STATE OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

In the Matter of the Psychology License of
Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr., Ph.D., L.P.
License No. LP0039

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL ORDER

The above-entitled matter came on for prehearing conference on June 16, 2000, before Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Richard C. Luis, at the request of the Complaint Resolution Committee ("Committee") of the Minnesota Board of Psychology ("Board"). The matter was initiated pursuant to Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing, issued by the Committee on May 5, 2000. On June 21, 2000, the ALJ issued Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommendation with an accompanying Memorandum ("ALJ's Report), recommending that the Board take disciplinary action against the psychology license of Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr., Ph.D., L.P. ("Respondent") in that he has defaulted.

Paul R. Kempainen, Assistant Attorney General, Suite 1400, 445 Minnesota Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2131, represented the Committee. Respondent made no appearance.

The Board met to consider the matter on August 4, 2000, at University Park Plaza, 2829 University Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414. The following members of the Board were present: Samuel Albert, Ph.D., L.P.; Sharon R. Andrews; Marcia Farinacci; Jane C. Hovland, Ph.D., L.P.; Ralph D. Maves, M.S.; L.P.; James H. Peterson; Nicholas J. Ruiz, Ph.D., L.P.; and Jane White Schneeweis, M.A., L.P. Assistant Attorney General Paul R. Kempainen appeared and presented oral argument for the Committee. Respondent appeared and argued in his own behalf. Assistant Attorney General Robert T. Holley was present as counsel to the Board. As a member of the Committee, Samuel Albert, Ph.D., L.P., did not participate in deliberations and did not vote in the matter.

Based upon the case record and the proceedings in this matter, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Board adopts the Findings of Fact contained in the ALJ's Report, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Enclosure 1.

2. In addition, because Paragraph 4 of the ALJ's Findings specifically incorporates as true and deems proven the allegations set forth in the Committee's Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing, the Board hereby makes the following Findings of Fact based upon those allegations and the evidence in the record supporting them:

a. On August 1, 1975, Respondent became licensed as a psychologist in the State of Minnesota. During all times relevant herein, Respondent has continued to be licensed by the Board. In addition, Respondent has held licenses to practice psychology in Wisconsin and Michigan.

b. On or about July 21, 1998, a prosecuting attorney for the Wisconsin Department of Regulations, Division of Enforcement, served a Complaint, dated July 20, 1998, on Respondent. The allegations in the Complaint included that Respondent had engaged in sexual contact with a client two times, in July and August, 1994, and had failed to cooperate with an investigation of the State of Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board ("Wisconsin Board").

c. From January 27 to 29, 1999, Respondent participated in a hearing before an administrative law judge for the State of Wisconsin. During the hearing, Respondent testified in his own defense.

d. On November 2, 1999, the administrative law judge issued a Notice of Filing Proposed Decision and a Proposed Decision. The administrative law judge's recommendations included that the Wisconsin Board find that Respondent had engaged in sexual contact with a client and had failed to cooperate with an investigation of the Wisconsin Board.

e. In a Final Decision and Order, dated January 27, 2000, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Enclosure 2, the

Wisconsin Board concluded that Respondent had engaged in gross negligence in the practice of psychology and unprofessional conduct, including engaging in sexual intimacies with a client, failing to avoid dual relationships, and refusing to cooperate with the Wisconsin Board's investigation of a complaint filed against him. The Wisconsin Board revoked Respondent's Wisconsin license to practice psychology.

3. During the course of Wisconsin's disciplinary investigation, Respondent was also being investigated by the Committee. *See* Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing, Exhibit C at 12-13. Respondent was interviewed by the Committee in July 1997. He failed to cooperate with the investigation at that time by lying and giving contradictory information about his sexual contact with the aforesaid client. *Id.*

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Board adopts the Conclusions contained in the ALJ's Report (Enclosure 1).

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Board issues the following:

ORDER

1. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent's license as a licensed psychologist in the State of Minnesota is immediately **REVOKED.**

2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that (if he has not already done so) Respondent shall surrender his original license and current license renewal certificate to the Board. Respondent shall accomplish surrender by delivering personally or by certified mail said license and certificate to the Minnesota Board of Psychology, c/o Pauline Walker-Singleton, Executive Director, University Park Plaza, 2829 University Avenue S.E., Suite 320, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414, within five days after receipt of this Order.

3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall pay, within one year of the date of this Order, a civil penalty of $5,000 for his failure to cooperate with an investigation of this Board in July 1997.

Dated: 10 August, 2000

MINNESOTA BOARD
OF PSYCHOLOGY

By: Jane C. Hovland
JANE C. HOVLAND, PH.D., L.P.
Vice Chair

MEMORANDUM

It is not disputed that Respondent failed to appear at the scheduled prehearing conference in this matter before ALJ Richard C. Luis on June 16, 2000. The failure caused Respondent to be in default. *See* Minn. R. 1400.6000 (1997). As a result, the allegations set out in the Committee's Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing may be taken as true or deemed proved without further evidence. *Id.*

The Committee alleged that the Wisconsin Board revoked Respondent's license to practice psychology in that state on January 27, 2000, on the grounds of gross negligence and unprofessional conduct, including engaging in sexual intimacies with a client on two occasions, failing to avoid dual relationships with the client and refusing to cooperate with the Wisconsin Board's investigation of the matter. Under Minnesota Statutes, section 148.941, subdivision 2(a)(6)(1998), we are authorized to take disciplinary action against a licensee when that person's license has been revoked or otherwise acted against in any jurisdiction for cause. We have

adopted the ALJ's conclusion regarding the issue. It is plain from the record before us that the Wisconsin Board's revocation of Respondent's Wisconsin license was for cause. Likewise, on the basis of Respondent's default, we have deemed proved the Committee's allegation that Respondent failed to cooperate with the Committee's investigation in 1997.

Under the circumstances, disciplinary action clearly is warranted. Our decision to revoke Respondent's license was not reached in haste. We fully considered whether a less severe sanction could adequately protect the public and concluded it could not. Particularly troubling is Respondent's sexual contact with a client on multiple occasions, including sexual intercourse in Respondent's office during a therapy session. Such conduct violates the most basic rules of professional ethics and is inexcusable. Moreover, the record offers no suggestion that Respondent grasps the profoundly damaging impact his actions may have had on the client; nor is there any other evidence that rehabilitation is likely. The decision to revoke was unanimous.

We have also imposed a civil penalty. The Minnesota Psychology Practice Act authorizes penalties not to exceed $5,000 for each separate violation. Minn. Stat. §148.941, subd. 2(b)(6)(1998). Failure to cooperate with an investigation of the Board constitutes a violation for which a civil penalty may be imposed as a deterrent. *Id.* at subd. 2(a)(8). The majority of the Board is persuaded by the Committee's arguments that a total penalty of $5,000 is an appropriate assessment in this case to discourage others from failing to cooperate with Board investigations.[1]

BY THE BOARD

---

[1] James H. Peterson opposed the imposition of a civil penalty.

7-0907-12867-2

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR THE MINNESOTA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

In the Matter of the Psychology License of Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The above-entitled matter came on for prehearing conference before Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Richard C. Luis on June 16, 2000 at the Office of Administrative Hearings in Minneapolis.

Paul R. Kempainen, Assistant Attorney General, 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400, St. Paul, MN 55101-2131, appeared on behalf of the Complaint Resolution Committee of the Minnesota Board of Psychology ("Board"). There was no appearance by or on behalf of the Licensee, Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr. (Respondent). The record closed on June 16, 2000.

NOTICE

This Report is a recommendation, not a final decision. The Board of Psychology will make the final decision after a review of the record. The Board may adopt, reject or modify the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommendations. Under Minn. Stat. § 14.61, the final decision of the Board shall not be made until this Report has been made available to the parties to the proceeding for at least ten (10) days. An opportunity must be afforded to each party adversely affected by this Report to file exceptions and present argument to the Board. The parties should contact Pauline Walker-Singleton, Executive Director, Minnesota Board of Psychology, 2829 University Avenue SE, Suite 320, Minneapolis, MN 55414, for information regarding the filing of exceptions and/or presentation of argument.

STATEMENT OF ISSUE

Whether the State of Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board revoked the Licensee's psychology license for cause, and if it did, whether Wisconsin's revocation of the Licensee's psychology license constitutes grounds justifying the Minnesota Board of Psychology to take disciplinary action against the psychology license of Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr.?

Based upon all the proceedings herein, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On May 5, 2000 a Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing in this matter was mailed to the Licensee at this address: Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr., Route 2, Box 93A, Iron River WI 54847. The Notice scheduled a prehearing conference in this matter for June 16, 2000.

2. The Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing mailed to the Licensee contains the following statement, in bold type, on page 2:

> **If Respondent fails to appear without the prior consent of the Administrative Law Judge at a prehearing conference, settlement conference, or a hearing or if he fails to comply with any interlocutory order of the Administrative Law Judge , Respondent shall be deemed in default of this matter. Upon default, the allegations or issues set forth herein may be taken as true or deemed proved without further evidence, and the Board of Psychology may revoke, suspend and/or take other action against Respondent's license to practice psychology in the State of Minnesota, which may include imposition of an administrative penalty not exceeding $5,000 for each separate violation of law.**

3. The Respondent did not appear at the prehearing conference on June 16, 2000. On May 22, 2000, he filed a letter with the Administrative Law Judge, which letter alleges that the Licensee surrendered his Minnesota License in March, 2000, that he had closed all his offices on February 14, 2000 and terminated his practice. He added: "I have no money to hire attorneys nor am I medically able to participate in an administrative hearing to be proposed for June 16, 2000 in Minneapolis".

4. The allegations set forth in the Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing, and the Attachments thereto, are taken as true and deemed proven. The allegations are incorporated into these Findings by reference.

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Administrative Law Judge and the Board of Psychology have jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to Minn. Stat. §§ 14.50 and 148.941.

2. The Licensee was given timely and proper notice of the prehearing conference in this matter.

3. The Board of Psychology has complied with all relevant substantive and procedural requirements of law and rule.

4. Under Minn. Rule 1400.6000 (1997), the Licensee is in default as a result of his failure to appear at the scheduled prehearing conference. When a party defaults, the allegations and issues set out in the Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing may be taken as true or deemed proven without further evidence. Therefore, those allegations and issues are taken as true and deemed proven.

5. Based upon the facts set out in the Notice of and Order for Prehearing Conference and Hearing, the Respondent has had his psychology license revoked for cause by another jurisdiction (State of Wisconsin Psychology Examination Board) within the meaning of Minn. Stat. § 148.941, subd. 2(a)(6). As a result, his license is subject to the imposition of disciplinary action by the Board of Psychology.

Based upon the foregoing Conclusions, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

RECOMMENDATION

IT IS RECOMMENDED that disciplinary action be taken against the psychology license of Anthony D. Mullozzi, Jr.

Dated this 21st day of June, 2000.

RICHARD C. LUIS
Administrative Law Judge

Reported: Default

NOTICE

Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 14.62, subd. 1, the Board is required to serve its final decision upon each party and the Administrative Law Judge by first class mail or as otherwise provided by law.

MEMORANDUM

In its Final Decision and Order dated January 27, 2000, the Wisconsin Psychology Examining Board concluded that the Licensee had engaged in gross negligence in the practice of psychology and unprofessional conduct, including engaging in sexual intimacies with a client, failing to avoid dual relationships and refusing to cooperate with the Wisconsin Board's investigation of a complaint filed against him. The Administrative Law Judge has reviewed the situation underlying the revocation, as detailed in the Attachments to the Notice of and Order for Prehearing

Conference and Hearing. Based on that review, and on the conclusions of the Wisconsin Board, it is concluded that Wisconsin revoked the Respondent's psychology license for cause within the meaning of Minn. Stat. § 148.941, subd. 2(a)(6).

R.C.L.

ENCLOSURE 2

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE PSYCHOLOGY EXAMINING BOARD

RECEIVED
00 MAY -8 PM 12:10
ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARINGS

IN THE MATTER OF
DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST

ANTHONY D. MULLOZZI, Ph.D. LS9807211PSY

Respondent

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

The parties to this matter under § 227.44, Stats., and for purposes of review under § 227.53, Stats., are:

Anthony D. Mullozzi, Ph.D.
RR 2 Box 93A
Iron River, WI 54847

State of Wisconsin
Psychology Examining Board
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935

State of Wisconsin
Department of Regulation and Licensing
Division of Enforcement
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935

This proceeding was commenced by the filing of a Notice of Hearing and Complaint on July 21, 1998. A hearing was held in this matter on January 27-29, 1999. Attorney John Zwieg appeared on behalf of the Department of Regulation and Licensing, Division of Enforcement. Attorney Scott W. Clark, Clark & Clark Law Offices, appeared on behalf of the Respondent. The hearing transcript was filed by March 24, 1999. Closing arguments were filed on or before May 4, 1999.

The administrative law judge filed her Proposed Decision on November 2, 1999, and both parties filed objections to the Proposed Decision. The parties appeared before the board on January 12, 2000, for oral arguments on the objections, and the board considered the matter on that date.

Based upon the entire record herein, the Psychology Examining Board adopts as its Final Decision and Order in this matter the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Anthony D. Mullozzi (d.o.b., 06/23/43) is currently licensed as a psychologist in the State of Wisconsin, pursuant to license number 633, which was first granted on May 26, 1977.

2. Respondent's most recent address reported to the Department of Regulation and Licensing is RR 2, Box 93A, Iron River, Wisconsin 54847.

3. Dr. Mullozzi currently practices in Ashland and Superior, Wisconsin. In 1994 and 1995, he had an office at St. Mary's Hospital in Superior, Wisconsin. In the 1980s and up until 1995, he practiced as a psychologist in Duluth, Minnesota. He also had an office for about ten years in Iron River, Wisconsin, which was closed in 1994 or 1995.

4. Dr. Mullozzi provided individual psychotherapy to [redacted] on:

1994 : January 5, 11, 26; February 2, 23; March 16, 30; April 6, 22; May 5,19,26; June 6,16,30; July 7,14, 22, 28; August 4,12,18,25; September 1, 14, 23, 29; October 6, 18; November 4, 18, 22; December 2, 16, 27.
1995: January 13, 25; February 1; March 22, 29; April 5, 25; May 3, 18, 26; June 13, 22, 28.

Dr. Mullozzi provided group psychotherapy to [redacted] on the following dates:

1994: January 13; February 10; March 3; April 7; May 12; June 16; August 11; September 8; October 13; November 10; December 7.
1995: January 12; February 9; April 12; May 11; July 13; August 10; September 13; October 12; November 9.

5. On July 24, 1994, Dr. Mullozzi invited [redacted] to his home for a private party and allowed her to be dressed in only her underwear in his sauna.

6. Dr. Mullozzi had sexual contact, which included oral sex and intercourse, with [redacted] on July 24, 1994, while she was in the sauna at his home.

7. [redacted] was still a patient of Dr. Mullozzi at the time he had sexual contact with her on July 24, 1994.

8. Dr. Mullozzi had sexual contact, which included oral sex and intercourse, with [redacted] in his Duluth, Minnesota office in August, 1994, during a scheduled therapy session.

9. [redacted] was still a patient of Dr. Mullozzi at the time he had sexual contact with her in his Duluth, Minnesota office in August 1994.

10. On March 21, 1996, Geoffrey Gaston, a staff member of the Division of Enforcement interviewed Dr. Mullozzi at Dr. Mullozzi's office in Ashland, Wisconsin. During the interview, Dr. Mullozzi told Mr. Gaston that [redacted] had never been in his residence or in his sauna and that he and [redacted] did not have any sexual contact in his sauna.

11. In August 1997, the Division of Enforcement received a complaint alleging that Dr. Mullozzi had engaged in inappropriate conduct with another patient ("Patient Two"), while she was seeing him in his professional capacity from approximately 1979 through 1982.

12. On March 3, 1998, Dan Williams, an Investigator with the Division of Enforcement, sent two letters to Atty. William Lamb, one addressed to Dr. Mullozzi and the other addressed to Atty. Lamb. In his letter to Atty. Lamb, Mr. Williams asked whether he would be representing Dr. Mullozzi. In his letter to Dr. Mullozzi, Mr. Williams requested that he provide the following information by March 17, 1998:

> (1) A response to the allegation, including a summary of your involvement with the patient.
> (2) A copy of all records involving the care/treatment of this patient.
> (3) Any other relative information which you feel is of importance to the case.

13. Atty. Lamb received Investigator Williams' March 3 letters on March 6, 1998. On March 12, 1998, Atty. Lamb had a telephone conversation with Dr. Mullozzi regarding Investigator Williams' March 3 letters.

14. On March 19, 1998, Investigator Williams received a telephone call from Dr. Mullozzi. During the telephone call, Dr. Mullozzi informed Investigator Williams that:

> (1) He had recently received from Mr. Lamb's office the March 3 letters from Investigator Williams to Mr. Lamb and to Respondent.
>
> (2) He had not decided whether Mr. Lamb would be representing him in 97PSY032 and that he would be in contact with Mr. Lamb to make that decision.

(3) Because the care had been provided to Patient Two in the 1970s. the patient's records had been destroyed.

(4) The patient's allegations were not true.

(5) He or Mr. Lamb would call Investigator Williams to advise when they would be submitting a written response to the March 3,1998 letter.

15. Between April 8, 1998 and May 20, 1998 Investigator Williams and Atty. Lamb communicated with each other at least nine times regarding the information requested by Mr. Williams in his March 3, 1998 letters including whether Mr. Lamb would be representing Dr. Mullozzi.

16. A written response to the information requested by Mr. Williams in his March 3, 1998 letters to Atty. Lamb and Dr. Mullozzi was never provided by Atty. Lamb or Dr. Mullozzi.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Psychology Examining Board has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to s. 455.09 Wis. Stats., and ch. Psy 5, Wis. Adm. Code.

2. Respondent's conduct as described in Findings of Fact (5) - (7) herein, constitutes unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (14) (1994), in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

3. Respondent's conduct as described in Findings of Fact (5) - (7) herein, constitutes gross negligence in the practice of psychology and is unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (2) in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g) and (h), Stats.

4. By engaging in the conduct described in Findings of Fact (5) - (7) herein, respondent failed to avoid dual relationships or relationships which is unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (17), Code, in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

5. Respondent's conduct as described in Findings of Fact (8) - (9) herein, constitutes unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (14) (1994), in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

6. Respondent's conduct as described in Findings of Fact (8) - (9) herein, constitutes gross negligence in the practice of psychology and is unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (2) in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g) and (h), Stats.

7. By engaging in the conduct described in Findings of Fact (8) - (9) herein,

respondent failed to avoid dual relationships or relationships which is unprofessional conduct under s. Psy 5.01 (17), Code, in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

8. By refusing to cooperate with the Board's investigation of a complaint file against him, as described in Findings of Fact (10) herein, respondent committed unprofessional conduct as defined in s. Psy 5.01 (24), Code in violation of s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

9. Respondent's conduct, as described in Findings of Fact (11) through (16) herein, does not constitute unprofessional conduct as defined in s. Psy 5.01 (24), Code and does not violate s. 455.09 (1) (g), Stats.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the license of, Anthony D. Mullozzi, to practice as a psychologist in the State of Wisconsin be, and hereby is, revoked.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

1. Counts VII, VIII and X of the Complaint are dismissed.

2. Pursuant to s. 440.22 Wis. Stats., the cost of this proceeding shall be assessed against Respondent, and shall be payable to the Department of Regulation and Licensing.

This order is effective on the date on which it is signed on behalf of the Psychology Examining Board.

EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE

The Psychology Examining Board has accepted the proposed Decision of the administrative law judge, Ruby Jefferson-Moore in its entirety, with two exceptions. First, the ALJ concluded that respondent's conduct set forth at Finding of Fact #5 constituted a failure to avoid dual relationships in violation of sec. Psy 5.01(17), Code, but did not constitute gross negligence in the practice of psychology, in violation of sec. Psy 5.01(2), Code. The board concludes otherwise.

Finding of Fact #5 states that, "on July 24, 1994, Dr. Mullozzi invited [redacted] to his home for a private party and allowed her to be dressed in only her underwear in his sauna." Each contact between a psychologist and his or her client during the period of ongoing psychological treatment constitutes a psychologist-patient interaction, and any such contact therefore involves the performance of professional duties by the psychologist. For respondent to invite [redacted] into his sauna with him while she was dressed only in her underwear would without question

have a negative impact on their continuing professional relationship, and it follows that his conduct in that regard constituted gross negligence in the practice of psychology in violation of sec. N 5.01(2), Code. Conclusion of Law #3 has been modified to reflect that determination.

The other modification to the ALJ's Proposed Decision is to order that respondent's license be revoked rather that the license be suspended for six months.

It is well established that the objective of licensing discipline is the protection of the public by promoting the rehabilitation of the licensee and by deterring other licensees from engaging in similar misconduct. *State v. Aldrich,* 71 Wis. 2d 206 (1976). Punishment of the licensee is not an appropriate consideration. *State v. McIntyre*, 41 Wis. 2d 481 (1968). Even assuming that rehabilitation is possible in this case, imposition of a simple suspension of the license with automatic reinstatement at the end of six months offers no assurance that rehabilitation will have occurred or will even have been attempted. Nor would suspending the license for one year, the maximum period of suspension possible under sec. 455.09(1), Stats., offer any such assurance. Should respondent make an earnest effort at reformation, and should he at some future time be able to demonstrate to the board by clear and convincing evidence that his rehabilitation is complete, then he may petition the board at that time to reinstate the license. Respondent's burden in making such a demonstration will be great, however, and no fixed-term suspension, however long, will suffice to ensure that reinstatement is justified.

Deterring other licensees from engaging in the same or similar conduct also militates for revocation of respondent's license. Respondent's misconduct was intentional, repeated and potentially devastating to his patient. To suspend his license for some fixed period, without more, has the potential for sending a message to other licensees who might be tempted to engage in grossly improper relationships with patients or clients that they may engage in the most egregious possible misconduct without being barred from practicing their profession for more than one year. The board therefore deems revocation of the license to be the only disciplinary sanction which adequately subserves the disciplinary objectives.

Dated this 27th day of January, 2000.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
PSYCHOLOGY EXAMINING BOARD

by _____, PhD
Barbara A. Van Horne, Ph.D.
Chair

WRA:2001212.doc