collaboration among local Psychological Associations, Boards, and Colleague Assistance Programs to strengthen the Colleague Assistance Program.

2). *Jurisdictional Updates.*

In addition to information provided in the handout book, members spoke about happenings in their jurisdiction. One person spoke of how well prescription authority has been working in Louisiana (I believe).

It is just my opinion, but it highlighted for me the importance of having a plan to address this issue. Wait and see will get us in a reactive mode rather than proactive.

- e. **Report from Citizen Advocacy Center (CAC) 2007 Annual Meeting.** This report was postponed until the December 7, 2007 Board meeting.
- f. **MPA's Request for Speaker.** Mark L. Miller, PsyD, LP, President of the Minnesota Psychological Association (MPA) sent a letter to the Board of Psychology inviting the Board to give a presentation on the proposed rules and the rationale for the changes at its Annual Convention on April 26, 2008. The organization asked that the presentation be followed by a question and answer period.

The Board discussed the request and determined that it can designate a speaker to attend the meeting and to present information about the Board, in general, and the rules promulgation process. However, the speaker will not address specific rule changes or the rationale for the rules. It is the Board's hopes that by April 26, 2008, licensees and other interested parties will have received the latest rule draft and the Board's Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR), which is the Board's rationale for the proposed rule changes. The Board believes that it is time to enter the final phase leading up to adoption, which will probably include public hearings.

A member pointed out that on several occasions, Board representatives have attended MPA meetings and led similar discussions. At a meeting on October 3, 2007, the Rules Committee (RC) responded to comparable questions from MPA leaders. Members could see no efficacy of again fielding questions about the rationale for the proposed rules.

Members of the Board stated that the public rule making process has been a long one. The current version of the rules represents drafts and re-drafts occurring over the past decade. In order to include the opinions and input from the Minnesota Psychological Association and others in the psychological community, the Board opted to work on these changes with the help of a Public Advisory Committee (PAC). Before any writing began, the PAC was formed and was heavily weighted with members of MPA and MPA's attorney. The Association's members have been involved in the rule making process from the beginning, MPA representatives have given input throughout the process, and the proposed draft represents the collaborative effort of the RC and the PAC. The Board has reviewed and approved the proposed rules and

has given the RC limited discretion to make only non-substantive changes at this point.

If the Board's participation is still requested under these circumstances, the Board can discuss at a future meeting the appropriate individual to send to the Convention on April 28, 2008 as its representative.

### 3. **Waivers/Variances.**

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.

Bridgeman, Harold, MA, LP	LP0408	10-31-07
Fogal, Kenneth G., MS, LP	LP0270	10-31-07
Lipe, Pamela S., MS, LP	LP0268	10-31-07
Roznovsky, Jane S., PhD, LP	LP0308	10-31-07

J. Wolf moved, seconded by J. Romano 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, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "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, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

07C-177	07C-169	07C-080
07C-150	07C-182	07C-168

### 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, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

07C-113	07C-177	06C-389
07C-175	07C-176	07C-169
07C-108	07C-056	07C-153
07C-146	05C-064	

**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, subdivision 2. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Anderson, Adam Scott	PhD
Bly, Terri Elofson	PsyD
Greenwood, Jacqueline Brigitte	PsyD
Hansen, Joseph William	PsyD
Horowitz, Jason Louis	PhD
Meyers, Laura Linda	PhD
Phillips, Kristi Kathleen	PsyD
Sesma, Heather Whitney	PhD
Siddiqui, Hina Zamir	PsyD
Stillman, Alexandra Michele	PhD
Van Voorst, Wendy Anne	PhD
Wandrei, Mary Lisa	PhD
Younge, Sara Marie	PsyD

**7. Licensure as Licensed Psychological Practitioner.**

Application Review Committee moved that the Applicant listed below be granted licensure as a Licensed Psychological Practitioner based upon a master's degree, 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, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Siefke-Harber, Lorna Kay	MA
--------------------------	----

**8. Re-Licensure Following Termination.**

The Application Review Committee moved approval of the re-Licensure of the following applicant. The applicant met all requirements for re-licensure in MN. Rule 7200.3610. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Tanya Dahms Sundberg, PhD (Board terminated for non-renewal 11-03-06)

**9. Conversion from Master's to Doctoral Level Licensed Psychologist Licensure.**

The Application Review Committee moved approval of the doctoral degree for the following master's level licensee on the basis that the degree meets the educational requirements for licensure. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

Elaine Marie Miller, MA, LP (PsyD)

**10. Emeritus Registration.**

The Application Review Committee moved that the following applicants be granted Emeritus Registration based upon fulfilling all requirements of MN. Stat. 148.9105. Voting "aye": M. Fulton, G. Jensen, J. Lee, T. Nguyen-Kelly, J. Romano, T. Thompson, S. Ward, and J. Wolf. Voting "nay": none. There being eight "ayes" and no "nays", motion carried unanimously.

**Shirley A. Bever, MA**

The applicant was originally licensed as a Licensed Psychologist on November 4, 1994 and completed an active career in good standing with the Board. Applicant retired from practice January 1, 2007.

**Diane Arlene Johnson, PhD**

The applicant was originally licensed as a Licensed Psychologist on July 15, 1993 and completed an active career in good standing with the Board. Applicant retired from practice May 31, 2000.

**11. 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:

Higgins, Jayn, MSE, LP	March 31, 2006	LP3438
Johnson, Phillip, MA, LP	February 28, 2007	LP3612
Palaganas, Mariella, MA, LP	May 31, 2006	LP3101

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

**12. Adjournment.**

J. Romano moved, seconded by M. Fulton that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

SUSAN HAYES  
Board Secretary