REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT

On behalf of Council I would like to take this opportunity to express appreciation for the chance our members have given us to serve the people of Saskatchewan. The Council of the College plays a key role in regulating the profession of psychology. I can comfortably state that each Council member takes that responsibility very seriously and has worked hard over the past year to fulfill the legislated mandate of the College.

It has become clear to me over the past year that the role of the president is to serve. There are times when actions must be taken as president, but those actions must reflect the will of Council. It has been my good fortune to work with some very principled and collaborative individuals on Council (i.e., Dr. Greg Stevens, Judy Curry, Karen Todd, Shelley Hengen, Laura Vilness, Dr. Jenny Keller). In addition to our College members on Council, we have the services of three very competent public reps on Council (i.e., Joan Dudgeon, Gord Glacair and Kurt Schroeder), who have contributed significantly to the work of Council. Finally, Karen Messer-Engel, our capable Registrar, also plays an active role on Council. We rely on her expertise and the information she brings to the table. Clearly, Council is responsible for making strategic decisions, but our Registrar enables us to understand the relevant issues. Overall, I am proud of the efforts of my colleagues on Council over this past term.

Numerous actions were initiated by Council over the past term. I encourage each of you to carefully read our Registrar’s report and please refer to the SCP website as well for additional information. If there are additional questions about Council’s activities over the past year I would be happy to personally answer your questions. Obviously, there will be differences of opinion at times amongst our members about decisions that have been made. Be assured that controversial decisions have been scrutinized by Council as critically as possible and by our lawyer, Merrilee Rasmussen. Merrilee has been with the College since our inception, and Council relies on her background and knowledge for informed interpretation of our legislation.

The College is well served by our office staff, including Karen Messer-Engel (Registrar), Wendy Petrisor (Assistant to the Registrar), and Donna Murphy (Receptionist). As noted in Mary Vandergoort’s 2008 report, this year has been the first year of a 4 year strategic plan. To date Council has been mostly involved with foundational issues and laying the groundwork for the future. Part of that work has included going through and rewriting our policies to ensure that they are consistent with our governance model. Florence Lalonde has assisted Council with this task at Council’s request. She brings a wealth of knowledge given her history as secretary with previous councils over the past few years. Working through our policies also includes defining the core responsibilities of Council and of the office staff, and articulating of boundaries. More specifically, we are realigning the responsibilities of Council and our staff so that Council is able to focus primarily on the ends and our staff can focus on the means by which we accomplish our objectives. This will enable future Council’s to work more efficiently and will allow the office to function with greater efficiency and autonomy. Ultimate authority will still reside in Council, but the relationships will be clarified. This is a work in progress and will continue to evolve over the next year. Whenever there is such major transition there is usually added stress. I would like to thank our staff for their collaboration and understanding since our strategic planning process began. We are now seeing the initial rewards of that work.

No report would be complete without recognition of the work of our committees. Please refer to our Registrar’s report for more detailed information about the various challenges faced by our committees. For those of you who are interested in working on behalf of our College, I am sure that any committee member would be happy to explain their work and why they are involved. From my own experience with committee members, I would say that by and large, our committees are stocked with individuals who want to make a difference and who are willing to work on behalf of the College and on behalf of the general public. I emphasize the latter because the College is first and foremost a regulatory institution. In all cases, the welfare of the general public takes precedence over all other interests, even including the interests of our registrants. Indeed, the reason why psychologists are registered by the college is to ensure that competent and ethical service is ensured. Our committees fulfill the lion’s share of that mandate.
Obviously you are aware that our registration fees have increased recently. Indeed, if you were to examine rates for various services provided by the College, you would find that rates for these services have increased. However, most of our fees are still well below the national average. Although we hope to keep our fees as low as possible, it is critical that our organization’s management is based on sound business principles. That is, budget deficits must not be tolerated. Reasonable reimbursement of the costs for our services will benefit all of our members over the long term. If we are unable to do that, the services we will be able to provide in the future will be limited. That will not be in our organization’s best interests.

Our vision statement that “all psychological services in Saskatchewan are delivered by registered psychologists who are ethical and competent” presumes a financially healthy and well functioning system that enables the College to fulfill it’s mandate. By attending to cost recovery, and ensuring we have competent staff the College will be able to do it’s work adequately.

Finally, I would like to offer my sincere appreciation for the opportunity I have had to serve as the President of the Saskatchewan College of Psychologists. I initially served two years as a Member-at-Large, moving on to serve one year as President-Elect and then in the past year as President. I had the privilege to learn from three of my peers and thank them for that. Over the next term Dr. Greg Stevens will assume the role of President. I have grown to respect and appreciate him over the past year. He will do a fantastic job as our next President and I confidently pass the torch to him. I would encourage any that have a yen to serve to think of volunteering with the College. Serving on our committees or on Council is honorable and challenging work. This work is also meaningful and directly contributes to the development and viability of our noble profession.

Respectfully submitted,
President

REGISTRAR’S REPORT

Another year has passed and we are not only a bit older but I would like to think that we are also quite a bit wiser. It is clear to me that role and responsibility of the College is complex and continually evolving, and the challenge is to keep up with that evolution. I am thankful for the opportunity to serve as the Registrar, and to have had the privilege to have met and have heard from many of you over the past year. Your feedback and perspectives are important in helping to determine where the College needs to focus its efforts and attention.

I am appreciative of the support that I have received from Executive Council. Over the last year Executive Council has worked hard to reflect on its role and the governance of the organization, and has been moving toward fundamental change that will streamline the work of the organization. I am grateful for the continued participation on Council and College committees by our three Public Representatives; Joan Dudgeon, Gordon Glaicar, and Curt Schroeder. They bring to this organization a perspective that is crucial to our mandate and our accountability as a regulatory body. I also would like to acknowledge the excellent legal representation that the College has received from Merrilee Rasmussen, Q.C. and Karen Prisciak, Q.C. Merrilee has been with the College since its establishment in 2002 and Karen joined as legal counsel to the PCC in 2007.

I am fortunate to have the opportunity to work with two coworkers who are competent, professional and are of immense assistance to me in my work; Wendy Petrisor and Donna Murphy. As you may recall Wendy’s position was reconfigured in the fall of 2008 to allow her to serve as the Assistant to the Registrar. Her current position involves supporting the work of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) and the Registrar’s work, while maintaining the higher level functions of the Office Manager. She is well suited to the position and continues to be an invaluable member of the College staff. Donna joined the College in November 2008 as the Receptionist/ Administrative Assistant. While she has only been with us for a short time she has already become an important member of the staff and positive contributor to the work of the organization.

A reality of the times is that the profession is aging and consequently many are moving into retirement. The College experienced a significant drop in its membership at renewal time (478 members December-08) from the previous month (493 members November-08). Our current membership numbers are as follows (February 09):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Practice</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Practice</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Practice</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Members</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Registration Committee (RC) plays a very important and significant role in the work of the College. The Committee has served the College and the profession with professionalism and commitment, and is invaluable to my work as the Registrar. The RC has worked hard to ensure a high level of training and competence among the registrants of the College. Some of the significant issues addressed by the RC over the last year have included issues such as distance education, practice competence, supervision during Provisional practice, and the registration/ credentialing policy of the College.

The Oral Examination Committee (OEC) has worked hard in the last year to ensure the competence of those admitted to the Full Practice Register. The College through the work of the Oral Examination Committee (OEC) offered two sets of oral examinations during the year; May and November. In total 20 examinations were conducted. The College is sensitive to the fact that historically there have been more candidates for
examination than spaces available. It also recognizes that establishing examination panels is difficult as the process is reliant on the availability of volunteers to serve on panels, and is very costly. Further there is a commitment to improve the standardization of the examination process. Executive Council has accepted in principle a recommendation by the OEC to further improve the process and hopefully reduce wait times through the establishment of set examination panels. It is hoped that through such an initiative that more examinations may be able to be offered, more frequently, and with fewer required volunteers. Another important reality to consider is that the oral examinations are very costly, and that the examinations have cost the College more than the fees that have been collected. It is with this, and the proposed changes to the examination process in mind, that the Executive Council passed a motion that establishes that the examinations must be provided on a total cost-recovery basis. Executive Council also recently passed a motion allowing for the review and establishment of the examination fee in December of each year (for the subsequent practice year). The oral examination fee for the 2009 practice year has been set a $500.00 per examination. This fee is consistent with fees established by Psychology regulatory bodies across Canada, and will cover the actual costs of providing the examination.

We are very fortunate to have a committed group of members of the profession who are willing to take on the very challenging and difficult work of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The PCC is the investigative arm of the College, and has the unenviable position of having to examine the conduct of their colleagues and peers. The nature of the complaints varies greatly but generally is consistent with what is being seen nationally in terms of the major complaints relate to issues of privacy/confidentiality, custody and access cases, and the provision of independent medical evaluations.

The Discipline Committee is the other committee of the College who has the very difficult task of sitting in judgement of members of the profession. It is true is that all of us as members of the profession have the potential to have a complaint lodged against us, and it is undeniably a difficult reality. I believe that it is important to remember that our willingness as a profession to examine our own practice and conduct will only serve to strengthen our profession.

The Legislation and Bylaws Committee of the College has submitted to Executive Council for their consideration two major pieces of work in the last year as well as commentary on questions raised at the College level pertaining to the legislation. Draft bylaws pertaining to the continuing education requirement, and the establishment of a Temporary Register have been received by Executive Council and have been approved in principle. The draft bylaws are currently being reviewed by legal counsel and will be submitted shortly to Government.

The Professional Practice and Ethics Committee (PP&E) has served both Executive Council and the members of the profession competently, providing opinion with regard to ethical and practice questions. It is hoped that in the future the Committee’s opinions can be provided in a general advisory format as the types of issues they are asked to consider are frequently issues that would be relevant to all practitioners. It is important to emphasize that the work of the PP&E is fundamentally different from that of the PCC, and that their role is not to adjudicate the merit of complaints against Psychologists.

It was with gratitude that the Executive Council received the reports of two Ad Hoc Committees; the Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education, and the Third Party Payer Committee. The issue of distance education for the purpose of licensure continues to be under consideration by the College. This is a question on the minds of regulators across North America. The Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education’s report provided a researched and considered opinion, and while not dismissing distance training, emphasized the importance of a period of residency in the training of the professional psychologist. The Third Party Payer Committee worked hard to advise Executive Council with regard to the issues pertaining to third party payers, and produced a standards of conduct document for working with third parties which is on Executive Council’s “action items” list to be considered.

The College has representation on both the Mental Health Sector Committee and the University of Saskatchewan Senate. While those involvements are not frequent, the organization has been well represented at these tables, and as such has been afforded the opportunity to provide input and opinion on the work of both groups.

As was reported last year, the College had been engaged in discussions with the Worker’s Compensation Board (WCB) with regard to the possibility of establishing a relationship agreement between the two organizations. Such an agreement was explored, however, in the final analysis it was decided by Executive Council that the College could not by virtue of its legislated mandate provide the level of assistance that was desired, and that it would be better to not enter into such an agreement but rather to encourage that this be met by the fraternal organizations of the profession.

Another noteworthy issue is that of diagnostic privilege and the profession of Social Work. I recently heard from the Saskatchewan Association of Social Work (SASW) that they continue to be interested in having the privilege extended to a qualified segment of their registrants, and that the suggestion of a change in this position was a misunderstanding by the Ministry of Health. As SASW is represented by the Ministry of Social Services, the two ministries will reportedly be discussing the feasibility of this further. The College has maintained its’ position that given the impact that diagnoses can have on the lives of those who receive them, a high standard of training and competence are necessary for those practicing diagnostics, as is an evaluation of that competence.

A significant issue that has been the focus of attention over the last few months for health regulators both provincially and nationally has been the Federal Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), specifically the recently agreed to and signed amendments to Chapter 7. As you may be aware the AIT is a federal/provincial/territorial agreement that was first signed in
1994, with the goal being to reduce or remove inter-provincial barriers to the movement of goods, services, capital and workers. Chapter 7 relates specifically to labour mobility. It was as a result of the AIT that many professions, Psychology included, began to negotiate Mutual Recognition Agreements in the late 1990s. The national regulators of Psychology signed the Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) in 2001 and this agreement outlined the core competencies necessary for the independent practice of Psychology, as well as outlined the terms and conditions for the facilitated mobility of Full Practice members of the profession across the 10 provinces and one territory. The MRA was amended in 2004 to include the Foundational Knowledge (FK) requirement which outlines the core academic courses felt to be necessary for the professional Psychologist. In a recent scan of the Canadian Psychology jurisdictions who are signatory to the MRA, it was determined that there have been few, if any cases where a MRA did not work and a qualified Full Practice member of one jurisdiction was denied licensure in another. Thus it was a surprise to learn late last spring that the Profession of Psychology had made it on the Governments’ AIT non-compliant list. Unfortunately while the national regulators in Psychology believe that the MRA has worked well and that mobility between jurisdictions is relatively simple for those who are Full Practice and MRA compliant, the amendments to Chapter 7 of the AIT to a certain extent remove from the hands of regulatory bodies the issue of mobility. Under the amendments a plumber in one jurisdiction is a plumber in another, and in the same way a Psychologist in Ontario is one in Saskatchewan. Thus as we understand it, each jurisdiction will not have the option of imposing additional requirements or assessments on incoming Full Practice Psychologists from other jurisdictions unless there are pre-approved “legitimate objectives” for the receiving jurisdiction. The only exception to this would be in a case where there is a history of formal discipline or current investigation into conduct/practice. There is the opportunity for professions to raise arguments for legitimate objectives or legitimate barriers to mobility. However, the regulator must convince its provincial government of the legitimacy of such a barrier, and then in turn should they be convinced they must persuade both the federal government and the other provincial governments of this. It is unclear whether issues such as jurisprudence, differing titles, and differing levels of entry into the profession will be accepted as legitimate objectives. The College is considering its options in terms of legitimate objectives. Full implementation will likely require legislative change, but my understanding is that the government is committed to full mobility. Full compliance is required by April 1, 2009.

The amendments to the AIT leave the rather interesting question regarding the role of the national MRA. The national regulators, the Association of Canadian Psychology Regulatory Organizations (ACPRO) established a task force to look at the AIT amendments and the profession. This writer served on the task force which met in November in B.C. to examine the issues and put forward recommendations to the larger group as to how to proceed. At a recent meeting of ACPRO in Ottawa in January, 2009 it was agreed that a national response to the amendments was important and that it is also important for each organization to raise its concerns and “get them on the radar” even if they are unsuccessful in having them declared legitimate objectives. ACPRO’s position is that if changes with regard to the regulation of the profession are necessary the regulators would like to have the opportunity to address the concerns as opposed to having changes imposed by government. There was also recognition of the value of the MRA and a commitment to revisit it in light of the AIT amendments.

One issue that appears to be becoming increasingly common among the members of the College relates to when the requirements of the profession (the legislation and/or the Code of Ethics for Psychologists 3rd Edition) are in conflict with the standards of the organization in which the Psychologist works. This has lead to discussions with organizations such as the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation (STF), the Office of the Privacy Commission, and employers. Some might view this as more the role of the advocacy bodies, however there clearly are issues that impact regulation. For example the issue of who ultimately has authority over the work of Psychologist when that individual works in the school system and is duly licensed as a teacher? The College recognizes the importance of providing the members of the College with guidance and clarity regarding the expectations for Psychologists.

Policy development is ongoing within the organization. New policies relating to the profession, developed during the last year are as follows: Failure to Comply with CEC Requirements (Feb 2008), Reimbursement of Registration Fees to the Estate of Deceased Members (Feb 2008), Continuing Education Credit – Audit Policy and Procedure (under consideration). Currently the Academic Credentialing Policy is under review in light of changes to the training of professional Psychologists and recent legal opinion. Executive Council has also been working on draft Council policies that are consistent with the anticipated changes to the governance model of the College, and the strategic plan.

I am grateful to have been given the opportunity to represent the College at ACPRO meetings and the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) meetings. Some of the topics covered at ACPRO meetings over the last year have included: a national position relating to licensure within the jurisdiction in which one practices; retirement planning (members planning for how to deal with their practice in event of death, illness or planned retirement); emails/electronic record keeping; a statement of support for CPA accreditation; establishment of an ACPRO website; residency requirements under the MRA; the need to be more prescriptive about what supervision should look like. Not surprisingly issues covered at the ASPPB meetings are similar to those of concern to the Psychology regulators in Canada; colleague assistance programs (fitness to practice issues); consistency in licensure; adjudicating complaints against Psychologists; standards for practicum training; distance education; post-Doctoral year; temporary licensure (Inter-Jurisdictional Practice Certificate); EPPP online application; competence in supervision; and multicultural competence. Both of these forums are very important to the work of the College. Through ACPRO and ASPPB the College has access to information relevant to
regulation, access to stakeholders and policy makers, support in its regulatory work, and a voice in how the profession will look in Canada and North America.

I continue to represent the College at the Network of Inter-Professional Regulatory Organizations (NIRO) table which is a body made up of the health regulatory organizations in Saskatchewan. This organization provides a forum at which to share information about professional regulation in the province, advocate with regard to regulatory issues, and work on issues of common concern. NIRO’s attention has very much been focussed on issues related to the AIT, as well as privacy issues and legislation.

During the last year I represented the College on a number of initiatives with various stakeholder organizations. In 2007 the College was invited to participate in a joint initiative between the Ministry of Learning and the Saskatchewan Educational Psychologist Association (SEPA) to develop a document to guide the practice of Psychology within Saskatchewan Schools. The document was completed in June 2008 and is now available on the Ministry’s website. Over the last two years I have represented the College on the Internationally Educated Health Professional (IEHP) Career Pathing Advisory Committee, and the IEHP Video Sub-committee which are a joint initiative between the Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations (SAHO) and the Ministry of Health. A video to raise the profile of internationally educated health professionals and what employers can expect in hiring an IEHP is near completion and will be released in the next few weeks by SAHO. Internationally educated health professionals will become increasingly important to the continued viability of the health system in Saskatchewan, and the viability of this profession. In October 2008 the College was invited by the SASW to an information meeting regarding the Saskatchewan Partnership for Children and Youth (Partnership). The Partnership has the goals of promoting awareness of the issues related to the mental health of children, youth and their families, and promoting competent and quality mental health services for them. The College has been invited to have regular representation on the Partnership committee, and Executive Council is currently considering the request. The College was also invited participate in the Saskatchewan Capacity of Internationally Trained Professionals - Roundtable with other professional organizations with the aim to look at any barriers to licensure and how to mitigate these so as to encourage and support the immigration. The College submitted a brief to the committee regarding its processes for licensure of internationally trained Psychologists. The College was also invited to attend a focus group on collaborative mental healthcare that was organized by the Canadian Collaborative Mental Health Initiative (CCMHI). The purpose of the focus group was to discuss and promote collaborative mental healthcare practice among professionals and consumers in primary care settings in Saskatchewan.

I had a number of opportunities over the last year to meet with future members of the profession through the university programs at both universities and the internship program in the Saskatoon Health Region. I believe that it is important for those of us currently in the profession to look for opportunities to mentor new members into the profession, and to take opportunities to promote a high standard of competence and professionalism.

Finally to with regard to the Workforce Planning Recruitment/Retention Grant that was awarded to the College in 2007 by the Ministry of Health, it has been difficult to implement the projects given more pressing issues facing the College. However, I am pleased to report that we are in the process of arranging for Dr. Carol Falender (California) to provide two workshops on the provision of supervision tentatively on May 28, 2009 in Regina and May 29, 2008 in Saskatoon. These workshops will be provided free of charge to members. More information will be forthcoming in the near future. I hope that you will mark the dates on your calendars and plan to attend. Implementation of the grant writing projects will also occur in the near future.

As I hope is evident, the last year has been very busy and productive. I sincerely thank those of you who have been able to assist with the work of the College, as clearly we could not have done as much without your assistance. I would invite those of you who have not yet been able to volunteer your time and talents to consider doing so in this next year. Volunteers not only bring much needed human resources to the organization, but also new ideas, new energy, and allow for broader representation in the regulation of the profession.

Respectfully submitted,
Registrar

REGISTRATION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Registration Committee (Committee) of the College is very ably staffed by Dave Gorrie (Chairperson), Dr. Liz Ivanochko, Terri Dumelie, Nathalie Berard, Tammy Ferguson, Carmel Kleisinger, and Joan Dudgeon (Public Representative). The Registrar serves as an ex-officio member. The Committee has the responsibility of ensuring that those admitted to the Register meet high standards of training and competence that have been established by the College. Meetings are held monthly (with the exception being during the summer). The Committee has been incredibly busy over the last year with reviews of complex applications, reviews of Provisional member progress, oral examination failure reviews, review of registration policy, and consideration of issues such as distance education, competency, and supervision etc. The Committee has the responsibility to stay abreast of changes in training and regulation and to advise Executive Council of issues that they need to be aware of. We have been incredibly fortunate as a regulatory organization to have a very stable and committed Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Registrar
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mandate
The mandate of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) is to receive, review, and investigate complaints alleging professional misconduct and/or incompetence against members of the College. In fulfilling its mandate, when an official complaint is received, the PCC makes an initial determination as to whether the complaint is appropriate to investigate. No investigation occurs when there are no grounds for the complaint because the member’s behavior is not reflective of professional misconduct and/or incompetence, the complaint is frivolous and/or vexatious, or when PCC has not jurisdiction in the matter before the committee. The PCC investigation may consist of gathering information, documentation and conducting interviews with a variety of witnesses, not limited to the complainant and member. If the PCC does investigate, one of three results ensues: a recommendation that no further action be taken; the initiation of either Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) or Mediation; or, referral of the matter to the Discipline Committee.

PCC Members
The current PCC membership consists of Chair, Linda Arnot, M.Ed., James Arnold, Ph.D, Joanne Frederick, M.A., Sandra Gardiner, M.Ed., Marilyn Macdonald, M.Ed., Valerie Morrissey, M.Ed. and Jason Peebles, Ph.D. Alternates are Tim Landry, Ph.D., Ruth Wong, Ph.D., Ruthanne Bell, Ph.D., Carole Eaton, M.A. The Committee expresses great thanks and appreciation to previous PCC committee members from this past year: Shelley Hengen, M.Ed., Rhonda Gough, M.Ed., Lynn Corbett, Ph.D., Carole Pond, Ph.D., Gail Clark, M.Ed. and Teresa Fehr, M.Ed. Counsel for the PCC is Karen Prisciak, Q.C., a partner with A.S.K. Law in Saskatoon.

Activities
In addition to the fulfilling the mandate of the PCC, the Committee conducted a fact-finding comparative analysis of procedures and standards from other Canadian jurisdictions and licensing bodies, with a view to exploring the possibility of expediting the time lines for resolving matters. The Committee is grateful for the support and guidance of Karen Messer-Engel and Wendy Petrisor.

Respectfully submitted,
Chair, Professional Conduct Committee

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE REPORT

Results of past hearings are available on the SCP website. Members of the Discipline Committee received invaluable education and training from Merrilee Rasmussen in preparation for disciplinary hearings. We received many reports from the Professional Conduct Committee that did not require action from the Discipline Committee. We are in the midst of a discipline hearing at this time (January, 2009) and have two more hearings planned for this year. Members of the committee are: Dr. Mary Hampton, Chair (Luther College, University of Regina), Dr. Angelina Baydala (University of Regina), Dr. Wayne Schlapkoohl (Battlefords Mental Health Centre), P.L. Crassweller (Weyburn Mental Health Centre); and Dr. Carl von Baeyer, alternate (University of Saskatchewan); our public representative Gord Glicicar, from Regina was appointed by council in January 2008 and he has been kept very busy. Marlene Harper, practicing psychologist in Regina, has joined the committee. We invite additional members to join the Discipline Committee to increase our capacity to handle hearings and to enhance balance on the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Hampton, Ph.D., R.D. Psych.
Chair, Discipline Committee

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Nominations Committee is formed each year to seek Saskatchewan College of Psychologists (SCP) members willing to stand for election to vacant positions on the College Council. When the numbers of nominations permit, the Committee carries out an elections process with extensive assistance from the SCP office staff. This year the appointed Committee included: Leslie Young, Shelley Tamaki, and Cathy Fieldgate (Chair).

Early in November, 2008, the Nominations Committee was formed and organized through assistance from Council liaison Karen Todd. Committee members were able to perform initial coordination via email, and received relevant documents and guidance from Karen Todd, and Wendy Petrisor, Assistant to the Registrar.

Existing Nominations Committee documents were reviewed by the current members via email. The Council elections Polling Day was set for March 6, 2009, and on November 20, 2008, SCP Office staff mailed the Call for Nominations to members for the positions of President-Elect, Secretary and Member-at-Large. Reminders regarding the call for nominations were e-mailed to SCP members through December 2008 and January 2009.

At the close of Nominations on January 20, 2009, SCP members had provided one nomination for each of President-Elect and the Member-at-Large positions. Cathy Fieldgate and Karen Todd were nominated respectively for the positions of Member-At-Large and President-Elect. As no other nominations had been received for any of the three positions, these members were acclaimed to the particular positions and no election process was initiated. As of the close of nominations there were no candidates offered forward for the
Council position of Treasurer. As such, according to SCP Administrative Bylaw 12(4), the Council may appoint a member of the College to fill this position.

The current Nominations Committee offers its gratitude and appreciation to the Chairpersons and Committees members in previous years for the developmental work and foundation they have provided regarding the processes and timelines required for the operation of the Nominations Committee. In addition, we acknowledge with considerable gratitude the support provided by Wendy Petrisor, and the guidance offered by Karen Todd, Liaison (along with Jenny Keller) to the current Committee and Karen Messer-Engel, SCP Registrar.

Respectfully submitted,
Cathy Fieldgate, M.A., R. Psych.
Chair, Nominations Committee

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE REPORT

The role of the Professional Practice and Ethics Committee is to provide input and opinions to Executive Council and SCP members regarding professional practice and ethical issues. I have been the Chair of this committee for the past three years. I want to thank the other members of this committee, Francis Stewart (Moose Jaw), Evelyn Steginus (Regina), Dr. Doug Jurgens (Prince Albert), and Keith Powell (Prince Albert), who have generously donated their time and expertise. This year, our committee has met in Regina and Prince Albert, as well as completed our work through electronic discussions.

In the past year, the committee provided feedback to members and Council on a number of issues, including:
- The transferring of student information across school districts without direct parental consent.
- The use of protected tests (e.g., intelligence tests) by B.A. level test administrators.
- Recordkeeping and privacy

We also had the opportunity to meet with the Privacy Commissioner for Saskatchewan, Gary Dickson, Q.C. to discuss the role of privacy legislation on the practice of psychology.

We look forward to continuing to provide assistance to Executive Council and members of the College regarding professional practice and ethical questions.

Respectfully submitted,
Lynn Loutzenhiser, R.D.Psych.
Chair, Professional Practice and Ethics Committee

ORAL EXAMINATION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Oral Examination Committee (OEC) has continued to work over the past year to oversee the administration and evaluation of the oral exam process with the goal of ensuring that this last step in the registration process is conducted in a timely, fair and standardized manner. Over the last year, 20 candidates have been examined. The OEC is in the process of developing a core examination panel with the purpose of further refining and expediting the examination procedure.

Once again, thanks to the many Full Practice Psychologists from across the province who have generously volunteered their time to participate in this process over the past year. Your commitment of time and experience is greatly appreciated. We look forward to your continued participation.

Committee Members: Tammy Dusterbeck-Colhoun (Co-Chair), Don Berg (Co-Chair), Mona Flood, Kristin Bellows, Ian MacAusland-Berg, Iris Rowlett, and Karen. Karen Messer-Engel, Registrar, attends meetings on a regular basis and we continue to be very thankful for her ongoing support and assistance.

Respectfully submitted,
Co-Chairs, Oral Examination Committee

LEGISLATION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE REPORT

Members: Theresa Zolner, David Randall, Laurie Garcea, Ken Hardy, Gayleen Roberston

During the past year Dr. David Randall prepared a discussion paper on Authorized Practice Endorsement. This discussion paper was approved by the Legislation and By-Law Committee and sent to the SCP Council. Discussion has also taken place regarding the report on Distance Education Report and the Committee will be providing comment in due course.

The Committee is awaiting response on the aforementioned before planning future meetings and activities.

Respectfully Submitted,
Chair, Legislation and Bylaws Committee
The Third Party Payer Committee submitted a report to Executive Council regarding the provision of third party payer services by psychologists. This report is currently under review by Executive Council and the committee is awaiting a response from Executive Council. As such the committee has not held any further meetings and there is no new information to report.

Respectfully submitted,
Glenn Pancyr, Ph.D., R.Psych.
Chair, Third Party Payer Committee

As the Mental Health Sector did not meet or undertake any new activities during the 2008 year, there is no new information to report.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Parker-Loewen, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.

On behalf of the Distance Education Committee, I am pleased to take this opportunity to submit a summary of our work. In December 2007 the committee submitted its report with a recommendation to consider a set of criteria for recognition of degrees based on distance education. The report was considered and approved in principle by SCP Council in Fall, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,
Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education

Although this committee has been dormant for a number of years, it was called together in early Sept/08 to review and discuss the findings of the "Bone and Joint Decade Task Force on Neck Pain and its Associated Disorders". The purpose was to make recommendations about what, if any, changes SGI should make to their policies and procedures regarding this issue. The task force had conducted a rigorous and extensive literature review of research reported during the past ten years, and although one would hope for more definitive findings, there were many statements which were limited to the range of "more likely/less likely.

The outcome of the meeting was the wish for practice guidelines for each of the regulators and associations present. SGI committed to contact the regulatory bodies to pursue this.

Respectfully submitted,

The University of Saskatchewan Senate is responsible for developing bylaws respecting student discipline on matters other than academic dishonesty; receive proposals and make recommendations regarding the establishment, or disestablishment, of colleges, schools, department, or institutes within the university; receive proposals and make recommendations concerning the university’s affiliation or federation with other institutions; and provide for the granting of honorary degrees.

The Saskatchewan College of Psychologists is one of a number of professional organizations invited to sit on the Senate. Our representation allows the College a voice on matters under consideration by the Senate. The College’s representative is appointed for a three-year term and attends the Senate’s twice yearly meetings. In addition, the representative can be asked to sit on Senate committees. The current representative has been appointed to the Senate’s Non-Academic Student Discipline and Appeals Committee and the Honorary Degrees Committee.

The Senate’s main focus at its Spring meeting was the review of the University’s “Second Integrated Plan”, specifically “The Role of the Senate in Plan Implementation”. The Integrated Plan is designed to direct the University’s energy and resources until the year 2012, supporting the 2002 Strategic Directions document. More detailed information on the Second Integrated Plan can be obtained at: www.usask.ca/ip

The Fall meeting of the Senate addressed several major initiatives. The Senate approved a Standard of Student Conduct (formerly called the Non-academic Discipline Regulations) and a Teaching and Learning Foundational Document. The Foundational Document (available at the website referenced previously) discusses the guiding principles, issues, and initiatives the University considers necessary to address the critical and complex questions associated with teaching and learning in the 21st century.

Respectfully submitted,
Greg Stevens, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.
PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES REPORT

Public Representatives sit on Councils and Boards of self-regulating professions to protect the public by representing the interests of the people. The Psychologists Act, 1997, provides for Public Representatives to be appointed to the Saskatchewan College of Psychologists (SCP). Appointments of three Public representatives to the council of SCP was proclaimed by an Order-in-Council and approved by the Lieutenant Governor and cabinet of Saskatchewan.

As Public Representatives, this year we attended Council meetings and participated in discussions on a wide variety of issues. Some of these issues included:

- Strategic planning and governance;
- Development of mission and vision statements; and
- Activities of committees

Our committee involvement, as well as that of the members, can be seen on the SCP website. We continue to be active participants at Council and committee meetings to articulate the views of the citizens of Saskatchewan.

We wish to thank Council, staff, and members for their dedication in maintaining the protection of the public through the competent and ethical practice of psychology.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Dudgeon, Gordon Glaicar, Curt Schroeder
Public Representatives
Our vision is that all psychological services in Saskatchewan are delivered by registered psychologists who are ethical and competent.

The mission of the SCP is to regulate the profession of psychology through the registration of psychologists and ensure the protection of the public through the ethical, competent practice of its members.

The College is a responsible, responsive and professional organization that respects the rights and dignities or others and the integrity of relationships.