

**STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY OF OHIO**

JULY 9, 2008

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

RIFFE CENTER, ROOM 1918

COLUMBUS

**CURRENT BOARD MEMBERS:**

President\*: Kathryn R. Shroder, Ph.D. – Licensee Member 2008<sup>1</sup>

Secretary: Julie Harmon, Ph.D. – Licensee Member 2009

Kevin D. Arnold, Ph.D., ABPP – Licensee Member 2008

Michael Distelhorst – Consumer Advocate Member 2008

Ann Kathleen Burlew, Ph.D. – Licensee Member 2010

Jane Z. Woodrow, Ph.D. – Licensee Member 2010

Gayle Lanctot— Consumer Advocate Member 2011

Willie Williams, Ph.D.—Licensee Member 2011

Pam Mattson—Consumer Advocate Organization Representative Member 2012

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ronald R. Ross, Ph.D., Executive Director; Kelli Coleman DelGuzzo, Investigator; Carolyn Knauss, Investigator

**LEGAL COUNSEL:** Roger F. Carroll, Principal Assistant Attorney General

**VISITORS:** Michael Ranney, Executive Director, OPA; Marty Traver, Ph.D., OPA Liaison to the Board; Ann Brennan, Ohio School Psychologists Association (OSPA); Glenn Karr, Attorney at Law.

**10:35 AM MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** by Dr. Shroder; Dr. Harmon called roll:

Dr. Burlew	Absent
Dr. Shroder	Present
Ms. Lanctot	Present
Dr. Arnold	Absent
Dr. Woodrow	Present
Dr. Williams	Present
Dr. Harmon	Present
Mr. Distelhorst	Present
Ms. Mattson	Present

Dr. Shroder opened the meeting by welcoming the visitors present. Drs. Arnold and Burlew then arrived and joined the meeting at 10:36 am and 10:37 am, respectively.

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 7, 2008 MINUTES**

Dr. Shroder invited discussion about the draft minutes as distributed with the agenda. After hearing no comments or corrections, Dr. Shroder asked for a wording correction to one sentence on page 4, which was discussed with the Board and agreed to. Dr. Williams offered a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Dr. Woodrow second.

A vote was taken\*

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Williams; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst.

Nay: None

Abstain: Ms. Mattson

---

<sup>1</sup> Year Board Member term ends

\* President votes only to break a tie

**The motion carried.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Dr. Shroder invited the Board to review the consent agenda. Specific to the Entrance Examiner's report, Dr. Harmon asked that the record reflect that she would abstain from voting on the licensure of Dr. Christina Kraft. Similarly, Dr. Arnold stated that he would abstain from approving the licensure of Dr. Ronald Levant and the 30-day practice permission granted to Dr. Phillip Stahl. Dr. Shroder asked that the record reflect her abstention from voting on the licensure of Dr. Jeffery Baker. The Entrance Examiner's report as presented for approval for the dates March 1, 2008 through June 30, 2008:

**PSYCHOLOGISTS:** Under the respective Ohio Revised Code sections

**4732.12:**

Anne Elizabeth Croskey, Ph.D.	#6436	Issued: 3/6/2008
Joshua William Shuman, Psy.D.	#6437	Issued: 3/6/2008
Young R. Shim, Ph.D.	#6438	Issued: 3/6/2008
Karla Anhalt, Ph.D.	#6439	Issued: 3/6/2008
Garret L. Gilmer, Ph.D.	#6440	Issued: 3/6/2008
Jelena Pavlovic Stevanovic, Ph.D.	#6441	Issued: 3/25/2008
Irina Sumajin Parkins, Ph.D.	#6442	Issued: 3/31/2008
Mindy R. Sefferino, Psy.D.	#6443	Issued: 3/31/2008
Elizabeth A. Beilstein, Ph.D.	#6444	Issued: 3/31/2008
Rebecca Brewer, Ph.D.	#6445	Issued: 3/31/2008
Teresa S. Lance, Ph.D.	#6446	Issued: 4/24/2008
Bridgette Wiggers, Ph.D.	#6447	Issued: 4/24/2008
Arena Mueller, Psy.D.	#6448	Issued: 4/24/2008
Rahema C. Rodgers, Psy.D.	#6449	Issued: 4/28/2008
Jeffery Baker, Ph.D.	#6450	Issued: 4/28/2008
Barry Beckman, Psy.D.	#6451	Issued: 4/28/2008
Karen Banks Tabern, Psy.D.	#6452	Issued: 5/29/2008
Christina Kraft, Ph.D.	#6454	Issued: 6/13/2008
Holly Nicole Harris, Ph.D.	#6460	Issued: 6/20/2008
Pamela Merritt Nilsson, Ph.D.	#6455	Issued: 6/26/2008
Sherry Haggins, Ph.D.	#6456	Issued: 6/26/2008
Tiffany C. Rush-Wilson, Ph.D.	#6457	Issued: 6/26/2008
Martin Kyle Johnson, Psy.D.	#6458	Issued: 6/26/2008
Laurie A. Greco, Ph.D.	#6459	Issued: 6/26/2008
Eric C. Drown, Psy.D.	#6461	Issued: 6/27/2008

**4732.15:**

Ronald F. Levant, Ed.D. ABPP	#6453-MA	Issued: 6/13/2008
------------------------------	----------	-------------------

**SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST**

Habeebah Rasheed Grimes, Psy.S	#SP580	Issued: 6/30/2008
--------------------------------	--------	-------------------

**REINSTATEMENT**

Marlana B. Esposito, Ed.S	#SP542	Issued: 5/19/2008
---------------------------	--------	-------------------

**THIRTY-DAY PRACTICE [4732.22(B)]**

Philip M. Stahl, Ph.D., ABPP

Arizona

Issued: 5/14/2008

Discussion was heard relative to terminology in the budget report, which Dr. Ross addressed by clarifying quarterly vs. annual allotments in OAKS. There were no other concerns heard relative to the consent agenda. Dr. Arnold made a motion to accept the consent agenda; Dr. Harmon second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Williams; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst;  
Ms. Mattson

Nay: None

Abstain: Dr. Harmon and Arnold as noted above

Note: Dr. Shroder, as President did not vote, although the record reflects her abstention from voting on the license of Dr. Baker.

**The motion carried.**

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Dr. Shroder invited discussion in an effort to set another meeting date after November 21, 2008. Dr. Ross suggested the Board consider something in April 2009, in an effort to avoid inclement weather. After an attempt to find a suitable date it was decided by consensus and at the suggestion of Dr. Shroder that the Board schedule 2009 meetings at the next scheduled business meeting of the Board on November 21, 2008.

Dr. Shroder then advised all that Shellie Dubose, Administrative Assistant 1, has left employment with the Board for an opportunity in private sector Human Resources. Dr. Shroder and others were heard expressing gratitude and well-wishes to Ms. Dubose as she enters into a different line of work.

Dr. Shroder turned to Dr. Arnold for an update on the Board's proposed taskforce in re: Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA). Dr. Arnold reported that on June 12, 2008 he and Dr. Ross met with Jody Fisher and Kevin Aldridge of the Ohio Department of MR/DD. The meeting was a follow-up to their meeting in late 2007 with Director Martin and Robin Harris of the Governor's Office. Dr. Arnold summarized the June 12 meeting, highlighting the focus on: ORC 4732 scope of practice; certification by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board; and, strategies to address the prospect of serving the public interest by bringing ABA under ORC 4732 through rule revisions. He reported, and Dr. Ross concurred, that the major concepts seemed acceptable to the MR/DD representatives and that we were assured that a return contact was pending after review with the Governor's Office (Health and Human Services). Dr. Ross briefly added that one possible outcome would be that, following rule updates, all ABA services in Ohio would be performed by psychologists and/or their registered supervisees, who prospectively could be subject to enhanced requirements (e.g., training and/or certification) before being registered. This was preliminary and hypothetical, however, and Dr. Ross confirmed that he has not yet heard from the Governor's Office. Dr. Arnold also reported that this process could result in a need for additional

educational opportunities for psychologists—to develop and sustain competencies—which could be addressed by OPA and OSPA.

### **BOARD OFFICER ELECTIONS**

Dr. Shroder then turned the Board's attention to the annual election of Board officers. She nominated Dr. Harmon to serve as President for a one-year term beginning October 5, 2008. Dr. Williams immediately moved that nominations be closed and Mr. Distelhorst, among others, quickly seconded the motion. Dr. Shroder asked for a vote on the nomination of Dr. Julie Harmon to serve as the Board President.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Williams; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson  
Nay: None  
Abstain: Dr. Harmon

**The motion carried.**

Congratulations and applause were heard.

Next, Dr. Shroder asked for nominations for Secretary. Mr. Distelhorst nominated Dr. Williams; Dr. Harmon seconded. Dr. Woodrow asked that nominations be closed, and there were no other nominations heard.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson  
Nay: None  
Abstain: Dr. Williams

**The motion carried.**

Congratulations and applause were again heard.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

#### **Criminal Background Check Rule Filing Approval**

Dr. Ross began his report by apologizing for failing to get the Board's approval, during the March 7, 2008 meeting, to file rule language on the new criminal background check law in ORC 4732.091. He referenced the draft rule distributed with the meeting agenda and briefly reviewed processes and some recent exchanges of information among his colleague board administrators about the background check process. The draft was presented:

4732-9-04      **Criminal records check.**

(A) In addition to the requirements established in rules 4732-9-01, 4732-9-02 and 4732-9-03 of the Administrative Code, all applicants for initial licensure as a psychologist or school psychologist shall submit to a criminal records check completed by the bureau of criminal identification and investigation in accordance with section 4732.091 of the revised code.

- (B) The board shall not grant a license to an applicant for an initial license to practice psychology or school psychology unless the applicant completes a criminal background check and the board, in its discretion, decides that the results do not make the applicant ineligible for a license.
- (C) The applicant requesting a criminal records check shall submit with a request to the bureau of criminal identification and investigation: a completed copy of a form prescribed under division (C)(1) of section 109.572 of the revised code; a set of fingerprint impressions obtained as described in division (C)(2) of section 109.572 of the revised code; the applicant's name and address; the board's name and address; and, a request that the superintendent of the bureau of criminal identification and investigation obtain from the federal bureau of investigation any information it has pertaining to the applicant.
- (D) The board shall only accept results of a criminal records check submitted to the board directly from the bureau of criminal identification and investigation.
- (E) The applicant shall bear all costs associated with the criminal records check as determined by the bureau of criminal identification and investigation, the federal bureau of investigation, and by any agency with authority to charge a fee for fingerprint impressions.

Dr. Burlew asked about considering a list of offenses that would help guide decision-making when there is a criminal history. Dr. Ross thanked her for bringing that up, as he also recalled discussion from March 2008, initiated by Dr. Arnold, about the development of a rubric that would serve to inform decision-making in response to an applicant having a criminal history reported to the Board office. Dr. Ross called attention to 4732.17 (A) (1), which allows the Board to refuse to issue a license when there is a felony or other conviction of a crime, and suggested retaining the current case-by-case review of each application by the Entrance Examiner, working in conjunction with a supervising member, investigator, and AAG.

Additional discussion followed about the pros and cons of developing a list of offenses for publication serving to advise applicants of certain offenses and the likelihood of encountering licensure barriers if such an offense is in one's history. Mr. Distelhorst noted that there are state laws relative to nursing homes which may be instructive to the board in this regard, and suggested that he'd benefit from Mr. Carroll's review of the topic. Mr. Karr added that, ultimately, should the Board refuse to issue a license under 4732.17 (A) (1), an appeal would likely end up in the Tenth District Court of Appeals, which would decide on the question of "moral turpitude" if the offense was not a felony.

Dr. Burlew suggested that the Board consider devising a list of offenses for applicants and Dr. Arnold agreed that there needs to be some methodology involving the decision-making process in response to certain information about an applicant's criminal history. Mr. Carroll joined the discussion by sharing that the Ohio Department of Education's approach includes a list of offenses, conviction of which results in automatic disqualification for certain licenses.

Dr. Ross summarized the current in-office processes and the discussion, and Dr. Traver suggested that the Board should consider publishing guidelines in the application about the need to report "expunged" and juvenile records. Dr. Ross reported that he receives periodic calls from prospective applicants with felony histories. He explained that he routinely advises all callers that, when questions arise as to whether an applicant should report certain offenses

and convictions, they should handle their application responses with the assistance of a knowledgeable attorney. Dr. Burlew then summarized some advantages and disadvantages of publishing a list of offenses that could disqualify an applicant. Dr. Ross and others thanked her for the summary, and then emphasized the importance of retaining flexibility as regulators, given the importance of context and rehabilitation. The same offense on paper for two applicants could reasonably reflect extremely different contexts, personalities, and capacities to be a psychologist. Dr. Arnold called attention to the obvious risks of issuing a license to a person with certain histories, even considering context and letters of support, and cites an example that the Board has dealt with. He voiced concerns about the Board's responsibility to draw lines in certain circumstances.

Dr. Ross, in the interest of time, asked for consensus to suspend discussion and to retain this agenda item for the November 21 agenda, and returned the Board's attention to the rule draft. Without delay, the Board agreed to proceed, and Dr. Williams moved to direct Dr. Ross to file the rule language as distributed so that a public hearing could be held on November 21, 2008. Dr. Woodrow second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson;  
Dr. Williams

Nay: None

Abstain: None

**The motion carried.**

### **Workplace Domestic Violence Policy**

Dr. Ross called attention to the draft Domestic Violence in the Workplace policy distributed with the agenda and offered a brief summary of its roots—in Governor Strickland's Executive Order and in DAS policy. There were no concerns voiced about the draft and Dr. Burlew, at Dr. Shroder's request for motions, moved to approve the policy (Dr. Harmon second).

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms.  
Mattson; Dr. Williams

Nay: None

Abstain: None

**The motion carried.**

### **HB503 Update and Rule Drafting**

Dr. Ross summarized the process leading to the unanimous passage of HB503 in the House, and the likely introduction of the bill in the Senate in the coming months. In preparation for the prospective statutory revision to sequence of training and degree requirements, Dr. Ross asked for a formal action to reconstitute the Board's Rules Committee, so that a draft of relevant rules can be prepared so that rules can be timely filed should the new law go into effect in 2009. He asked the Board to approve a process whereby OPA and OSPA could have 2-3 representatives

actively involved in the process with members of the board. In addition, he asked if there were members present who wanted to engage in the process, and Drs. Harmon, Shroder, and Woodrow indicated their interest. There was strong consensus among the Board and visitors that a transparent, collaborative process at this stage will be the best approach to addressing the anticipated need to define “what counts” among pre-internship training experiences, should HB503 become law.

At Dr. Shroder’s request for a motion, Dr. Williams moved that the Board authorize Dr. Ross to schedule a meeting of a Rules Committee, which will serve to make recommendations to the Board about administrative regulations that would clarify the prospective changes to ORC 4732.10. Ms. Lanctot second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson;  
Dr. Williams

Nay: None

Abstain: None

**The motion carried.**

**School-based training supervision:** At Dr. Shroder’s recommendation, this topic was addressed next in an effort to ensure that Dr. Arnold could participate in the discussion, given his need to leave early to attend to pre-existing professional commitments. Dr. Ross called attention to the two scenarios that he had distributed with the agenda, and with the March agenda, although discussion on March 7, 2008 was tabled due to time constraints:

School-based training supervision scenarios for discussion

- 1) An ODE-licensed school psychologist is enrolled in a school psychology doctoral program and, by virtue of being employed in a school setting because of the ODE credential, remains in that setting and registers under a psychologist for training supervision in anticipation of Psychology Board licensure. The student is registered with the Board as a “trainee” and proceeds to meet job requirements, while complying with the Psychology Board supervision rules. This includes using the disclosure statement and a proper title that indicates the training status, such as “School Psychology Intern” or “School Psychology Trainee.” The school administration would be aware of the nature of the supervised relationship and the fact that 1800 hours of time in the school is being conceptualized as the unlicensed practice of psychology—under supervision—for the purpose of professional training under Psychology Board requirements. Although the person is employed explicitly because she holds the ODE school psychology credential, the school system is OK with the parameters and supervision issues because the school’s needs are still being met, while the student is having professional training/experience needs satisfied. The supervisor is not paid by the supervisee and has authority for the assignment and management of the services being rendered by the supervisee.
- 2) A doctoral student does not hold the ODE school psychologist license, but is in a doctoral program that places students in public schools for training. The student is registered with the Board as a psychology trainee, under a psychologist or Board-licensed school psychologist, and all of the supervision rules are followed. This includes using the Board-required disclosure statement and a proper title that indicates the training status, such as “Psychology Trainee.” The school administration is aware of the nature of the supervised relationship and the fact that 1,800 hours of time in the school is being conceptualized as the unlicensed practice of psychology—under supervision—for the purpose of professional training under State Board of Psychology licensure requirements. The supervisor is not paid by the supervisee and has authority for the assignment and management of the services being rendered by the supervisee. The experience involves standard applied-practice in school psychology, and the experience satisfies ODE requirements for a school-based internship required for the ODE license. Because the experience is being supervised in compliance with Board supervision rules (by a Board licensee), the student wishes to have the hours considered in satisfaction of one

of the two years of supervised experience required for admission to Board psychology licensure exams (once the PhD is completed). The hours would essentially be applied toward applications for two licenses—the ODE credential and the Board license.

After Dr. Ross attempted to highlight some of the issues raised in the scenarios, members of the Board, including Drs. Harmon and Arnold clarified the issues and helped to focus the discussion. Relative to each scenario, discussion resulted in consensus that there were no apparent conflicts with Board rules, and for that reason, the scenarios did not appear to raise concerns. Dr. Ross acknowledged that the scenarios were written in a manner that actually highlighted reasonable and careful approaches to pre-licensure training in school settings. Dr. Shroder reminded the Board that an issue present, based on her recollection of circumstances in some settings, relates to the use of the title “school psychologist” by an ODE-credentialed school employee concurrent with being registered as a psychology or school psychology trainee for work in the same setting. Comments were heard from Mr. Distelhorst, Dr. Woodrow, Dr. Harmon and others, consistent with the belief that, as long as there is compliance with Board law and rules, the use of a title “school psychologist” (which is legal and necessary based on holding the ODE-issued credential) is not seen to be a problem, given that it is not misleading or inaccurate. Dr. Ross clarified that for those supervisees who do not hold such a credential, that title would obviously be misleading and deceptive. Consensus was reached in response to Dr. Harmon’s statement that, in cases in which the board-registered trainee *does* have such a credential issued by ODE, as long as it is not misleading, continued use of it seems perfectly acceptable. Discussion was also heard about the importance of clarification with school administration about the employee’s status, title, and role, and that there are clearly situations in which a school-employed ODE-licensed school psychologist can remain in his or her job and receive training in partial fulfillment of the Board’s school psychologist (and in some cases, the psychologist) license. As part of the discussion, Dr. Arnold briefly explained the historical and contemporary status of the specialty area of “School Psychology,” and highlighted its place as an APA-recognized specialty in the practice of psychology.

### **OPA Colleague Assistance Efforts and Proposal**

Dr. Ross asked that attention turn to a draft proposal from the OPA Committee on Colleague Assistance, with whom he has been interacting in an effort to facilitate future law and/or rule changes in an effort to formalize a program (in the proposal the program is referred to as “Ohio Colleague Assistance Program, “OCAP”). He began by highlighting his ongoing concern that many licensees, in spite of laws and rules and rights afforded to psychological service recipients, do not appreciate that they can seek services for themselves without fear of being reported to the Board. Licensees enjoy to same right to privacy, confidentiality, and privilege as any other person entering into a confidential relationship with a psychologist or other professional. There was general consensus that this is related to the “culture of fear” that has been discussed previously, and which is presumed to serve as a barrier to help-seeking among Board licensees.

Mr. Distelhorst called on his experience in colleague assistance in the legal profession, and noted an Ohio Supreme Court rule that “relaxes” or eliminates the requirement to report a colleague, depending on the colleague’s participation in the Ohio Lawyer Assistance Program (OLAP). This related to the concept of “safe passage” that the Board has discussed at various meetings, and which the OPA and Dr. Ross have repeatedly returned to as a necessary component of a program. Discussion was active, and repeatedly there was consensus from different perspectives, that licensees should be reminded that they are *currently* able to seek confidential services for any reason, including distress whether or not related to use of alcohol and/or other drugs. In addition, discussion returned several times to the concept that the development of a

program such as that proposed by the OPA must afford clear procedures for confidential services, such that a licensee could and should be able to self-refer for evaluation and treatment without the Board having knowledge of that. There was also consensus that, should the Board receive a client complaint alleging misconduct relative to possible impairment, then it is likely too late to afford such a right to keep program involvement private (although at that stage the Board and the public and the licensee could benefit from having the program in place to facilitate evaluation, treatment, and reporting to the Board about risks and return to practice issues). Absent a client complaint, the program would not communicate to the Board about a licensee's participation without the licensee's consent, or absent violation of to-be-established program rules.

Discussion was heard relative to the proposed populations to be served. Dr. Shroder called attention to the appearance that only OPA members would be eligible for services, and Mr. Ranney clarified that, in fact, all licensees would be eligible. In addition, there was discussion about the ongoing conversations within the OPA committee about the extension of benefits to graduate students and OPA staff members. Dr. Traver offered one perspective such that this type of program should be available exclusively to professional psychologists, and Dr. Harmon added that the prospective cost of serving graduate students would seem to, on its own accord, support limiting services to licensees. Mr. Distelhorst explained the OLAP model, which emphasizes early identification and intervention and for that reason is open to law students.

Dr. Shroder asked Mr. Carroll whether, should the Board participate financially in the operation of such a program, there were risks that the Board could incur liability if a program provider engaged in misconduct relative to a licensee/participant. She clarified that she wondered if, based on the OPA proposal, "approved" program providers would implicitly be "approved" by the Board. Mr. Carroll noted the importance of such a concern and agreed to conduct some research into Dr. Shroder's question.

Mr. Ranney expressed his thanks to the Board for its approach and his gratitude to Dr. Ross for leadership in this regard.

Dr. Arnold excused himself at 12:00 PM and received the thanks and well-wishes of those present, and he clarified that unless his position is filled by an appointment, he plans to attend the November 21, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Distelhorst noted that this discussion raises what is a clear and legitimate public protection issue, and there were numerous comments heard indicating strong consensus with the notion that the public will ultimately benefit if Ohio's psychologists and school psychologists have access to a program offering prevention, education, evaluation, and intervention services.

The issue of using Board funds to participate in program support was discussed. Mr. Distelhorst noted that the Supreme Court helps to fund OLAP, so there is apparently precedence for using public money for such program.. Dr. Ross confirmed for all present that he has attempted to identify FY08 and FY09 funds to "seed" this program, but has been advised that we are not able to spend funds on this initiative without explicit statutory authority. He advised that the most recent draft of ORC 4732, for updating, includes a section specifying this exact type of program.

Finally, Dr. Ross reported that it appears that the Board, by consensus, has green-lighted additional program development, and he agreed to continue in related discussions with representatives of the emerging program.

## **12:50 PM LUNCH RECESS**

Dr. Shroder announced that those who purchased a lunch were invited to the office on the 18<sup>th</sup> floor, as food is not to be in the 19<sup>th</sup> floor conference rooms.

## **1:20 PM PUBLIC SESSION RESUMED**

Dr. Ross noted for the record that all members had returned from lunch, with the exception of Dr. Arnold, who had departed for the day.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT, CONTINUED**

### **ASPPB Interjurisdictional Practice Certificate (IPC)**

Dr. Ross asked the Board to turn its attention to the ASPPB announcement concerning the new "IPC." He summarized the purpose of the certificate, and there was discussion about its genesis in recent natural disasters in the United States. Dr. Ross clarified that the IPC, if recognized by the Board through a rule change, would streamline processes in the office relative to reviewing applications for permission to practice for no more than thirty days per year under ORC 4732.22 (B). He reminded the Board that the Board's acceptance of the ASPPB Certificate of Professional Qualification (CPQ), dating to the 1990's, results in licensure of experienced psychologists who may not meet the 3600-hour training requirement in our law (because the CPQ requires 3000 hours). Similarly, the IPC would result in the granting of the Board's 30-day permit to experienced psychologists meeting the IPC requirements, although successful applicants may or may not meet the licensure qualifications in 4732.10. Finally, Dr. Ross advised the Board that as an active member of the ASPPB, recognizing this new certificate would be appropriate, given that ultimately it will serve to decrease resources needed in the office when confronted with nonresidents seeking permission to practice under 4732.22 (B).

Dr. Harmon made a motion to direct the Executive Director to engage in processes necessary to formally recognize the ASPPB IPC, including drafting a rule amendment for consideration at the next meeting of the Board. Mr. Distelhorst second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Dr. Arnold; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson;  
Dr. Williams

Nay: None

Abstain: None

**The motion carried.**

### **"Face-to-Face" Supervision Requirement in the Internet Age**

Next, the Board was asked to review the narrative sent with the agenda concerning inquiries received by Dr. Ross about the use of internet-based technologies to conduct psychological supervision. He explained that OAC 4732-13-04 (B) (17) and (22) (C) were promulgated prior to the availability of "web cams" and other technologies now quite prevalent. Therefore, he assured the Board that, in response to inquiries from supervisors and supervisees, he routinely advises

that the “face-to-face” supervision requirement can comfortably be understood to require being in the same room. He also stated that anybody using such technologies would be required to ensure that the connections are secure and that efforts are made to disguise any identities.

Discussion followed. Dr. Traver raised a concern about supervisors getting too much distance from the supervisory relationship, should there be a formal action approving the use of such technologies. Dr. Harmon and Dr. Shroder voiced agreement with Dr. Traver’s concern. Dr. Ross stated that the Board may wish to consider allowing a certain amount of supervision time to occur via secure electronic means. Dr. Burlew described what she perceived, at the University of Cincinnati, to be an excellent use of internet-based communications in educational programs and consultations for mental health professionals.

Dr. Ross remarked that the reconstituted Rules Committee would be a logical forum for this issue, given that the group will be recommending new rules relative to training time, training activities, and supervision. After brief discussion he asked if there was consensus to assign this to the Rules Committee, and the Board agreed to that suggestion.

Dr. Ross then asked for a few minutes to review HB285, a new law to take effect later in 2008, and which requires regulatory entities to waive first-time paperwork violations committed by small businesses if exceptions are not met. He briefly reviewed the LSC summary of the law and asked Mr. Carroll if, because the Board does not license “small businesses” per se, the law might not clearly relate to our activities. Mr. Carroll stated that it is possible that it does, in fact, pertain to individual license holders, and stated that he would research this issue and report back at the next meeting. Dr. Ross thanked him for his willingness to assist.

At that point, Dr. Shroder solicited a motion to enter Executive Session. Dr. Woodrow moved that the Board enter Executive Session for the purpose of discussing pending legal matters. Dr. Williams second.

Dr. Harmon conducted a roll call vote:

Dr. Burlew	Yes
Dr. Shroder	Yes
Ms. Lanctot	Yes
Dr. Williams	Yes
Dr. Harmon	Yes
Mr. Distelhorst	Yes
Dr. Woodrow	Yes
Ms. Mattson	Yes
Dr. Arnold	Absent

**2:00 PM EXECUTIVE SESSION BEGAN**

**2:25 PM PUBLIC SESSION RESUMED**

Dr. Harmon called roll:

Dr. Burlew	Present
Dr. Shroder	Present
Ms. Lanctot	Present
Dr. Woodrow	Present

Dr. Williams	Present
Dr. Harmon	Present
Mr. Distelhorst	Present
Ms. Mattson	Present
Dr. Arnold	Absent

Dr. Shroder asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agreement presented for consideration in Executive Session. Mr. Distelhorst offered a motion to approve the Consent Agreement reviewed in Executive Session; Dr. Williams second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson; Dr. Williams  
Nay: None  
Abstain: Dr. Woodrow

**The motion carried. Ms. Knauss, at Dr. Shroder's invitation, announced that the subject of the approved Consent Agreement, resulting in license revocation, is Elizabeth Semenchuk of North Royalton**

Dr. Harmon moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Williams second.

A vote was taken:

Aye: Dr. Woodrow; Dr. Burlew; Ms. Lanctot; Dr. Harmon; Mr. Distelhorst; Ms. Mattson; Dr. Williams  
Nay: None  
Abstain: None

**The motion carried.**

**2:30 PM** Dr. Shroder adjourned the meeting.

**[SIGNED COPY ON FILE IN BOARD OFFICE]**

---

Ronald R. Ross, Ph.D.  
Executive Director

---

Kathryn R. Shroder, Ph.D.  
President