



# College of Psychologists of British Columbia

Annual Report 2006

404 - 1755 West Broadway  
Vancouver, B.C. V6J 4S5  
[www.collegeofpsychologists.bc.ca](http://www.collegeofpsychologists.bc.ca)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Listing of Board, Staff, Committee Members, Oral Examiners, Supervisors and New Registrants ..... | 2  |
| Report from the Chair .....   | 6  |
| Committee Reports .....   | 7  |
| Discipline Committee .....  | 7  |
| Inquiry Committee .....   | 8  |
| Patient Relations Committee .....   | 9  |
| Registration Committee .....  | 9  |
| Quality Assurance Committee .....   | 11 |
| Legislation Committee .....   | 12 |
| Finance Committee .....   | 14 |
| Report from the Registrar .....   | 14 |
| Minutes of the 2006 Annual General Meeting (May 2, 2006) .....                                    | 31 |
| Audited Financial Statements for 2006 .....   | 33 |

# **BOARD, STAFF, COMMITTEE MEMBERS, SUPERVISORS, ORAL EXAMINERS AND NEW REGISTRANTS FOR THE 2006 YEAR**

## **BOARD**

Michael Elterman, M.B.A., Ph.D., R.Psych., Chair of the Board  
Robert Colby, M.S., R.Psych., Vice Chair, Board; Chair, Registration Committee  
Lee Cohene, Ph.D., R.Psych., Chair, Legislation Committee  
Henry Harder, Ed.D., R.Psych., Chair, Inquiry Committee  
Michael Joschko, Ph.D., R.Psych., Chair, Quality Assurance Committee  
Derek Swain, Ed.D., R.Psych., Chair, Finance Committee  
Daniel Fontaine, Public Member, Chair, Patient Relations Committee,  
Public Member, Discipline Committee  
Marguerite Ford, Public Member, Inquiry Committee  
Wayne Morson, Public Member, Chair, Discipline Committee,  
Public Member, Registration and Finance Committees

## **STAFF MEMBERS**

Andrea Kowaz, Ph.D., R.Psych., Registrar  
Cheryl Bradley, Ph.D., R.Psych., Deputy Registrar  
Colleen Wilkie, Ph.D., R.Psych., Deputy Registrar  
Judy Clausen, Registrar's Assistant  
Avigail Cohen, Office Assistant  
Wendy Harris, Registration Coordinator  
Gina Rowan, Inquiry Coordinator and Director of Records

## **DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Wayne Morson, Public Member, Chair            | Lynn Alden, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  |
| Rosemary Alvaro, Ph.D., R.Psych.              | Bruce Clark, Public Member                   |
| Michael Coles, Ph.D., R.Psych. (until 09/06)  | Daniel Fontaine, Public Member               |
| Henry Hightower, Public Member                | Donna Paproski, Ph.D., R.Psych. (from 12/06) |
| Erica Reznick, Ph.D., R.Psych. (until 11/06)  | Janet Strayer, Ph.D., R.Psych. (until 09/06) |
| Lynn Superstein-Raber, Ph.D., R.Psych.        | Susan Turnbull, Ph.D., R.Psych.              |
| Cheryl Washburn, Ph.D., R.Psych. (from 12/06) |  |

## **INQUIRY COMMITTEE**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Henry Harder, Ed.D., R.Psych., Chair           | Kirk Beck, Ph.D., R.Psych.                 |
| Yaya De Andrade, Ph.D., R.Psych.               | Marguerite Ford, Public Member             |
| Jill Hightower, Public Member                  | Russell King, Ph.D., R.Psych. (from 04/06) |
| Pippa Lewington, Ph.D., R.Psych. (until 04/06) | Alexis Thuillier, Public Member            |
| Hendre Viljoen, Ph.D., R.Psych.                | Joseph Zaide, Ph.D., R.Psych.              |

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE**

Michael Joschko, Ph.D., R.Psych., Chair  
Chris Gibbins, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Leora Kuttner, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Karen Tee, Ph.D., R.Psych. (until 09/06)

Leigh Bowie, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Julia Hass, Public Member  
Joan Pinkus, Ph.D., R.Psych.

### **REGISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Robert Colby, M.S., R.Psych., Chair  
Marion Ehrenberg, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Anne Marie Jones, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Marvin McDonald, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Cheryl Washburn, Ph.D., R.Psych.

Catherine Costigan, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Amy Janeck, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Robert Ley, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Wayne Morson, Public Member

### **PATIENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

Daniel Fontaine, Public Member, Chair  
Michael Elterman, Ph.D., R.Psych.

Robert Colby, M.S., R.Psych.

### **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Derek Swain, Ed.D., R.Psych. (Chair)  
Michael Elterman, Ph.D., R.Psych.

Robert Colby, M.S., R.Psych.  
Wayne Morson, Public Member

### **SUPERVISORS**

Lynn Alden, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Eva Allan, M.Ed., R.Psych.  
Elizabeth Bannerman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Michael Boissevain, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
John Carter, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
Kenneth Craig, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Patricia (Trish) Crawford, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Anthony Dugbartey, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Dolores Escudero, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Lynda Grant, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Lee Grimmer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Lindsey Jack, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Rita Knodel, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Mary Korpach, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Barbara Madani, M.A.Sc., R.Psych.  
Jennifer McIvor, Psy.D., R.Psych.  
Alison Miller, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Bruce Monkhouse, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Tavi Nicholson, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Donna Paproski, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Lyne M. Piché, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Donald Read, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Marsha Runtz, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Susanne Schibler, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Martin Shoemaker, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Eric Speth, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Harilaos Stefanakis, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Paul Sungaila, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Karen Tallman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Michelle Worth, Ph.D., R.Psych.

Victoria Alfonso, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Nicole Aubé, Psy.D., R.Psych.  
Susan Baum, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Robert Carey, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Sarah Cockell, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Joanne Crandall, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Susan Cross, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Marion Ehrenberg, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Maureen Godfrey, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Joy Green, M.A., R.Psych.  
Simon Hearn, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Krystyna Kinowski, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
William Koch, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Leora Kuttner, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Todd Mason, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Deborah McTaggart, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Laura Mills, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Marlene Moretti, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Maureen Olley, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Martin Phillips-Hing, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Ann Pirolli, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Anneliese Robens, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
Ronald Samuda, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Edward Shen, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
John Spencer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Sujatha Srikameswaran, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Rhona Steinberg, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Lynn Superstein-Raber, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Rene Weideman, Ph.D., R.Psych.



## ORAL EXAMINERS

Victoria Alfonso, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Randall Atkinson, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Mark Bailey, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Barbara Beach, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Susan Blake, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Michael Boissevain, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Geoffrey Carr, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Michael Coles, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Evelyn Corker, M.A., R.Psych.  
 Joanne Crandall, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Susan Cross, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 David Eveleigh, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Mervyn Gilbert, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Joy Green, M.A., R.Psych.  
 Jordan Hanley, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 John Higenbottam, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Elizabeth Huntsman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 David Katz, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Krystyna Kinowski, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Brenda Kosaka, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Ulrich Lanius, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Wolfgang Linden, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Barbara Madani, M.A.Sc., R.Psych.  
 Deborah McTaggart, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Nancy Meyer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Bruce Monkhouse, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Donna Paproski, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Martin Phillips-Hing, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Donald Ramer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Erica Reznick, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 James Roche, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Deborah Samsom, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Susanne Schibler, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Heather Scott, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Kathleen Simas, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Meagan Smith, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Runa Steenhuis, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Rhona Steinberg, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Paul Sungaila, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Paul Swingle, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Joyce Ternes, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Inna Vlashev, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Rene Weideman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Maureen Whittall, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Marshall Wilensky, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Sheila Woody, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Verna-Jean Amell, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Nicole Aubé, Psy.D., R.Psych.  
 Susan Baum, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Carole Bishop, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Douglas Boer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Robert Carey, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 John Carter, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
 Constance Coniglio, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
 Kenneth Craig, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Patricia (Trish) Crawford, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Jacqueline Douglas, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Sandy Gardner, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Brian Grady, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Susan Hackett, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Simon Hearn, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Grace Hopp, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Charlotte Johnston, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Margaret Kendrick, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Brenda Knight, M.A., R.Psych.  
 Randall Kropp, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Ronald Laye, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Anne MacGregor, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
 Jane McEwan, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Gregory Meloche, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Laura Mills, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Jennifer Newman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Philip Perry, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Lyne Piché, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Jennifer Reiss, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Anneliese Robens, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
 Barbara Rosen, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Ronald Samuda, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Myron Grant Schimpf, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Ruth Sigal, M.Ed., R.Psych.  
 Cecelia Louise Smith, M.Sc., R.Psych.  
 Ingrid Söchting, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Harilaos Stefanakis, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Janet Strayer, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Lynn Superstein-Raber, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Karen Tallman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Jean Toth, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Larry Waterman, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Malcolm Weinstein, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Ursula Wild, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Rosemary Wilkinson, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
 Arianna Yakirov, Ph.D., R.Psych.

## NEW REGISTRANTS - 2006

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Cheryl Ainsworth, Ph.D., R.Psych.              | Diana Alexander, Ph.D., R.Psych.            |
| Juliette Arato-Bollivar, Ph.D., R.Psych.       | Kim Arkinstall, Ph.D., R.Psych.             |
| Valerie Ashton, Psy.D., R.Psych.               | Karianne Axford, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.       |
| Edward Baess, Psy.D., R.Psych.                 | Simon Bazett, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.         |
| Karen Bentley, M.Sc., R.Psych.Assoc.           | Joan Biever, Ph.D., R.Psych.                |
| Jeannette Bittman, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.       | Gerald Blomme, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.        |
| Mark Bodnarchuk, Ph.D., R.Psych.               | Annalize Booy, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.         |
| Christina Browne, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.        | Marla Buchanan, Ph.D., R.Psych.             |
| Heather Burke, Ph.D., R.Psych.                 | Douglas Cave, Ph.D., R.Psych.               |
| Bartolome Cerda Amengual, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc. | Alexander Chapman, Ph.D., R.Psych.          |
| Tena Colton, Psy.D., R.Psych.                  | Linda Jean Crawford, M.Sc., R.Psych.Assoc.  |
| Timothy Crowell, Psy.D., R.Psych.              | Barbara de Faye, Ph.D., R.Psych.            |
| Karen Eamon, Ph.D., R.Psych.                   | Mazen Samir Elchami, Psy.D., R.Psych.       |
| Nichole Fairbrother, Ph.D., R.Psych.           | Jennifer Ferns, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.        |
| Marlo Gal, Ph.D., R.Psych.                     | Roger Gervais, Temporary Registrant         |
| Saeed Ghafari, Ph.D., R.Psych.                 | Charlene Goldstein, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.    |
| Darryl Grams, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.            | Grant Grobman, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.         |
| Catherine Harwood, Ph.D., R.Psych.             | Laurie Hashizume, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.     |
| Paola Lake, Ph.D., R.Psych.                    | Marie-France Lapierre, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc. |
| Kathleen Lewis, Ph.D., R.Psych.                | Irene Lieban, Psy.D., R.Psych.              |
| Thomas Lipinski, Ph.D., R.Psych.               | Teal Maedel, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.           |
| David Marxsen, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.            | Susan Matthews, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.        |
| Gregory McCallum, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.         | Kamie McConnell, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.       |
| Susan McIsaac, Ph.D., R.Psych.                 | Marisol McRae, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.         |
| Candice Murray, Ph.D., R.Psych.                | Rami Nader, Ph.D., R.Psych.                 |
| Gregory Olson, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.            | Timothy Joseph Paré, Ph.D., R.Psych.        |
| Faye Paris, Ph.D., R.Psych.                    | Michelle Patterson, Ph.D., R.Psych.         |
| Natalee Popadiuk, Ph.D., R.Psych.              | Margaretha Prat, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.       |
| Ann Robson, Ph.D., R.Psych.                    | Michael Scales, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.        |
| Joan Schultz, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  | Judith Setton-Markus, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc. |
| Janet Shiell, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  | Marleane Sinclair, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.     |
| Sharolyn Sloat, Ph.D., R.Psych.                | Mary Tennant, M.Ed., R.Psych.Assoc.         |
| Daryl Ternowski, Ph.D., R.Psych.               | Julia Ungar, Ph.D., R.Psych.                |
| Spencer Wade, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  | John Wagner, Ph.D., R.Psych.                |
| Shannon Wagner, Ph.D., R.Psych.                | Gordon Wallace, Ph.D., R.Psych.             |
| Tina C. Wang, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  | Linda Weaver, Ph.D., R.Psych.               |
| Marvin Westwood, Ph.D., R.Psych.               | Audrey Wexler, Ph.D., R.Psych.              |
| Todd Willoughby, M.A., R.Psych.Assoc.          | Aiko Yamamoto, Ph.D., R.Psych.              |
| Liesle Young, Ph.D., R.Psych.                  | Martin Zakrzewski, Ph.D., R.Psych.          |

## REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

On behalf of the Board, I wish to express appreciation to the scores of registrants whose contributions as committee members, oral examiners, regulatory supervisors, and as informed and involved registrants have helped to bring to a close another year of fair and responsible regulation of our profession. The Board also expresses its ongoing support for and appreciation to our dedicated staff. College staff manage a large volume of complex and time sensitive matters with professionalism, competence and integrity.

**Information Meetings** The Board held an information meeting in Vancouver on November 16, 2006 which was attended by approximately 30 registrants, as well as public members of the Board and various College committees. Information meetings were also held in Victoria (January 24), Kelowna (February 23), Nelson (March 13), and Nanaimo (April 4). The Board continues to extend offers to provide “individualized” information sessions to groups of registrants in particular work or geographic locations, given the importance for registrants to be informed about College activities and decisions and to participate in discussions regarding the regulation of the profession in British Columbia.

**Board Elections** A Call for Nominations was distributed to registrants in the fall of 2006, to fill two elected positions on the Board. Nominations were received for four individuals. Elected for a three year term were Lee Cohene and Rebecca St. Clere England.

**Annual Evaluation of Registrar** The objectives which provide the criteria for the annual evaluation of the Registrar include the following: bringing the College in line with the national and international standards (both substantive and procedural) for professional regulation; enhancing the profile, standing and credibility of the College with government; development and maintenance of an effective system for document control, management, filing and storage; efficient and timely management of complaints and applications for registration; ensuring regular and effective communication with registrants about regulatory issues affecting them; enhancing the decision-making competencies of the Inquiry, Registration, Discipline and Quality Assurance Committees; maintaining the efficient resourcing and staffing of the College; and ensuring data integrity, security, control and management. The annual evaluation involves discussion about achievement of the objectives and the Board’s provision of sufficient resources and support for their achievement. The Board was extremely pleased with the achievement of the Registrar and her staff with regard to these objectives.

**Reviews of Inquiry Committee Decisions** A total of 10 reviews of Inquiry Committee decisions on complaints were heard by the Board in 2006. These reviews were requested by complainants under the *Health Professions Act*. In each instance the Board upheld the decision of the Inquiry Committee, based on a review of the documents before the Inquiry Committee when making its decision.

**College Workshops** The College’s involvement in organizing and sponsoring high calibre workshops on ethics and professional conduct continued throughout 2006.

**Participation with ASPPB** The Registrar continued to chair an ASPPB task force on Model Regulations and Legislation, and the College participated in ASPPB meetings in April in Sandestin, Florida and in October in San Diego, California. The Registrar presented a paper in San Diego on the publication of disciplinary decisions in Canada.

**Liaison with the Professional Association** During 2006 the Registrar and Board provided an orientation workshop for the Board of the British Columbia Psychological Association.

**Registrar awarded CPA Fellow Status** I was pleased to submit a nomination for our Registrar for the status of CPA fellow. The Board was delighted that the Registrar was awarded this status at the CPA Annual Convention in June, 2006. It is notable that CPA recognized the significant contributions that our Registrar has made to the regulation of psychology in our province, as well in Canada and North America through her involvement with Canadian Provincial Associations of Psychology (CPAP), with the group of Canadian regulators in Psychology, and the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Board (ASPPB).

**Strategic Planning** The Board and Registrar met for a strategic planning meeting in November and drafted a Strategic Plan for circulation to registrants for comment and feedback. The draft mission statement is as follows: *To regulate the profession of psychology in the public interest in accordance with the Health Professions Act of British Columbia by setting the standards for competent and ethical practice, promoting excellence and taking action when standards are not met.* The strategic plan articulated the values which inform efforts to meet the College's mandate under the *Health Professions Act*: Professionalism, Objectivity, Transparency, Accountability, Registrant involvement/participation, Clear communication. The three key objectives outlined in the strategic plan are: 1. Fair and Effective Regulation of the Profession of Psychology under the *Health Professions Act*, 2. Communication with Stakeholders and 3. Organizational Effectiveness. The Strategic Plan will be finalized in 2007.

**Legal Consultation** The College's current reliance on legal services is divided into several main categories: A. Routine legal consultations for Inquiry and Registration Committees, including potential attendance of legal counsel at committee meetings; B. General legal counsel (Board legal consultation, legal matters such as lawsuits against the College); C. Legal consultation on Freedom of Information requests; and D. Special legal consultation on discipline matters including preparation for, and the conducting of, extraordinary hearings of the Inquiry Committee, Discipline Committee hearings, and legal consultation for hearing panels. The Board continued to be pleased with the calibre of legal consultation provided to the College.

**Practice Advisories** During the 2006 year the following draft and final practice advisories were approved by the Board for distribution to registrants:

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Practice Advisory 4 | Release of Psychology Records  |
| Practice Advisory 8 | Informed Consent ( <b>Draft</b> )  |
| Practice Advisory 9 | Record Keeping in Publicly Funded and/or Multidisciplinary Settings ( <b>Draft</b> ) |

**Bylaw Changes** The Board submitted the following Bylaw changes to government:

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| July 21, 2006      | To amend subsections 8.9, 10.14 and 11.8 of the <i>Code of Conduct</i>                |
| September 15, 2006 | To amend sections 8.8, 8.9 and 8.10 of the <i>Code of Conduct</i> by renumbering them |
| December 11, 2006  | To add Bylaws 57(5) and 59(6) and Schedules "J" and "K"                               |

The first two submissions were deposited with the Minister and enacted in 2006. Schedules "J" and "K", while submitted in 2006, were deposited with the Minister early in 2007. These bylaw changes are described in more detail in the report of the Legislation Committee.

**In closing** It was my privilege to serve as the Chair of the Board for 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Elterman, M.B.A., Ph.D., R.Psych.,  
Chair of the Board 2006

## **DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE REPORT**

There were no hearings of the Discipline Committee in 2006. As noted elsewhere in this report, one Citation for a hearing by the Discipline Committee was outstanding at the end of 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne Morson, Chair  
Discipline Committee 2006

# INQUIRY COMMITTEE REPORT

It was my pleasure to continue to serve as Chair of the Inquiry Committee for the 2006 year. This Committee has closed 346 of the 370 complaints received under the *Health Professions Act* during the period January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2006. The total of 370 received complaints represents 168 individual registrants, each of whom had received one or more complaints during the January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2006 time frame. Twenty-four (24) complaints remained open as at December 31, 2006. All of the 346 closed complaints have been resolved without the need for a hearing of the Discipline Committee, notwithstanding the readiness of this Committee to proceed on citations when the alleged misconduct warrants proceeding. During 2006, citations for a hearing of the Discipline Committee were issued to three registrants relating to four complaint files. Two of these files relating to one registrant were eventually resolved through a letter of undertaking. A second registrant resigned from the College and is no longer eligible to practice psychology in British Columbia. At the end of 2006, the final file on which a Citation for a hearing by the Discipline Committee had been issued remained unresolved. Summaries of consensual resolutions of complaint matters may be found in the Registrar's Report.

Files closed during 2006 are summarized in the table below along with the nature of the decision of the Inquiry Committee in closing the complaint file. Please review the Registrar's report for a comprehensive description and breakdown of 2006 complaint investigations and resolutions.

The Inquiry Committee consists of very hardworking and dedicated professional and public members who work in consultation and cooperation with a very competent staff team consisting of the Registrar, Deputy Registrar and Inquiry Coordinator. It has been a pleasure to serve as Chair for the 2006 year.

**Table 1: Files Closed during 2006 (N=61)**

| Closing Reason   | Number    | %*         |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Letter of Undertaking or Consent Agreement                                   | 12        | 19.7       |
| Resolved   | 10        | 16.4       |
| Insufficient Evidence  | 20        | 32.8       |
| Decision Not to Proceed (no jurisdiction, withdrawn, vexatious or frivolous) | 18        | 29.5       |
| Referred to Discipline Committee   | 1         | 1.6        |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>61</b> | <b>100</b> |

\* percentages in this and subsequent tables may contain rounding errors

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Harder, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
Chair, Inquiry Committee 2006

## PATIENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

As per the *Health Professions Act*, the objectives of this Committee include: recommending to the Board specific procedures for handling complaints of professional misconduct of a sexual nature; informing the public about the process of bringing their concerns to the College; monitoring and periodically evaluating the operation of procedures established; developing and coordinating educational programs dealing with professional misconduct of a sexual nature for registrants and the public as required; establishing a patient relations program to prevent professional misconduct of a sexual nature; recommending to the Board standards and guidelines for the conduct of registrants and their patients. A pamphlet developed by the Committee for registrants is available on the College website. Information regarding appropriate conduct is also included in the complaints brochure available to the public, also available on the website.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Fontaine, Chair,  
Patient Relations Committee 2006

## REGISTRATION COMMITTEE REPORT

This was a significant year for the Registration Committee. A number of policies were developed, and the College continued to dialogue with government on important issues.

### Government Relations

**1. The Health Professions Act** The College has requested an amendment to the *Health Professions Act* to enable health regulatory boards in BC to share information with each other, as the College is able to do with other psychology regulatory boards outside of BC. The College has also voiced concerns about section 52.1(3)(b), which is not yet in force. This section, which would allow individuals to use titles from other jurisdictions.

**2. Reserved Actions and Exemptions** The College received a letter from Dr. Penny Ballem, Deputy Minister of Health, on May 1, 2006 indicating the government's intention to maintain the exemption from restriction on the use of the title 'psychologist' by public school employees "for the next three to five years while it reviews the implementation of the *HPA*." The College reminded government that we had implemented the extraordinary application/registration process based on discussions held with government about its intent to implement the recommendation of the Health Professions Council that the exemptions be lifted. The College is pleased with the manner in which the extraordinary application process was achieved, and is confident that the process developed can be further utilized as necessary in the future. The College also met with registrants working in the school system to survey their thoughts and concerns about the practice of school psychology. Many of the issues discussed are similar to those of registrants working in other institutional settings, such as autonomy of decision making with regard to selection of assessment instruments and informed consent.

**3. Mobility** A letter from the Ministry of Economic Development was received about the government's desire to facilitate the registration of foreign-trained professionals in BC. The Alberta-British Columbia Trade, Investment, and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) was signed in Edmonton on April 28, 2006. This agreement includes provisions for enhancing labour mobility. The agreement is compatible with the MRA and the College's Bylaws regarding reciprocal registration.

**Feedback from Oral Examiners/Supervisors** Oral examiners are routinely provided with a feedback form on completion of an oral examination as a means of sharing observations and comments on the oral examination process. The Committee responded to the feedback received. A monthly luncheon meeting at the College office was initiated in 2006, open to all oral examiners and regulatory supervisors for support, feedback, and problem-solving of common issues.

**Extraordinary Applications** The Committee is pleased to report that in 2006, most of the extraordinary applicants progressed to being placed on the Limited Register. The names of these extraordinary applicants are found in this Report under New Registrants. These registrants (and the remaining extraordinary applicants who are nearing completion) are to be commended for their interest in becoming regulated psychology professionals and their participation in the implementation of the extraordinary provisions.

**Academic Preparation** The Registration Committee continues to review applications from individuals who have not completed CPA/APA accredited training. The Committee is of the opinion that preparation for entry level practice in professional psychology has been clearly established by CPA and APA. Applicants from accredited programs find the application process easier and quicker to navigate. Throughout the year the Committee sought to further clarify the definition of residency and the criteria for evaluating graduate degrees. A greater number of applications are being submitted from individuals who have completed experimental degrees with varying upgrades to professional practice, and there are frequent questions regarding whether online professional psychology programs meet the registration requirements. These remain ongoing issues for the Committee.

**Supervision** During 2006, the Registration Committee announced implementation of a post-degree supervision year for those applying to be psychologists (those applying to be psychological associates already are required to have post-degree supervision). The Registration Committee struck a Task Force and reviewed information from other jurisdictions regarding this issue. Supervision requirements are under review by APA, and a number of jurisdictions are reconsidering the requirements for post-doctoral supervision. In light of these developments, and to preserve the shortened time it takes to become registered, the Committee decided to formalize its current expectation that all applicants practice under supervision while proceeding through the application process, rather than initiating an entirely new supervision requirement. The Committee has established a step-wise plan to implement the supervision requirement which was communicated in the October 2006 *Chronicle*. As of January 1, 2008, all applicants will be required to submit a supervision plan for any psychological services they are providing in B.C. Applicants can select their own supervisor, who must be a registrant. Further details of the requirement will be developed after the Committee has had an opportunity to review a number of supervision plans.

**Title Issues** The Registration Committee sends out “*cease and desist*” letters to individuals who are not registered with the College but are using the title ‘psychologist’ or its derivatives, and/or practicing psychology. This is a significant issue with a high number of potential violations. At a meeting attended by the Chair of the Registration Committee, College counsel, and staff, it was decided to proceed on a priority basis with title issue concerns that have implications for public protection. The Registration Committee decided to proceed on one potentially serious matter by way of a petition to the court.

**Degree Authorization Act** The *Degree Authorization Act* gives the Minister of Advanced Education the power to grant university status to private institutions, and to approve new university programs. As provided under the Act, the Registration Committee reviews proposals for new programs in professional psychology. In some cases, the Committee has voiced concern that the program will not adequately equip students to meet College registration requirements on completion of the program.

**Areas of Practice** The Registration Committee continues to discuss a number of issues related to area of practice, including: the number of areas of practice declarable on mobility and reciprocal applications, and required criteria to change area of practice at renewal.



**Fees** The Registration Committee reviewed its fee structure and lowered the administration fee for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), and now refunds the application package fee on receipt of a completed application.

**Application to Registration Time Frame** For applications that are straight-forward, the typical time from application to registration is 9-12 months for regular applicants (it is possible to complete the process in 6 months), and 5-6 months for reciprocal or mobility applicants (it is possible to complete the process in 4 months).

**Retirement** The Registration Committee has paid careful attention to the number of individuals declaring retired status at renewal and then requesting to return to the Full Register shortly thereafter. The Committee decided to adapt the policy regarding returning to the Full Register, by making the policy more responsive to the observed difficulties in decision-making regarding retirement from the profession. The Committee will continue to monitor the decision-making of registrants considering retirement.

**New Registrants** A total of 79 new registrants were added to the Register in 2006. Of these, 30 were registered as psychological associates, including 26 individuals who applied under the extraordinary provisions. Please see the Registrar's report for more informative statistics regarding the College Register and statistics summarizing the regulatory activities of the College in the application/registration area.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Colby, M.S., R.Psych.,  
Chair, Registration Committee 2006

## QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

I am pleased to report on the activities of the Quality Assurance Committee during 2006. In addition to the annual review of the Continuing Competency Program, the Committee was actively engaged in several important initiatives. Below is a summary of the work of the Committee in 2006.

**1. Continuing Competency Program Review** The Continuing Competency Program review was conducted in February, 2006. A total of 103 registrants were selected to submit their completed Continuing Competency Activities log for 2005. The College set aside a day to respond to any questions regarding the review, and almost 10% of the selected registrants took advantage of this consultation. The review of log sheets for the 2005 year proceeded smoothly, and most registrants were prompt and clear in their completion of the form. The distinctions among the different categories of activities were almost uniformly understood by registrants. Most registrants reported far more hours than the minimum number specified by our program- this is likely a reflection of the degree to which most registrants routinely incorporate continuing competency activities into their professional routines. All registrants in the review were found to be in compliance with the program.

**2. Continuing Competency Program development** This year, after careful deliberation and research on policies in other jurisdictions, the Committee determined that beginning in January, 2007, registrants may "bank" extra hours accrued for *Category A* of the Continuing Competency Program on a carry-forward basis for one year. Additional hours beyond those required for the subsequent year are not eligible for banking. An important principle that guided the Committee in making this determination was that Continuing Competency hours be reasonably current and relevant to the registrant's current practice. Further refinement of the Continuing Competency Program involved the decision to use a random number generator system for future review selection and the decision to grant an optional one-year exemption from submitting review forms for registrants selected for review for a third consecutive year.

**3. Designation of another registrant to take care of one's practice records in the event of unexpected incapacity or death** The Committee requested and the Board has approved a requirement that each registrant designate another registrant to be responsible for her/his practice records in the event of incapacity or death. The requirement will commence with renewal for the 2009 calendar year, and will involve listing the designated registrant on the renewal form. For the 2008 renewal, registrants will be encouraged, but not required, to designate another registrant. The Committee's reasoning in requesting this requirement is based in an awareness of the aging demographic of the College. In the 2007 year, the Committee anticipates holding a series of workshops on retirement planning and the writing of a "professional will".

**4. Ethics Workshops** The Committee continued to develop workshops on ethical issues during the 2006 year, and set dates for two workshops to occur in the first half of 2007. The Committee is pleased with the calibre of speakers we have been able to obtain, and looks forward to facilitating further informative workshops for registrants.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Joschko, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Chair, Quality Assurance Committee 2006

## LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Board submitted the following Bylaw changes to government during the 2006 year:

1. That subsection 8.9 of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended as follows:

**8.9 Provision of services in sponsoring agency**

*Where a registrant offers psychological services or is directing the psychological services of others within a sponsoring institution and the registrant believes that the most appropriate services to a client is not in accord with the expectations of the sponsoring institution, the supervising registrant must attempt to reconcile these differences with the administration of the institution in order to best respond to the client's needs.*

*The subsection as amended (by changing services to service(s)) would read:*

**8.9 Provision of services in sponsoring agency**

*Where a registrant offers psychological services or is directing the psychological services of others within a sponsoring institution and the registrant believes that the most appropriate service(s) to a client is not in accord with the expectations of the sponsoring institution, the supervising registrant must attempt to reconcile these differences with the administration of the institution in order to best respond to the client's needs.*

2. That subsection 10.14 of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended as follows:

**10.14 Fair and accurate presentation**

*A registrant who interprets the science or the practice of psychology or psychological services to the general public must present the information fairly and accurately.*

*The subsection as amended (removing "the" from the 2<sup>nd</sup> line) would read:*

**10.14 Fair and accurate presentation**

*A registrant who interprets the science or the practice of psychology or psychological services to the general public must present the information fairly and accurately.*

3. That subsection 11.8 of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended as follows:

**11.8 Communicating results**

*When communicating the results of an assessment to a client or to the legal guardian or other agent of a client, a registrant must provide use adequate interpretive aids or explanations and language that is reasonably understandable.*

*The subsection as amended (removing the word "provide") would read:*

**11.8 Communicating results**

*When communicating the results of an assessment to a client or to the legal guardian or other agent of a client, a registrant must use adequate interpretive aids or explanations and language that is reasonably understandable.*

4. That Subsection 11.24 of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended by changing the title from Provision of raw results to Provision of raw test data.
5. That subsection 16.21 of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended as follows:

**16.21 Honoring commitments**

*A registrant must honour all commitments they have made to research participants.*

*The subsection as amended (by changing the spelling of "honouring") would read:*

**16.21 Honouring commitments**

*A registrant must honour all commitments they have made to research participants.*

AND

1. That subsection 8.8 Accountability for supervisees of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended by renumbering is as 8.7 Accountability for supervisees.
2. That subsection 8.9 Obligation to advise of responsibility of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended by renumbering it as 8.8 Obligation to advise of responsibility.
3. That subsection 8.10 Provision of services in sponsoring agency of Schedule "F", Code of Conduct, be amended by renumbering it as 8.9 Provision of services in sponsoring agency.

A further submission was made during 2006 with regard to the addition of two schedules to the Bylaws stipulating the assessment of costs after an inquiry or discipline hearing. While submitted in 2006, these schedules were not deposited with the Minister until early in 2007.

Additional efforts were devoted to the continued development of an advisory on the issue of maintaining psychology records within the public institutional setting. Feedback and discussions with registrants working in these settings continued and when the draft is finalized, it will be circulated to registrants.

With the Quality Assurance Committee having reached full stride in terms of its role in enhancing competent practice, the increase in Board sophistication with regard to the College's legislative mandate, and the process of distribution of all practice advisories to all College statutory committees, it was decided that the functions of the Legislation Committee have been appropriately addressed and that Committee will not continue into 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee Cohene, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Chair, Legislation Committee, 2006

## FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

The College continues to stay well within budget projections. In addition, the staff continue to manage the high work volume with just slightly under 6 FTE positions. Rather than budgeting for anticipating hearing costs which are difficult to project, the Board directed the established of a contingency fund in 2006 with funds earmarked to cover hearing costs. The tariff of costs submitted for deposit with the Minister will facilitate the recovery of a portion of hearing and investigation costs.

**Table 2: Comparative Expenses**

| Year | Wages and Benefits |    | Routine Statutory Expenses |    | Hearings* |   | Other Expenses** |    | Total Expenses |     |
|------|--------------------|----|----------------------------|----|-----------|---|------------------|----|----------------|-----|
|      | Amount             | %  | Amount                     | %  | Amount    | % | Amount           | %  | Amount         | %   |
| 2004 | 521,791            | 41 | 288,686                    | 23 | 74,816    | 6 | 391,336          | 30 | 1,276,629      | 100 |
| 2005 | 554,704            | 48 | 128,899                    | 11 | 70,563    | 6 | 403,717          | 35 | 1,157,883      | 100 |
| 2006 | 565,346            | 46 | 201,542                    | 17 | 50,113    | 4 | 402,896          | 33 | 1,219,897      | 100 |

\* This figure represents the cost of extraordinary hearings and preparations for discipline hearings.

\*\* Included in these expenses are costs associated with committee meetings, Board expenses, travel, rent, office supplies.

It is notable that while routine statutory expenses (including legal consultations) increased over 2005, the amount remains considerably lower than routine statutory expenses in 2004 and in previous years. The amount spent in issuance of citations and preparation for hearings was also less in 2006 than in previous years.

Respectfully submitted,

Derek Swain, Ed.D., R.Psych.  
Chair, Finance Committee 2006

## REGISTRAR'S REPORT

Below is the Registrar's Report on the activities of the College for the year 2006. This report is divided into three main sections:

- I. Registration/Application Matters** This section provides a description of the College Register for 2006 and the status of applications for registration, as well as a summary of activities of the College in this area.
- II. Complaint and Investigative Matters** The second section provides a descriptive and statistical analysis of complaint and other investigative matters.
- III. Administrative Matters** The third section summarizes administrative activities related to external relationships and our obligations under the *Ombudsman and Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Acts*.

## I. REGISTRATION/APPLICATION MATTERS

This section reviews activities at the College related to the status of the College Register during 2006, and the status of applications for registration. It is divided into 8 sections as follows:

1. the College Register 2006
2. summary of application activity
3. status of application files
4. area of practice
5. examinations
6. statistics summarizing length of application process
7. title issue investigations
8. extraordinary applicants

### 1. The College Register 2006

As at December 31, 2006, the College Register showed a total of 1075 registrants, including one individual who had temporary registration status during the 2006 year.

**Table 3: The College Register as at December 31, 2006**

| Register Status on December 31                       | 2001        | 2002        | 2003       | 2004        | 2005        | 2006        |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Full Register  | 873         | 863         | 889        | 924         | 933         | 932         |
| Suspended  |             |             |            |             |             | 1           |
| Limited Register- Inquiry Committee                  |             | 15          | 14         | 15          | 13          | 11          |
| Limited Register- Inquiry Committee / Non-Practicing |             | 1           | 1          |             |             |             |
| Limited Register- Inquiry Committee/ Out of Province |             |             |            | 1           |             |             |
| Limited Register - Out-of-Province                   | 57          | 58          | 43         | 29          | 28          | 27          |
| Limited Register - Non-Practicing                    | 51          | 61          | 17         | 11          | 18          | 23          |
| Limited Register- Retired                            | 19          | 17          | 15         | 13          | 14          | 23          |
| Limited Register- Registration Committee             |             | 1           | 2          | 5           | 22          | 57          |
| Category Pending as at Dec. 31, 2006                 |             |             | 1          | 1           | 2           |             |
| Temporary Registration                               |             | 1           | 2          | 3           | 2           | 1           |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>1000</b> | <b>1017</b> | <b>984</b> | <b>1002</b> | <b>1032</b> | <b>1075</b> |

As shown in the table below, a total of 79 new registrants were added to the Register in 2006. Of these, 30 were registered as psychological associates, including 26 individuals who applied under the extraordinary provisions.

**Table 4: New Registrants by Class of Registration**

|                                 | Regular | Reciprocal | Mobility | Extraordinary | Temporary | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------|
| <b>Psychologists</b>            | 22      | 12         | 4        | 10            | 1         | 49    |
| <b>Psychological Associates</b> | 0       | 4          | 0        | 26            | 0         | 30    |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                    | 22      | 16         | 4        | 36            | 1         | 79    |

Table 5 below shows the breakdown of the 79 individuals registered in 2006 according to application type and placement on the Full or Limited Register. Fifty-three percent (n=42) of the new registrants were placed on the Full Register. Of these, most (90%, n=38) were in the psychologist class of registration, and 50% were regular applicants. Thirty-six of the 37 new registrants who were placed on the Limited Register were applicants under the extraordinary provisions. These individuals have completed all of the initial requirements for registration with the College under the extraordinary provisions, and will complete any remaining registration requirements (the EPPP or National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) examination, internship equivalencies, and the Oral Examination) prior to approval for placement on the Full Register.

**Table 5: New Registrants on Full and Limited Register by Application Type**

|                                  | Reg       | Recip     | Mobil    | Extra     | Temp     | Total     |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| <b>Full Register</b>             |           |           |          |           |          |           |
| Psychologists                    | 21        | 12        | 4        | 0         | 1        | 38        |
| Psychological Associates         | 0         | 4         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 4         |
| <b>Total on Full Register</b>    | <b>21</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b> | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Limited Register</b>          |           |           |          |           |          |           |
| Psychologists                    | 1         | 0         | 0        | 10        | 0        | 11        |
| Psychological Associates         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 26        | 0        | 26        |
| <b>Total on Limited Register</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>37</b> |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>22</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>79</b> |

## 2. Summary of Application Activity

The table below summarizes the application activities at the College during the 2006 year, along with comparison data from previous years. As shown in the table, a total of 55 applications were received during the 2006 year. Of these, 60% (n=33) were regular applications. Twenty-four percent (n=13) were reciprocal applications from another Canadian jurisdiction, and 13% (n=7) were mobility applications from jurisdictions in the United States. No applications were withdrawn, ineligible, or disqualified during 2006.

**Table 6: Application Activity Summary 2001-2006**

| Activity                       | 2001-2004 | 2005 |      |       |       |     |       | 2006 |      |       |       |     |       |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
|                                |           | Reg  | Temp | Recip | Mobil | Ext | Total | Reg  | Temp | Recip | Mobil | Ext | Total |
| # of applications received     | 283       | 26   | 2    | 12    | 5     | 0   | 45    | 33   | 2    | 13    | 7     | 0   | 55    |
| # of applications withdrawn    | 6         | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 2   | 2     | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0     |
| # of applications not eligible | 15        | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0     | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0     |
| # of applicants disqualified   | 2         | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 1   | 1     | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0     |

### 3. Status of Application Files

Table 7 shows the status of all applications as at December 31, 2006. There were 81 open applications at various stages of the application process.

**Table 7: Status of Applications as at December 31, 2006**

| Application Stage                        | 2006      |            |          |               |           |
|--|-----------|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|
|  | Regular   | Reciprocal | Mobility | Extraordinary | Total     |
| Initial review                           | 16        | 4          | 1        | 2             | 23        |
| Under review for credentials/consistency | 12        | 2          | 0        | 0             | 14        |
| EPPP                                     | 17        | N/A        | N/A      | —*            | 17        |
| Written Jurisprudence Exam               | 2         | 2          | 1        | 3             | 8         |
| Oral Examination                         | 9         | N/A        | N/A      | 4             | 13        |
| Ready for placement on Register          | 2         | 1          | 2        | 1             | 6         |
| <b>Total Open Files as at 12/31/06</b>   | <b>58</b> | <b>9</b>   | <b>4</b> | <b>10</b>     | <b>81</b> |

\*Extraordinary applicants complete the EPPP examination or equivalent while on the Limited Register rather than during the application process.

### 4. Area of Practice: Applicants and Registrants

Applicants must indicate one area of practice in psychology on the application form. This area is expected to be the broad area of practice which best describes the individual's training and competence. Table 8 below represents the area of practice indicated by new applicants in 2006. All but four applicants selected Clinical or Counselling as most descriptive of their area of practice.

**Table 8: Area of Practice for New Applicants in 2006**

| Area of Practice                | Regular   | Reciprocal | Mobility | Temporary | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Clinical Psychology             | 24        | 10         | 5        | 2         | 41        |
| Counselling Psychology          | 8         | 1          | 1        |           | 10        |
| Clinical Neuropsychology        | 1         | 2          | 1        |           | 4         |
| School Psychology               |           |            |          |           | 0         |
| Rehabilitation Psychology       |           |            |          |           | 0         |
| Forensic/Corrections Psychology |           |            |          |           | 0         |
| Undeclared as at December 2005  |           |            |          |           | 0         |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>33</b> | <b>13</b>  | <b>7</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>55</b> |



The area Research/Academic is not intended as a declared area of practice for applicants. The areas of Clinical and Counselling are defined by the College as broad areas encompassing many sub-areas, while the areas of Forensic/Corrections, Health, School, Rehabilitation, Industrial/Organizational and Clinical Neuropsychology are seen as more narrowly defined areas of practice, sometimes including exclusive practice in a particular setting.

Each year, registrants are required at renewal to report their primary area of practice. The Register indicated the following breakdown for the self-declared primary area of practice indicated by Registrants on December 31, 2006, excluding retired registrants (n=23) and one temporary registrant:

**Table 9: Self-Declared Primary Area of Practice for Registrants  
as at December 31, 2006**

| Self-Declared Primary Area of Practice | Number of Registrants | %          |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Clinical Psychology                    | 582                   | 55         |
| Counselling Psychology                 | 228                   | 21         |
| Clinical Neuropsychology               | 60                    | 6          |
| School Psychology                      | 65                    | 6          |
| Health Psychology                      | 6                     | 1          |
| Rehabilitation Psychology              | 14                    | 1          |
| Research/Academic Psychology           | 26                    | 2          |
| Forensic/Corrections Psychology        | 49                    | 5          |
| Industrial/Organizational Psychology   | 23                    | 3          |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>1053*</b>          | <b>100</b> |

\* This number does not include the 22 registrants who were in the retired category as at December 31, 2006.

## 5. Examinations

All regular applicants complete three examinations as part of the application process: the EPPP, the oral exam (OE) and the Written Jurisprudence Examination (WJE). Reciprocal and mobility applicants are required to successfully complete the WJE. Table 10 below summarizes examination results for 2006. In 2006, 39 extraordinary applicants completed Part A of the oral examination, which contains 10 questions covering aspects of ethical conduct and knowledge of regulation. The Part A examination is the final step to be completed by applicants under the extraordinary provisions prior to placement on the Limited Register. The Committee has clear policies regarding the passing criteria for the Part A examination, including the requirement that all items be successfully completed either through the examination process or through remedial work under supervision.

**Table 10: Examination Results**

|  | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Number of applicants who wrote EPPP        | 48   | 9    | 16   | 22   | 16   | 31   |
| Number of Oral examinations (Regular)      | 44   | 13   | 15   | 34   | 25   | 26   |
| Number of WJE examinations                 | 0    | 21   | 19   | 68   | 117  | 47   |
| Part A of Oral examination (Extraordinary) | n/a  | n/a  | n/a  | n/a  | 39   | 36   |

The EPPP exam was taken 31 times in 2006 with no failures. The scaled score range for these applicants was 516-729 out of 800. Communication of exam results to applicants continues to be shortened due to expedited transmission of results to the College from the testing service.

As in past years, the WJE examination is held at the College offices on a monthly basis. It was administered 47 times in 2006 to a total of 47 applicants, one of whom took the exam for a second time (the first time was in 2005). The College also conducts the Oral Examination on site. In 2006, 26 examinations took place, of which 2 were a second attempt. Typically, individuals who fail one or two areas on the examination agree to complete a brief period of supervision (3-6 months) which targets the identified areas.

## **6. Length of Time from Application to Registration**

As was the case in 2005, regular applicants typically complete all aspects of the application process in 6-7 months. A time frame of 3-4 months has remained typical for mobility and reciprocal applications. Applicants can avoid delays by responding promptly to any questions about their qualifications or course work at the file review stage of the application process. The time to registration increases when an applicant is not successful in an examination and must retake the exam, or when a referee is not prompt in providing a requested reference to the College. Applicants whose training or education are unusual may also require additional time to complete the application process. Applicants with foreign credentials (excluding the United States) must have their degree evaluated for Canadian equivalency prior to proceeding to a review of their application file.

## **7. Investigation of Title Issues under the *Psychologists Regulation***

The year 2006 saw an increase in the workload of the Committee as an expanding number of potential violations of title use were brought to the Committee's attention by members of the public and professionals.

Fifteen investigations into alleged violations of the *Psychologist's Regulation* were opened by the Registration Committee in 2006, two of which were with regard to former registrants.

## **8. Extraordinary Applicants**

We have reported extensively on the provisions and process of the extraordinary period of application in previous annual reports and the *Chronicle*. To summarize, the extraordinary provisions were undertaken by the Registration Committee to facilitate the registration process for potential applicants in the new psychological associate class of registration at the Master's level of training, and to anticipate the removal by government of exemptions to restrictions on title at certain employment settings. The guiding principle was that the requirements for registration would be those elements essential for registration as a psychologist or psychological associate in B.C., with the accommodation that some of these requirements could be completed after placement on the Limited Register. Excluding expired, withdrawn, ineligible and halted applications, 80% (55 out of 68) of the applicants under the extraordinary provisions had successfully completed all initial registration requirements and were placed on the Limited Register by the end of 2006. One additional placement on the Limited Register was pending at the end of the year, and a further five applicants were eligible to take Part A of the oral examination, the final step prior to placement on the Limited Register.

## II. COMPLAINT AND INVESTIGATIVE MATTERS

This section contains information about complaints received in the year 2006 as well as a report on all complaints closed during 2006. Included are descriptions of aspects of the complaints process and a sampling of complaints received during the year.

1. Complaint file status as at December 31, 2006
2. Descriptive complaint summary
3. Investigations opened by the Inquiry Committee
4. Length of time to close complaint files
5. Closing reasons for complaints closed in 2006 and comparison with previous years
6. Components of the complaint investigative process
7. Letters of Undertaking/Consent Agreements
8. Summary of a sample of Complaints in 2006
9. Complaints per year and number of registrants with complaints

### 1. Complaint file status as at December 31, 2006

Since the College of Psychologists came under the *Health Professions Act*, 370 complaints have been received, 50 of which were received during 2006. All complaints received prior to 2005 were closed by the end of 2006. File status for the years 2005 and 2006 are as follows.

- A. Complaints received in 2006 (n=50): Thirty (30) of the complaints received in 2006 were also closed in 2006, leaving a total of 20 complaints received in 2006 open as at December 31, 2006.
- B. Complaints received in 2005 (n=44): Four complaint investigations begun in 2005 remained open at the end of 2006. Negotiations were underway to resolve two of these complaints. Respondents in the remaining two cases were being asked to respond to concerns of the Committee under section 33(5) of the *Health Professions Act*.
- C. All complaints received by the College under the *Health Professions Act* (n=370): As noted above, the total number of complaints received under the *Health Professions Act* is 370. Of these investigations, 346 were closed and 24 (20 from 2006 and four from 2005) remained open at the end of 2006.

**Table 11: Complaint File Status as at December 31, 2006 for all complaints received under the *Health Professions Act***

| Status                    | Year Complaint Received |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|                           | 2000-2004               |            | 2005      |            | 2006      |            | Total      |            |
|                           | #                       | %          | #         | %          | #         | %          | #          | %          |
| Awaiting Review           |                         |            |           |            | 4         | 8          | 4          | 1.1        |
| Active Review             |                         |            |           |            | 4         | 8          | 4          | 1.1        |
| Practice Records          |                         |            |           |            | 1         | 2          | 1          | .3         |
| 33(5)                     |                         |            | 2         | 4.5        | 9         | 18         | 11         | 2.9        |
| HPA S.28 Inspections      |                         |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
| Without Prejudice Meeting |                         |            | 1         | 2.3        | 1         | 2          | 2          | .5         |
| Letter of Undertaking     |                         |            | 1         | 2.3        |           |            | 1          | .3         |
| Citation                  |                         |            |           |            | 1         | 2          | 1          | .3         |
| Total # open files        | 0                       | 0          | 4         | 9.1        | 20        | 40         | 24         | 6.5        |
| Total # closed files      | 276                     | 100        | 40        | 90.9       | 30        | 60         | 346        | 93.5       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>              | <b>276</b>              | <b>100</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>370</b> | <b>100</b> |

## 2. Descriptive Complaint Summary

Below are four descriptive variables (primary allegation, complaint context, area of practice, and complainant type) on which all complaints are tracked:

**a. Primary Allegation** Table 12 contains a breakdown of complaint investigations according to the primary allegation made by the complainant as it relates to the *Code of Conduct*. The most frequent primary allegation for complaints opened in 2006 was general standards for competency. For complaints received since the College came under the *Health Professions Act*, assessment procedures is the primary allegation in the largest number of cases (n=138, 37.3%), followed by competency (n=50, 13.5%) and client relationships (n=48, 12.97%). Many of the cases in which competency is the primary allegation involved an assessment. It is often challenging to determine which of competency or assessment procedures to record as the primary allegation.

**Table 12: Primary Allegation in Complaints Received 2000-2006**

| Primary Allegation<br>(Code of Conduct)  | Year Complaint Received |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
|--|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|  | 2000-2004               |            | 2005      |            | 2006      |            | Total      |            |
|  | #                       | %          | #         | %          | #         | %          | #          | %          |
| General Standards for Competency (CC 3.0)  | 18                      | 7          | 18        | 41         | 14        | 28         | 50         | 13.5       |
| Informed Consent (CC 4.0)  | 13                      | 5          | 1         | 2          | 4         | 8          | 18         | 4.9        |
| Relationships-Clients (CC 5.0)   | 42                      | 15         | 5         | 11         | 1         | 2          | 48         | 13         |
| Relationships-Work (CC 5.0)  | 2                       | 1          | 1         | 2          | 2         | 4          | 5          | 1.4        |
| Relationships-Dual Roles (including Prohibited Relationships/ Conduct and Impairment) (CC 5.0) | 9                       | 3          | 3         | 7          | 4         | 8          | 16         | 4.3        |
| Confidentiality (CC 6.0)   | 14                      | 5          |           |            | 2         | 4          | 16         | 4.3        |
| Professionalism (CC 7.0)   | 36                      | 13         | 3         | 7          | 10        | 20         | 49         | 13.2       |
| Provision of Services (CC 8.0)   | 5                       | 2          |           |            | 4         | 8          | 9          | 2.4        |
| Representation of Services/Credentials (CC 9.0)  | 2                       | 1          |           |            |           |            | 2          | .5         |
| Advertising/Public Statements (CC 10.0)  | 4                       | 1          | 2         | 5          | 1         | 2          | 7          | 1.9        |
| Assessment Procedures (CC 11.0)  | 119                     | 43         | 11        | 25         | 8         | 16         | 138        | 37.3       |
| Fees (CC 12.0)   | 8                       | 3          |           |            |           |            | 8          | 2.2        |
| Maintenance of Records (CC 13.0)   | 1                       | 5          |           |            |           |            | 1          | .3         |
| Security/Access to Record (CC 14.0)  | 1                       | 5          |           |            |           |            | 1          | .3         |
| Compliance with Law (CC 18.0)  | 2                       | 1          |           |            |           |            | 2          | .5         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>276</b>              | <b>100</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>370</b> | <b>100</b> |

**b. Complaint Context** Table 13 reports on the context within which complaints occurred. As has consistently been the case in the past, in 2006 a substantial proportion (n=26; 52%) of the complaint concerns arose in the context of an assessment, such as custody and access proceedings or insurance claims.

**Table 13: Complaint Context in Complaints Received 2000-2006**

| Complaint Context     | Year Complaint Received |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|                       | 2000-2004               |            | 2005      |            | 2006      |            | Total      |            |
|                       | #                       | %          | #         | %          | #         | %          | #          | %          |
| Assessment            | 162                     | 58         | 30        | 68         | 26        | 52         | 218        | 58         |
| Consultation          | 5                       | 2          | 1         | 2          |           |            | 6          | 3          |
| Intervention          | 66                      | 24         | 8         | 18         | 8         | 16         | 82         | 22         |
| Regulatory Compliance | 7                       | 3          | 3         | 7          | 6         | 12         | 16         | 4          |
| Other                 | 36                      | 13         | 2         | 5          | 10        | 20         | 48         | 13         |
| <b>Totals</b>         | <b>276</b>              | <b>100</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>370</b> | <b>100</b> |

**c. Area of Practice** Table 14 below presents descriptive information on the area of practice within which complaints occurred. In 2006, 48% (n=24) of the complaints received were in the broad area of clinical psychology, and an additional 16% (n=8) occurred within the custody and access sub-area within clinical psychology.

**Table 14: Complaint - Area of Practice in Complaints Received 2000-2006**

| Complaint Area of Practice | Year Complaint Received |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|                            | 2000-2004               |            | 2005      |            | 2006      |            | Total      |            |
|                            | #                       | %          | #         | %          | #         | %          | #          | %          |
| Clinical Psychology        | 127                     | 46         | 18        | 41         | 24        | 48         | 169        | 46         |
| Custody and Access         | 75                      | 27         | 13        | 30         | 8         | 16         | 96         | 26         |
| Counselling Psychology     | 20                      | 7          | 3         | 7          | 10        | 20         | 33         | 9          |
| Forensic /Corrections      | 28                      | 10         | 2         | 5          | 2         | 4          | 32         | 9          |
| Industrial /Organizational | 1                       | 1          |           |            | 1         | 2          | 2          | 1          |
| Neuropsychology            | 7                       | 3          | 4         | 9          | 5         | 10         | 16         | 4          |
| Rehabilitation Psychology  | 6                       | 2          | 2         | 4          |           |            | 8          | 2          |
| Research /Academic         | 2                       | 1          | 2         | 4          |           |            | 4          | 1          |
| School Psychology          | 6                       | 1          |           |            |           |            | 6          | 2          |
| N/A                        | 4                       | 1          |           |            |           |            | 4          | 1          |
| <b>Totals</b>              | <b>276</b>              | <b>100</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>370</b> | <b>100</b> |

**d. Complainant Type** As indicated in Table 15 below, 38% (n=19) of the complaints received in 2006 were filed directly by the clients of respondents. The Inquiry Committee opened 11 files (22%) on its own motion based on information provided to it; colleagues, including other psychologists, lawyers or other professionals, accounted for 14% (n=7) of the complaints received in 2006. Cumulatively since 2000, the most frequent category of complainant has been third parties to services provided by a registrant, followed by direct clients. Typically, third party complaints involve situations where the psychologist is hired by someone other than the service recipient. The "other" category consists of former clients and members of the public with no professional relationship with the registrant.

**Table 15: Complainant Type in Complaints Received 2000-2006**

| Complainant Type               | Year Complaint Received |            |           |            |           |            |            |            |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                | 2000-2004               |            | 2005      |            | 2006      |            | Total      |            |
|                                | #                       | %          | #         | %          | #         | %          | #          | %          |
| Client - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party | 95                      | 34         | 4         | 9          | 4         | 8          | 103        | 28         |
| Client - Direct                | 52                      | 19         | 11        | 25         | 19        | 38         | 82         | 22         |
| Client Relative                | 36                      | 13         | 11        | 25         | 3         | 6          | 50         | 14         |
| Colleague                      | 43                      | 16         | 11        | 25         | 7         | 14         | 61         | 16         |
| Inquiry Committee              | 26                      | 9          | 4         | 9          | 11        | 22         | 41         | 11         |
| Other                          | 24                      | 9          | 3         | 7          | 6         | 12         | 33         | 9          |
| <b>Totals</b>                  | <b>276</b>              | <b>100</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>370</b> | <b>100</b> |

### 3. Investigations Opened by the Inquiry Committee

Under the *Health Professions Act*, the Inquiry Committee can open an investigation on its own motion involving public protection concerns or when investigation of allegations made by complainants provides evidence which on its face suggests a new area of concern. Most frequently, investigations initiated by the Committee arise in the following circumstances: failure to comply with regulatory obligations in connection with another complaint, receipt of information generally available to the public, information obtained through an inspection of a registrant's practice records, or through information provided to the College, that is deemed of sufficient concern to initiate an investigation. In 2006, 11 complaint investigations were opened by the Inquiry Committee. Fifty-five percent (n=6) of these files were opened to investigate issues of compliance with regulatory obligations. The remainder were opened based on information brought to the attention of the Inquiry Committee regarding possible breaches of the *Code of Conduct*.

### 4. Length of Time to Close Files

For complaints closed in 2006 (n=61), the number of months required to investigate and close a file ranged from 1 to 33 months. The average time to closure was 8 months. Table 16 below contains the average length of time to close complaint files across the years 2000-2006.



**Table 16: Time (in months) to Close Files by Year File Closed,  
for Complaints Received 2000-2006  
(N=346)**

| <b>Year Complaint Closed:</b>        | <b>2000-2004*</b>   | <b>2005</b>         | <b>2006</b>        |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Length of Time to Close File:</b> | 8 months<br>n = 237 | 11 months<br>n = 48 | 8 months<br>n = 61 |

\*29 complaints involving three individuals, closed in 2004, are not included in this tabulation because of the atypically long resolution time that resulted from protracted negotiations.

## 5. Complaint File Closing Reasons

Approximately two-thirds of the complaints closed in 2006 were dismissed because of insufficient evidence of a breach of the *Code of Conduct*, withdrawn, or not proceeded on for administrative reasons. This figure has been reasonably consistent since the College became regulated under the *Health Professions Act*. For complaints received and closed since 2000, about one-third were resolved by means of an undertaking or agreement with the respondent, or by some action offered by the respondent that satisfied the Committee's concerns in the matter.

**Table 17: Closing Reasons for Complaints Received and Closed 2000-2006  
(N= 346)**

| <b>Closing Category</b>  | <b>Closing Reason</b>   | <b>Year Complaint File Closed</b> |            |             |            |             |            |               |            |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|
|  |   | <b>2000-2004</b>                  |            | <b>2005</b> |            | <b>2006</b> |            | <b>Totals</b> |            |
|  |   | <b>#</b>                          | <b>%</b>   | <b>#</b>    | <b>%</b>   | <b>#</b>    | <b>%</b>   | <b>#</b>      | <b>%</b>   |
| Dismissed for lack of evidence or otherwise not proceeded upon | Decision Not to Proceed   | 37*                               | 16         | 3           | 6          | 17          | 28         | 57            | <b>16</b>  |
|  | Withdrawn   | 8                                 | 3          |             |            | 1           | 2          | 9             | <b>3</b>   |
|  | Insufficient Evidence   | 115                               | 49         | 15          | 31         | 20          | 33         | 150           | <b>43</b>  |
|  | <b>Subtotal</b>   | <b>160</b>                        | <b>68</b>  | <b>18</b>   | <b>37</b>  | <b>38</b>   | <b>62</b>  | <b>216</b>    | <b>62</b>  |
| Voluntary Resolution   | Letter of Undertaking   | 49                                | 21         | 14          | 29         | 12          | 20         | 75            | <b>22</b>  |
|  | Resolved  | 20                                | 8          | 4           | 8          | 10          | 16         | 34            | <b>10</b>  |
|  | <b>Subtotal</b>   | <b>69</b>                         | <b>29</b>  | <b>18</b>   | <b>37</b>  | <b>22</b>   | <b>36</b>  | <b>109</b>    | <b>32</b>  |
| Resigned/Cancelled Referred to RC or DC                        | Resigned/Cancelled Referred to Registration or Discipline Committee | 8                                 | 3          | 12          | 25         | 1           | 2          | 21            | <b>6</b>   |
| <b>Totals</b>  |   | <b>237</b>                        | <b>100</b> | <b>48</b>   | <b>100</b> | <b>61</b>   | <b>100</b> | <b>346</b>    | <b>100</b> |

\* This number was reported as 36 in error in the 2004 report.

## 6. Components of the Complaint Investigation Process

Components of the complaint investigation process include without prejudice meetings, extraordinary hearings, and citations and discipline hearings, described below.

**a. Without Prejudice Meetings** The term “without prejudice” is used to indicate that nothing that occurs in a without prejudice meeting or correspondence may be used in other proceedings. Without prejudice meetings provide an informal and effective means for resolving complaint matters. Two without prejudice meetings were held in 2006. Additionally, a number of without prejudice telephone conversations occurred, and several without prejudice letters with proposals for complaint resolution were sent. By way of example, a without prejudice meeting between the Inquiry Committee and a respondent occurred in the context of a complaint involving a custody and access assessment. The complainant was concerned about psychometric test security and non-standard circumstances in the assessment. At the conclusion of the meeting, the respondent signed an agreement to safeguard test protocols, questions and forms, as well as to include statements of limitations in assessment reports regarding any non-standard circumstances or events.

**b. Extraordinary Hearings** Sometimes concerns arise which necessitate immediate action on the part of the Inquiry Committee, such as issues with sufficient public protection concern that the Committee believes an immediate restriction on practice or license suspension may be warranted. There is no testing of evidence at an extraordinary hearing. Rather, a decision is made on whether the available evidence, on its face, supports action by the Inquiry Committee. Any extraordinary action or agreement is an interim measure, designed to address immediate public protection concerns, while the complaint investigation continues and/or pending a full hearing of the Discipline Committee. Extraordinary actions or agreements, therefore, do not represent final resolutions of the complaint issues. In 2006, notice was issued for extraordinary hearings on three files involving two registrants. In the case of the registrant with two complaint files, a Letter of Undertaking was signed on an interim basis that satisfied the Committee’s concerns for public protection while the complaint investigation continued. In the third case, an extraordinary hearing was held, and the registrant was suspended on an interim basis pending a full hearing of the Discipline Committee.

**c. Discipline Hearings & Citations** In contrast to an extraordinary hearing, a discipline hearing is the equivalent of a full trial on all issues, and a finding of fact is made at the end of the hearing. No Discipline Committee hearings were held in 2006, although the Committee moved to issue a citation for a hearing of the Discipline Committee on four files (3 registrants). In one file, the registrant elected to resign prior to the hearing date; the second registrant signed a Letter of Undertaking to resolve two files before the hearing was convened, and the final citation involved one registrant and one complaint file.

## 7. Letters of Undertaking/Consent Agreements

Table 18 below provides a summary of Letters of Undertaking/Consent Agreements signed with registrants during the year 2006 as a means of bringing a complaint file to a close. The terms of such agreements are determined on a case by case basis and are all signed on a voluntary basis. In a number of the more serious complaints below, a hearing of the Discipline Committee would have been held had such a resolution not been achieved.

**Table 18. Summary of Terms of Letters of Undertaking/Consent Agreements in 2006**

| # of Files/<br>#<br>registrants | Type    | Primary<br>Allegation        | Terms of Consent Agreement or Letter of Undertaking                               |           |           |                               |   |            |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|---|------------|
|                                 |         |                              | Practice Change   | Education | Apology   | Supervision                   | Limitation                                  | Assessment |
| 5 files/<br>1 registrant        | Final   | 03-Competency                |   |           |           |                               |   | Yes        |
| 2 files/<br>1 registrant        | Final   | 11-Assessment<br>Procedures  |   | Paper     |           | Supervision to<br>write paper | No Dangerous<br>Offender work               |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 11-Assessment<br>Procedures  |   |           |           |                               | No review<br>reports without<br>supervision |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 05-Prohibited<br>Rel/Contact |   | Paper     |           |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 11-Assessment<br>Procedures  | Improved test administration,<br>security; statement of<br>limitations in reports |           |           |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 05-Intervention              | Improved informed consent<br>procedures, record-keeping,<br>collegial courtesy    |           |           |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 05-Rel/Work                  |   | Paper     | To client |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 05-Rel/Clients               | Improved informed consent<br>procedures   |           |           |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 03-Competency                | Improved statement of<br>limitations in assessments                               |           |           |                               |   |            |
| 1 file/<br>1 registrant         | Final   | 03-Competency                | Improved role clarity,<br>assessment procedures                                   |           |           |                               |   |            |
| 2 files/<br>1 registrant        | Interim | 03-Competency                |   |           |           | Supervision                   | No assessments                              |            |

## **8. Summary of A Sample of Complaints Received in 2006**

Below is a sampling of complaints received during the year. In each case, a brief review of the main allegations raised by the complaint is provided, and a description of the process and outcome of the complaint investigation. The Committee noted a continued trend towards more complaints in the context of insurance claims.

The first two cases reviewed below were resolved by means of an agreement by the respondents to modify their practice in ways that were viewed by the Committee as likely to assist the respondent in avoiding similar complaints in the future. The first case involved a psycho-educational assessment of a child prepared some years prior to the complaint. The complainant, also a registrant, requested the raw test data of the assessment in order to facilitate comparison with an update assessment the complainant was undertaking. In reviewing the data, the complainant became aware of errors in the scoring and norming of one of the tests administered in the earlier assessment. The Committee reviewed the information provided by the complainant, obtained the practice records of the respondent, and posed several questions to the respondent under section 33(5) of the *Health Professions Act*. The registrant took the concerns of the Committee and the complainant seriously, agreed to prepare an addendum to the report correcting the errors, and forwarded the addendum to the child's school.

A second case that was resolved by means of an agreement serves as a reminder to registrants to maintain role clarity when providing psychological services. The complaint involved a report containing child custody and access recommendations by a registrant who was providing psychological treatment to one of the parents. The complainant expressed concern that the respondent had entered into conflicting roles by making custody recommendations for the child of an individual the respondent was seeing for psychotherapy. The Committee carefully reviewed the documents submitted by the complainant, obtained the respondent's practice records, and asked the respondent a number of questions in a letter under section 33(5) of the *Health Professions Act*. The complaint was resolved through an agreement by the respondent not to mix treatment and assessment roles, and not to make custody and access recommendations without a full assessment.

A case which was resolved following without prejudice discussions with the respondent involved a neuropsychological report prepared by the respondent in relation to a workplace accident. The complainant alleged that the respondent's report contained numerous factual errors, such as composition of the complainant's family, various dates, and names of individuals. The complainant also alleged bias on the part of the respondent. The Committee carefully reviewed the documents submitted by the complainant, requested and obtained the respondent's practice records. A review of the records satisfied the Committee that no bias was evident, and in order to resolve the issue of the factual errors, without prejudice discussions were held with the respondent, who decided to prepare an addendum to the report correcting the errors. The respondent forwarded the addendum to WorkSafe BC, and the file was closed.

In another complaint, involving assessment of cognitive impairment following a workplace accident, a respondent prepared a neuropsychological assessment of an individual who subsequently complained that the report contained numerous factual errors and incorrect conclusions. The complainant was also concerned about the role of a neuropsychological fellow who assisted with the assessment, and alleged that this individual was never properly explained to him. The Committee dismissed the case following a review of the documents submitted by the complainant, and an inquiry to the respondent regarding the nature of information provided to clients about the role of his assistants. This case highlights again the challenges confronted by many complainants, who may have sustained cognitive impairments that affect their ability to understand psychologists' procedures and recommendations.

As a final example, the Inquiry Committee reviewed a complaint related to a custody and access assessment in which the complainant alleged that the respondent did not inform her of the limitations to confidentiality of the information she provided in an interview. The complainant disclosed sensitive personal information to the respondent, and was unhappy that this information was included in the respondent's report and consequently was available to the court and other interested parties. The complainant also alleged that the respondent was biased against her in the assessment. The Committee obtained the relevant practice records, and posed the respondent a number of questions under section 33(5) of the Act, before dismissing the complaint because of insufficient evidence of an ethical violation.

## 9. Complaints per Year By # of Registrants and Number of Registrants with Complaints

Table 19 below describes the number of registrants about whom complaints have been received since the College was first granted responsibility for regulating the profession in 1993.

**Table 19: # of Complaints per year from 1993 - 2006 and # Registrants with Complaints**

| <b>Year</b>  | <b># complaints (with named registrant)</b> | <b># Registrants</b> |
|--------------|---|----------------------|
| 1993         | 30  | 21                   |
| 1994         | 26  | 22                   |
| 1995         | 44  | 35                   |
| 1996         | 38  | 30                   |
| 1997         | 45  | 39                   |
| 1998         | 47  | 32                   |
| 1999         | 53  | 37                   |
| 2000         | 64  | 48                   |
| 2001         | 59  | 42                   |
| 2002         | 54  | 38                   |
| 2003         | 53  | 42                   |
| 2004         | 46  | 31                   |
| 2005         | 44  | 35                   |
| 2006         | 50  | 42                   |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>652</b>                                  | <b>279*</b>          |

\* This figure is not a column total, as some registrants appear in multiple years.

A total of 168 registrants have had at least one complaint since January, 2000 as shown in the Table below. Seven individuals resigned as a means of resolving matters with the College or in response to complaints received. Approximately 15% of current registrants have had at least one complaint filed under the *Health Professions Act*.

**Table 20: Number of Complaints since January 2000 Per Registrant**

| # of Complaints | # Named Registrants | Total complaints | Public complaints | Motion of IC |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 1               | 102                 | 102              | 95                | 7            |
| 2               | 29                  | 58               | 52                | 6            |
| 3               | 11                  | 33               | 30                | 3            |
| 4               | 8                   | 32               | 27                | 5            |
| 5               | 5                   | 25               | 24                | 1            |
| 6               | 1                   | 6                | 4                 | 2            |
| 7               | 2                   | 14               | 6                 | 8            |
| 8               | 2                   | 16               | 16                | 0            |
| 9               | 1                   | 9                | 9                 | 0            |
| 10              | 4                   | 40               | 33                | 7            |
| 11              | 3                   | 33               | 31                | 2            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>168**</b>        | <b>368*</b>      | <b>327</b>        | <b>41</b>    |

\* Two complaints, opened in error, without a named respondent, are excluded.

\*\* Seven of these are no longer registered as a result of the outcome of the complaint matters.

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

**1. Ombudsman Investigations** There were no investigations of the College by the Ombudsman's Office in 2006.

**2. Requests under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*** There were four requests made under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act during 2006 that were addressed by the College. In addition, the College participated in a series of invited consultations regarding changes to that legislation.

**3. Relationships with Other Regulatory Bodies in Psychology** The College remained actively involved with the other Canadian regulatory bodies through our involvement in CPAP and with the group of regulators that meet in conjunction with the bi-yearly CPAP meetings. In addition, I continued to Chair the Task Force on Model Regulations for the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards.

**4. Acknowledgments** It is my ongoing privilege to work with a team of highly dedicated and enthusiastic individuals in the College office. The nature of the work requires an unwavering attention to detail and an ability to change focus on a moment's notice. The work produced reflects the experience, expertise and commitment of this wonderful group of people and they each have earned my respect and appreciation. The members of the College Board are generous with their time and expertise and devote many hours to the careful consideration of policy development and decision-making. Appreciation is also expressed to the many registrants who take the time to provide thoughtful comment and feedback.

Respectfully submitted

Andrea Kowaz, Ph.D., R.Psych.  
Registrar

# **MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2006 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

## **(FOR REVIEW OF THE 2005 YEAR)**

The Annual General Meeting of the College of Psychologists of B.C. was held on May 2, 2006, at the Chan Centre Auditorium at Children's Hospital in Vancouver, the Queen Alexandra Centre for Children's Health in Victoria, Nanaimo Regional Hospital, Kelowna Regional Hospital, and the University of Northern British Columbia in Prince George. There were 78 registrants in attendance in Vancouver, 23 registrants in Victoria, 6 registrants in Kelowna, 5 registrants in Nanaimo, and 6 registrants in Prince George.

### **Agenda**

The table of contents in the Annual Report served as the agenda for the May 2, 2006 meeting.

### **Minutes**

The Minutes of the 2004 Annual General Meeting held on May 9, 2005 were approved.

### **Report from the Chair**

Dr. Michael Elterman referred registrants to his Report in the Annual Report. He highlighted the issues of accountability to the public, relationship with the government, including the dialogue regarding exemptions for government workers and school psychologists, and the Board's commitment to holding information meetings throughout the Province.

### **Inquiry Committee**

Dr. Harder reported that the backlog of complaints has been cleared and the Committee is able to process complaints in a timely manner. Registrants were referred to the Inquiry Committee's report in the Annual Report. Dr. Harder responded to questions from registrants.

### **Registration Committee**

Mr. Colby referred registrants to his report on Page 6 of the Annual Report. He thanked the staff for their support, which assisted the Committee in reviewing 217 application files.

### **Quality Assurance Committee**

Dr. Joschko thanked the members of the Committee and the staff for their work during the year. He reported on the Continuing Competency Program which allows registrants to self-manage their continuing education. Registrants were referred to his report on page 10 and Dr. Joschko responded to questions.

### **Legislation Committee**

Dr. Cohene outlined the issues reviewed by the Legislation Committee in 2005, including the changes made to the *Health Professions Act*, scrutinizing the work of members of other Colleges governed by the *HPA*, and a practice advisory regarding file storage in large institutions.

### **Finance Committee**

Dr. Swain referred registrants to his report on Page 12 and to the Audited Financial Statements at the end of the Annual Report and responded to questions.



# **MINUTES CONTINUED**

## **Registrar's Report**

Dr. Kowaz thanked the Board, Committee members and staff for their support and the huge volume of work accomplished during the past year. An overview of the complaint process, files which potentially could go to Discipline Committee Hearings, and the application and registration process was given. The Registrar responded to questions from registrants.

## **Volunteer Recognition**

Dr. Elterman recognized the contribution of volunteers to the College, including Board and Committee members, Oral Examiners, and Supervisors. Also acknowledged were public members serving on the Board and Committees.

The meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS  
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**DECEMBER 31, 2006**

**Auditors' Report  
Statement of Financial Position  
Statement of Changes in Net Assets  
Statement of Operations  
Statement of Cash Flows  
Notes to Financial Statements**

**The Raber Mattuck Group**

# **The Raber Mattuck Group**

*Chartered Accountants*

Suite 318, North Tower, Oakridge Centre, 650 West 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 2M9  
Telephone: (604) 435-5655 Facsimile: (604) 435-1913 E-mail: info@rabermattuck.com

## **AUDITORS' REPORT**

**To the Registrants of  
College of Psychologists of British Columbia**

**We have audited the statement of financial position of the College of Psychologists of British Columbia as at December 31, 2006 and the statements of changes in net assets, operations and cash flows for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the College's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.**

**We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform an audit to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation.**

**In our opinion, these financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the College as at December 31, 2006 and the results of its operations and the changes in its net assets for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.**

**"Signed" Raber Mattuck  
Chartered Accountants**

**Vancouver, British Columbia  
March 13, 2007**

With Offices Across Canada

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**  
**STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION**  
**AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2006**

|  | <u>2006</u>             | <u>2005</u>             |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|  | \$                      | \$                      |
| <b>ASSETS</b>                            |                         |                         |
| <b>CURRENT ASSETS</b>                    |                         |                         |
| Cash                                     | 1,053,794               | 1,253,613               |
| Cash - restricted (Note 4)               | 250,000                 | -                       |
| Prepaid expenses                         | <u>7,367</u>            | <u>7,121</u>            |
|  | 1,311,161               | 1,260,734               |
| <b>PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT (Note 2)</b>   | <u>33,023</u>           | <u>44,087</u>           |
|  | <u><u>1,344,184</u></u> | <u><u>1,304,821</u></u> |
| <b>LIABILITIES</b>                       |                         |                         |
| <b>CURRENT LIABILITIES</b>               |                         |                         |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | 100,823                 | 61,412                  |
| Employee remittances payable             | 24,292                  | 18,450                  |
| Deferred revenue (Note 3)                | <u>631,800</u>          | <u>787,950</u>          |
|  | <u>756,915</u>          | <u>867,812</u>          |
| <b>NET ASSETS</b>                        |                         |                         |
| <b>PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT</b>            | 33,023                  | 44,087                  |
| <b>INTERNALLY RESTRICTED</b>             |                         |                         |
| General Contingency Fund (Note 4)        | 250,000                 | -                       |
| <b>UNRESTRICTED</b>                      | <u>304,246</u>          | <u>392,922</u>          |
|  | <u>587,269</u>          | <u>437,009</u>          |
|  | <u><u>1,344,184</u></u> | <u><u>1,304,821</u></u> |

Approved by the Board

"Signed" Derek A. Swain, Director

"Signed" Wayne Morson, Director

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

The Raber Mattuck Group

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2006**

|                                      | General<br>Contingency<br><u>Fund</u><br><u>2006</u><br>\$ | Invested<br>In Property<br>and Equipment<br><u>2006</u><br>\$ | <u>Unrestricted</u><br><u>2006</u><br>\$ | <u>Total</u><br><u>2006</u><br>\$ | <u>Total</u><br><u>2005</u><br>\$ |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>NET ASSETS, beginning of year</b> | -  | 44,087  | 392,922                                  | 437,009                           | 253,105                           |
| Excess of Receipts Over Expenditures | -  | (11,064)  | 161,324                                  | 150,260                           | 183,904                           |
| Interfund transfers                  | <u>250,000</u>   | <u>-</u>  | <u>(250,000)</u>                         | <u>-</u>                          | <u>-</u>                          |
| <b>NET ASSETS, end of year</b>       | <u>250,000</u>   | <u>33,023</u>   | <u>304,246</u>                           | <u>587,269</u>                    | <u>437,009</u>                    |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**The Raber Mattuck Group**

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**  
**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2006**

|   | <u>2006</u>               | <u>2005</u>               |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
|   | \$                        | \$                        |
| <b>RECEIPTS</b>   |                           |                           |
| Registration fees   | 1,208,190                 | 1,171,540                 |
| Application and exam fees   | 87,110                    | 78,015                    |
| Interest  | 37,629                    | 21,489                    |
| Other income and cost recovery  | <u>37,228</u>             | <u>70,743</u>             |
|   | <u>1,370,157</u>          | <u>1,341,787</u>          |
| <br><b>EXPENDITURES</b>   |                           |                           |
| Administration  | 679,687                   | 675,762                   |
| Audit   | 4,735                     | 4,440                     |
| Board   | 38,489                    | 34,956                    |
| Committees (meetings, travel and honoraria)                           | 60,667                    | 54,202                    |
| External relations (dues)   | 5,405                     | 6,603                     |
| Extraordinary Hearings  | 10,051                    | 17,460                    |
| Discipline Hearings (Including Preparation)                           | 40,262                    | 53,103                    |
| Operations  | 135,897                   | 138,657                   |
| Registrant / Applicant services                                       | 43,162                    | 43,801                    |
| Statutory functions (FOI, investigations, routine legal consultation) | <u>201,542</u>            | <u>128,899</u>            |
|   | <u>1,219,897</u>          | <u>1,157,883</u>          |
| <br><b>EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER EXPENDITURES</b>                       | <br><u><u>150,260</u></u> | <br><u><u>183,904</u></u> |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

The Raber Mattuck Group

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**  
**STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS**  
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2006**

|   | <u>2006</u><br>\$       | <u>2005</u><br>\$       |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</b>     |                         |                         |
| Excess of receipts over expenditures            | 150,260                 | 183,904                 |
| Adjustments for:                                |                         |                         |
| Amortization                                    | 17,520                  | 19,510                  |
| Prepaid expense                                 | (246)                   | 6,636                   |
| Accounts payable                                | 39,411                  | (9,467)                 |
| Employee remittances payable                    | 5,842                   | 8,976                   |
| Deferred revenue                                | <u>(156,150)</u>        | <u>(279,500)</u>        |
|   | <u>56,637</u>           | <u>(69,941)</u>         |
| <br><b>CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES</b> |                         |                         |
| Purchase of capital assets                      | <u>(6,456)</u>          | <u>(2,595)</u>          |
| <br><b>NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH</b>      | 50,181                  | (72,536)                |
| <br>CASH, beginning of year                     | <u>1,253,613</u>        | <u>1,326,149</u>        |
| <br><b>CASH, end of year</b>                    | <u><u>1,303,794</u></u> | <u><u>1,253,613</u></u> |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**The Raber Mattuck Group**

**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**  
**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**  
**DECEMBER 31, 2006**

**1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

*Fund Accounting*

Revenues and expenditures for general activities and administration are reported in the General Fund.

The General Contingency Fund was established during the year to cover future unexpected expenditures.

*Property and Equipment*

Purchased property and equipment are recorded at cost.

Contributed property and equipment are recorded at fair value at the date of contribution.

Amortization is provided on a declining balance basis at the following rates:

|                                 |                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Office furniture and equipment  | - 20% declining balance |
| Computer equipment and software | - 30% declining balance |
| Leasehold improvements          | - 5 years straight line |

In the year of acquisition, only one-half of the normal amortization is recorded.

Amortization expense is reported in the Capital Asset Fund.

*Revenue and Expense recognition*

Registration fees are recognized as income in the fiscal year due. Expenditures are recognized as incurred.

**2. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT**

|                                | 2006           |                             | 2005              |                   |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                | Cost           | Accumulated<br>Amortization | Net Book<br>Value | Net Book<br>Value |
|                                | \$             | \$                          | \$                | \$                |
| Office furniture and equipment | 84,558         | 68,265                      | 16,293            | 20,366            |
| Computer equipment             | 98,124         | 81,394                      | 16,730            | 16,060            |
| Leasehold improvements         | <u>40,706</u>  | <u>40,706</u>               | <u>-</u>          | <u>7,661</u>      |
|                                | <u>223,388</u> | <u>190,365</u>              | <u>33,023</u>     | <u>44,087</u>     |

The Raber Mattuck Group



**COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
DECEMBER 31, 2006**

**3. DEFERRED REVENUE**

Deferred revenue represents membership fees for the 2007 calendar year received in advance.

**4. GENERAL CONTINGENCY FUND**

The General Contingency Fund was established by the Board of Directors during the year.

The General Contingency Fund is to be used in special circumstances and subject to the approval by the College of Psychologists of British Columbia Board of Directors.

**The Raber Mattuck Group**