

**BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS
JULY 11, 2005
PUBLIC AGENDA MEETING MINUTES**

The general meeting of the New Jersey State Board of Psychological Examiners was held at the Board office, 124 Halsey Street, Newark, New Jersey. The meeting was called to order at 9:50 A.M. by Mark Glat, Psy.D., Chair.

PRESENT:

Mark Glat, Psy.D.
Victoria W. Jeffers, Ph.D.
Kenneth G. Roy, Ed.D.
T. Stephen Patterson, Ph.D., Government Member
Carole M. Harper, MA., RN., Public Member, Secretary
Keith D. Cicerone, Ph.D.

ABSENT:

Jeffrey H. Tindall, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Kenneth A. Leight, Ph.D.

ALSO ATTENDING:

Carmen A. Rodriguez, Deputy Attorney General, Counsel to Board
Elaine L. DeMars, Managing Executive Director
Wanda Smith, Secretarial Assistant
Carmella Volz, Assistant to the Executive Director

MINUTES:

Upon motion made by Dr. Patterson and seconded by Dr. Jeffers, the Board approved the public session minutes of April 4, 2005 and June 6, 2005, with corrections. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

The Board voted unanimously to go into closed session for discussion of the oral examinations.

The Board returned to open session.

CREDENTIAL COMMITTEE REPORT:

TEMPORARY PERMIT–NOT TO EXCEED THREE YEARS

The following candidates were approved for a three-year temporary permit for the supervised practice of psychology:

Karin Sieger, Psy.D.
Michael Zarabi, Psy.D.
Jane Esposito, Ph.D.
Yahaira Marquez, Ph.D.
Collen Mullen, Psy.D.
Susan Walker, Ph.D.
Melissa Christine, Psy.D.
Renee Wilson, Ph.D.

Tania Miller, Psy.D.
Rachel Strohl, Ph.D.
Candice Knight, Psy.D.
Stefani Seiden, Psy.D.
Donna Crabtree, Psy.D.
David Brantley, Ed.D.
Mara Zotta, Psy.D.
Victoria Nichols, Ph.D.

TEMPORARY PERMIT–NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR

The following candidate were approved for a one-year temporary permit for the unsupervised practice of psychology:

Judith Bernstein, Ph.D.

LICENSED BY EXAMINATION

Upon motion made by Dr. Jeffers and seconded by Dr. Roy, the Board determined that the following candidates have satisfied the requirements for licensure. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Jordana Skurka, Psy.D.
Marjorie Woodruff, Ph.D.
Cheryl Ann Notari, Ph.D.
Danielle LaVelle, Ph.D.
Jennifer Lyke, Ph.D.
Neil Hibler, Ph.D.

CORRESPONDENCE

Wendy B. Loonin, Ph.D.

Dr. Loonin wrote requesting an extension of the 90-day limit to submit her work sample for the oral examination. Dr. Loonin stated that her one-year temporary permit was issued on March 16, 2005. She intends to base the required work sample on a client she began seeing on April 13, 2005 and requests additional time to treat the patient. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to grant Dr. Loonin an additional 90 days to submit her work sample. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Alexandra Mandel, Psy.D.

Dr. Mandel wrote requesting an extension of the 90-day limit to submit her work sample for the oral examination. Dr. Mandel stated that she has just begun seeing a patient for therapy for which she wants to present for the oral exam. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to grant Dr. Mandel an additional 90 days to submit her work sample. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Debra Gill, Ph.D.

Dr. Gill wrote requesting an extension of the 90-day limit to submit her work sample for the oral examination. Dr. Gill stated that she had just begun developing a caseload and need additional time to treat and develop the structure for her paper. Additionally, Dr. Gill reported personal circumstances that support the request for an extension. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to grant Dr. Gill an additional 90 days to submit her work sample. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Katherine Perez-Rivera, Ph.D.

Dr. Perez-Rivera wrote requesting special accommodations for taking the E.P.P.P. written examination. Dr. Perez-Rivera stated that due to a medical condition, additional time is needed to complete the examination. Dr. Perez-Rivera submitted a letter from her chiropractor to support her request. Upon motion made by Dr. Patterson and seconded by Dr. Cicerone, the Board voted to approve an additional one hour for Dr. Perez-Rivera to complete the E.P.P.P. written examination. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

John McGinley, Ph.D.

Dr. McGinley wrote requesting permission to submit a work sample based on an evaluation that was completed in 2003. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to deny Dr. McGinley's request pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:42-5.1(b)1, which requires a work sample based on treatment that is either in progress or where the treatment services were terminated within one year before the submission of the work sample. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Aileen P. Walsh, Ph.D.

Dr. Walsh wrote requesting permission to practice pursuant to N.J.S.A. 45:14B-6(d). Dr. Walsh is licensed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In her employment with Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, she would provide services at the clinic in Voorhees and in Atlantic County one day each month. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to approve Dr. Walsh's request for the first 90-day period and directed that Dr. Walsh be notified that approval must be sought for every additional 90 day period. The Board further advised Dr. Walsh that she must provide the Board with a report of the actual dates and treatment locations for approval of subsequent requests. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Ofer Zur, Ph.D.

Dr. Zur wrote in response to Dr. Jeffers' article "A Word of Caution Regarding Boundary Violations" that appeared in the Summer 2004 (Volume 3) newsletter of the New Jersey State Board of Psychological Examiners. Dr. Zur detailed the areas of his agreement with the call for caution when it comes to boundary violations and that sexual or romantic touching with current clients is unethical, illegal and counter clinical. He also detailed aspects of his work he felt were misinterpreted in the article. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to thank Dr. Zur for his comments. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

ASPPB General Office

The Board reviewed a request for comments from the ASPPB Annual Meeting and Mobility Committees regarding proposed agenda items for the ASPPB Annual Meeting scheduled to be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from October 19-23, 2005. The request addressed the potential expansion of the ASPPB Disciplinary Data System which currently includes specific types of discipline, based on nomenclature used by each jurisdiction. The Board also noted the importance of including examination-related topics in the annual meeting agenda. Upon motion made and seconded, the Board approved the attendance of Dr. Glat, Dr. Jeffers and Ms. Harper to attend the Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Additionally, the Board voted to forward a response to ASPPB. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Sandra R. Leiblum, Ph.D., #971

Dr. Leiblum presented the following questions regarding licensure requirements of candidates for licensure:

Can non-licensed psychologists working in an exempt setting provide supervision for pre-doctoral interns and if so, will the hours count toward completion of the pre-doctoral supervisor hours? Would staff who have worked in an exempt setting for years, need to fulfill all the requirements for licensure as would a new graduate? Is a supervisor required to personally screen all of the treatment cases of a pre-doctoral intern or post-doctoral fellow? Would the supervision by individuals licensed in another state count toward licensure? Upon motion made and seconded, the Board voted to advise Dr. Leiblum that the Statute does not provide for a non-licensed psychologist to supervise candidates for licensure. Therefore, the Board only accepts supervision hours that have

been accrued under the supervision of a licensed psychologist or licensed in the state where the supervision was rendered, for a minimum of two years. Additionally, all candidates for licensure must meet the same requirements for supervision: taking the E.P.P.P. written exam and the submission of a work sample to take the oral examination. The statute does not allow for an alternative path. The Board further advised Dr. Leiblum that a supervisor does not have to personally screen all of the cases that pre-doctoral or post-doctoral fellows treat but the screening must be done by a supervisor. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Joel McClough, Ph.D., New York University, Child Study Center

Dr. McClough wrote to provide the Board with the additional information it requested to make a final determination for his request to provide clinical services in the State of New Jersey, as part of a clinical research project being conducted by the Child Study Center of the New York University School of Medicine. Upon motion made by Dr. Cicerone and seconded by Dr. Jeffers, the Board voted to approve Dr. McClough's research project to be conducted in the State of New Jersey as it has been outlined, to include intervention. The Board will request notification of any substantive changes to the project design or implementation, notification upon the conclusion of the project and a copy of the IRB manual. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

NOTICE OF MEETING CANCELLATION

Upon a unanimous vote, the Board canceled its August 8, 2005 regular agenda meeting and will schedule oral examinations for that date. The next regular agenda meeting will be on September 12, 2005.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Newsletter Committee

Ms. Harper reported that she will provide the full Board with a copy of the draft newsletter articles that have been submitted.

REVIEW OF EXEMPTION NOTICE FORM

Bancroft NeuroHealth Catherine Fierro, MSW

The Board reviewed the additional public funding information submitted by Ms. Fierro. Pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 45:14B-6(3), after review of the additional information submitted, upon motion made by Dr. Jeffers and seconded by Dr. Roy, the Board determined that Bancroft NeuroHealth satisfies the requirements of an exempt facility. Ms. Fierro was advised that in order to continue the exempt status, the agency is required to provide complete documentation to the Board annually, each January, that it continues to meet the requirements for the exempt status. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION

Assembly, No. 4337—allows school psychologists to treat individuals in the private sector; provides for health benefits coverage therefor.

The full Board reviewed the proposed legislation (a revised version of A1841) and the Board reiterated the depth of their concern for the protection of the public should this or any similar bill be enacted.

The Board found that as A-1841 proposed, A4337 would allow school psychologists to treat certain individuals in the private sector. The proposal in paragraph 10 amends the provision of the Practicing Psychology Licensing Act at N.J.S.A. 45:14B-6(g) to permit a person who is not a licensed psychologist but who is permanently certified as a school psychologist by the State Department of Education to engage in the activities of a licensed psychologist in providing psychological services to a person 23 years of age or under.

Following review of the proposed legislation, the Board found that consumers, specifically vulnerable children

and young adults, will be put at risk by the proposed legislation because it extends the psychological services a school psychologist may provide into areas where they have not been trained and does not specify or require additional training to remedy this.

The Board noted that this exemption does not define "psychological services," and appears to expand the scope of services provided by a school psychologist to include all psychological services. Currently, school psychologists are trained to administer and interpret psychological tests, the focus of which is to determine a given child's obstacles to learning. The criteria for assessment in the public schools rests on educational difficulties. Although the school psychologist has some training in counseling, there is little if any training in treatment beyond behavior in the school setting. School psychologists are not trained to treat such things as fire-setting, physical or sexual abuse, substance abuse, obsessive compulsive disorder, suicidality, depression or anxiety disorders: they are simply trained to identify them. This bill would allow them to provide treatment for these disorders.

The statute does not set forth any training requirements for the school psychologist to become competent in clinical management, diagnosis, or treatment of the mentally ill child: the school psychologists are trained in "counseling" rather than "therapy." In other words, this bill would give the school psychologist the legal right to treat mentally ill children and young adults without specifying additional training beyond the minimal counseling training required of the school psychology certification.

Moreover the bill refers to the State Department of Education as the certifying body. The Board's position is that the mission of the State Department of Education does not include the certification of psychologists: they know about education, not mental illness. In addition, the bill neither includes a mechanism for review of the standards of practice of the school psychologist nor does it create an avenue for the consumer to register complaints. If something goes wrong, there is no one for the consumer to go to for redress.

The exemptions proposed in this bill appear to be intended to bypass current law, N.J.S.A. 45:14B-(6), enacted to provide protection of the public.

Upon motion made by Dr. Patterson and seconded by Dr. Jeffers, the Board voted to affirm the above. Voting in favor of the motion: all.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole M. Harper, MA., RN
Public Member, Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Date: Mark Glat, Psy.D.
Chair