



SASKATCHEWAN COLLEGE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS

1026 Winnipeg Street
Regina SK, S4R 8P8

Tel: (306) 352-1699
Fax: (306) 352-1697
Email: skcp@sasktel.net
www.skcp.ca

Annual Report

Spring 2016

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT

Being president is not that hard, you should try it!

Encouraging members to participate in the regulation of psychology was one of my reasons for establishing the "College Notes". Hopefully the notes have provided you with some useful information about the various college committees and the commitment members make to serve on them.

The primary function of the college is to ensure that members who apply for licensure are qualified to use the title, and when appropriate the Authorized Practice Endorsement. The secondary function is to address complaints received from the public about the practice of members of the profession. The college serves many other functions including regular communication and consultation in regard to regulatory issues with other jurisdictions, as well as with various non-regulatory organizations (various ministries within government, other professions, interest groups, etc.).

This past year Executive Council (Council) worked on the development of a strategy for managing staff salaries, and a succession strategy for the Registrar/Executive Director position. Executive Council also worked with the Professional Conduct Committee to address workload concerns, and reduce investigation timelines. To this end, the college hired an investigator in a temporary position, and is considering the feasibility of adding a staff member in the position of Deputy Registrar who would assist the Registrar in meeting her responsibilities, as well as take on complaint investigation duties.

With your help, the college has streamlined the registration process, but more can be done and the solution for most of the college's struggles with timeliness is simple, we need more "hands on deck."

When members raise concerns about delays in registration processes or investigations or discipline hearings, I would like to encourage their consideration of the question "what am I doing to improve the situation?" The college has the responsibility of public protection and this is not a simple or quick task, and means that at times members will be dissatisfied with the actions that must be taken.

A major roadblock to the college moving forward with important changes in terms of its work has been the provincial government's failure to address changes in our legislation and bylaws, year after year. Not unlike other regulatory bodies, our issues just don't appear to rise to the level of importance.

At the national and international levels there is almost complete agreement that entry into the title of Psychologist should require an accredited Doctoral degree. This is not at all unreasonable in light of where training programs are moving, and the increase in training standards within other health professions. Saskatchewan has some work to do if we are to embrace the national position and not fall out of step with the other Canadian jurisdictions. This is a most important matter because it affects how people will enter the profession not only in Saskatchewan but Canada wide. Already we have noticed applicants searching out the path of least resistance for registration and then leapfrogging into other jurisdictions with stricter entrance requirements using the agreement on internal trade to fast track registration into a new jurisdiction. It is important to state that should the National Standard be achieved, it will not mean that there will not be licensure at the Masters level in this province under the College. Rather that this will likely mean a different scope of practice and title.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/REGISTRAR

Council has worked to streamline its meetings and reduce costs. This past year we experimented with an online meeting and it worked reasonably well saving Council member time and the college money. This will likely become a more regular feature of Council meetings. We hope that reducing travel time will make participation in College work much more accessible to our members who live outside of Regina and Saskatoon.

Council is also working on developing an operational strategy, a set of targets to work towards to help focus our efforts and energy. A five year strategic plan has come and gone and it is time to make a new one.

Typical goals of the strategic plan would include looking at staffing, budgeting, projecting needs and revenues in the next five to 10 years. There are specific tasks that need to be reviewed periodically such as revising the SCP Professional Practice Guidelines and the Information Handbook for Applicant's. Both of these documents are currently under review. Ad hoc committees typically perform these tasks as many of the standing committees are already working at maximum capacity.

As the college is a public service and does not promote psychology you might wonder who does this. This is the responsibility of the Psychological Association of Saskatchewan (PAS). This organization, like the college, suffers from a lack of participation by members. If you have an interest in promoting the profession in the eyes of the public, other health care providers, and the government, please participate in the PAS.

In conclusion, thanks to all the members who are meeting their professional obligation by contributing to the operations of the College. Many thanks to our staff, Karen Messer-Engel, Wendy Petrisor, and Lori Kydd-Deis. You can be assured that the college is the beneficiary of three highly skilled and dedicated employees.

Special thanks are owed to Karen. She has taken on roles as committee chair, committee member, and on the executive of ACPRO and ASPPB, keeping Saskatchewan visible and highly respected among regulators nationally and internationally.

Financial Status: Annual Expenditure of EC \$4156

Respectfully submitted by:
Glenn Pancyr, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.
President

I feel very fortunate to continue to have the opportunity to serve in the role of the Executive Director/ Registrar of the College. It is a role that continues to be both gratifying, and challenging to me. Thank you for the support that you continue to provide to the College, its work, and its staff. Your contributions through Committee work, participation on exam panels, consultations, and your suggestions have helped to make this organization one that is respected within both the Canadian and North American Psychology regulatory circles. Executive Council (EC) has represented you well through its efforts to ensure that those admitted to licensure meet high standards of practice and ethical competence, through addressing issues of concern that impinge upon those standards, establishing standards for licensure and practice, and through addressing concerns identified by the public and the membership. The work of the College has been well supported by Ms. Wendy Petrisor, and our new Admin Support Staff / Receptionist, Ms. Lori Kydd-Deis. I was very pleased to have Ms. Kydd-Deis join the staff when Ms. Joyce Dunn chose to leave us in 2015. Ms. Dunn's contributions to the work of the College were significant and we are very thankful to her. The staff of the College work incredibly hard to serve the public and the members of the profession, and to support the mandate of the College. It is my hope that we are successful in meeting these goals.

There have been many members who have volunteered their time and expertise to serve on the various College committees. I am truly grateful for their willingness to help the College in meeting its mandate, and for the exemplary work that has been done. Without this volunteerism my work would be much more difficult.

Who are the members of the College?

Our membership numbers have dropped slightly which is not surprising given that the members of this profession, like those of other professions, are aging. The "baby boomers" among us are moving toward retirement. More members appear to be leaving the profession than those coming into the profession.

Licensure Category	Members April 2015 AGM	Members March 2015	Members March 2016
Full Practice	421	422	425
Provisional Practice	72	72	69
Non-Practice	48	48	42
Total	541	542	536 (.73% decrease from March 2015)

Registered Members Age Groups	Female	Male	Undisclosed
15-24	1	1	0
25-34	64	3	0
35-44	91	21	0
45-54	90	30	0
55-64	94	48	0
65-74	43	30	0
75+	3	4	0
Unknown	10	3	0
total	396	140	536

Thirty-three percent (33%) of our members are under the age of 44. Forty four percent (44%) of the members are age 55 and older. In the next few years I anticipate that the numbers of members leaving the profession will only increase. In a practical sense this will impact the work of the College in terms of the number of volunteers available to serve on committees and exam panels, the availability of Full Practice members to serve as supervisors for Provisional members, and of course in terms of the resources available to carry out the work of the College. This will of course also impact the members available to provide psychological services. Ensuring that there are adequate numbers of competent licensed members of the profession to provide psychological services, is both a regulatory and an advocacy issue which will I believe need to be considered in going forward.

Approximately 74% of the membership are female and 26% are male, which is consistent with the workforce data which has been gathered on the profession in the US and Canada. This is a substantial shift in the composition of the profession, which just 40 or so years ago was male-dominated.

The academic training of the membership of the College continues to be primarily at the Master's level. Members trained with Master of Education degrees in Educational Psychology continue to be the predominant group within the membership of the College.

	2015	Full Practice 2016	Prov. Practice 2016	Non-Practicing 2016	Total 2016
Ph.D.	176	151	13	12	175
Psy. D	4	3	1	0	4
Ed. D	4	4	0	0	4
M.A.	76	53	9	7	69
Lic.Psy Sc.	1	1	0	0	1
M.C.	7	6	2	0	8
M.Ed.	253	195	40	19	254
M.	2	0	0	2	2
Psy.					
M.S.	1	1	0	0	1
M.S.E.	1	1	0	0	1
M.Sc.	16	10	4	2	16
Total	541	425	69	42	535

What has occurred in the last year?

The College is now in its 14th year and much has changed since its inception. A lot goes on at the College in terms of the day-to-day tasks important in ensuring that the mandate of regulation and public protection are met. I will highlight and update you about some of the key issues that the College has been working to address over the last year.

Change in the regulation of the profession is necessary for the profession's continued viability as a self-regulating profession and importantly in meeting the interests of the public served. I feel it is important that I again discuss and update you on the anticipated changes to regulation in Canadian Psychology. As you may recall the Federal and Provincial Governments established mobility/trade agreements [i.e. amendments to the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), New West Partnership Trade Agreement (NWPTA)] that have had a significant impact on the landscape in which the regulation of professions occurs. In particular the agreements ultimately remove from the regulator sole jurisdiction over who is eligible to be licensed in a profession.

The Governments' mobility/trade agreements compelled the Canadian Psychology regulators to review how licensure of the profession occurs across the country, and to accept and own that who is a Psychologist in Canada is determined not necessarily by a common set of training standards or competencies, but rather a Psychologist is often determined by where one is physically located when they license initially. The reality of Canadian Psychology is that there are currently substantive differences between jurisdictions in terms of

who is licensed and the credential and skills under which they are licensed. Thus an unintentional consequence of these governmental agreements, as noted previously in the President's report has been the "shopping" by some for jurisdictions where the licensure requirements are not as demanding, and using licensure in that jurisdiction to procure licensure in a jurisdiction in which they may not have met the requirements for licensure, or may have not met the requirements for licensure as a Psychologist. The other obvious realization that the Canadian regulators of Psychology came to, is that the public is not well served by differing standards for who is a Psychologist. In addition there was the realization that the public generally do not understand the subtle differences that we in the profession subscribe to in defining ourselves. It appears that many members of the public do not have a clear understanding of the different training levels, the different practice competencies, the different areas of Psychology, let alone the difference between this profession and Psychiatry, Counselling or Social Work.

In 2014 in response to the realizations that occurred as a result of the implementation of the amended AIT, and the NWPTA, the Association of Canadian Psychology Regulatory Organizations (ACPRO) began working in earnest on minimizing the jurisdictional differences that exist in terms of regulatory philosophy and policy. In November 2014 ACPRO established a formal position on a National Standard for the profession. The National Standard position is a Canadian Psychological Association accredited Doctoral degree into the title "Psychologist." In 2015 each provincial regulatory body considered the position established by ACPRO and determined whether or not they could support it, and could work towards it. The Executive Council (EC) of the College endorsed the ACPRO position in principle and agreed to work towards it to the extent possible relative to our jurisdictional realities. To date, eight of the ten provincial jurisdictions have endorsed the standard and have agreed to work towards it. ACPRO currently is considering how licensure at the Master's level can co-exist with the National Standard. I serve on the subcommittee examining this issue. Some jurisdictions such as this one will continue for the foreseeable future to provide licensure at the Master's level although there will necessarily be differences between the two levels of training, likely in scope and title. The College believes that it is important to maintain Master's licensure under the banner of Psychology. Those trained at the Master's level provide competent and ethical psychological services, and are integral members of the health service system and of the profession. It is in the public's interest for licensure at this level of training to continue. Movement to a

national standard will be a long process and will not likely occur in the near future. I anticipate that a grand-parenting provision for those licensed as Psychologists at the time of implementation will be part of a change to the National Standard.

As you may recall the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers (SASW) was successful in establishing diagnostic privilege for qualified members of the profession of Social Work. The SASW is currently in the process of seeking approval of their regulatory bylaws that would pave the way for the implementation of the amending legislation. Similar to the College's requirements for the Authorized Practice Endorsement (APE), Social Workers seeking diagnostic privilege must meet training, exam and practice competency requirements. As part of the process to obtain the APE, Social Workers deemed eligible for the endorsement (minimum of a Master's degree with a clinical focus) will be required to have a specified period of supervised diagnostic practice under another regulated professional who has diagnostic privilege as part of their license. Some members of the College have identified concern regarding the possibility of being asked, or perhaps required to provide supervision in diagnostic practice to members of the Social Work profession. Concern in part pertains to the difference in training between the professions. Supervision of the clinical work of other health professionals is currently part of the work requirements for many members of the College. Collaborative care models are common in many work environments, and promote the "cross-pollination" of professions and in some environments the integration of health services. Psychologists are increasingly working within collaborative care environments and being called on to provide supervision of the clinical work of other professions. The supervision of other professions qualified to seek diagnostic competence would be consistent with such models of service delivery. Having said that, I very much appreciate the real concern that some members may have in regard to what will happen if there is a complaint raised by a member of the public in regard to a diagnosis provided by a Social Worker who was under the supervision of a Full Practice Psychologist with the APE. It is important to stress that like *the Psychologists Act 1997*, the APE amendments to *the Social Workers Act* affords diagnostic privilege only to those Full Practice members of the profession who have been awarded the endorsement. Thus in essence according to the legislation, it is the supervisor who is making the diagnosis. It is clear to the College that there is a need for a mechanism to address the issue of complaints about diagnostic work carried out by a Social Worker under supervision by a Psychologist. Undeniably there is liability and risk that supervisors

take on in agreeing to supervise other professionals whether they are Psychologists or members of another professional group. Should a complaint be received it seems unreasonable for both regulatory bodies to address it independently as in doing so there is great potential that there ends up being two totally different outcomes for the same complaint. This would not be a reasonable outcome in my opinion. The EC has agreed to the exploration with SASW of possible solutions such as a joint investigation/discipline process or an MOU outlining how complaints will be handled. The College has had a preliminary discussion with SASW, and will be meeting again in regard to this once the bylaws have been ratified by their membership.

The issue of diagnostic competency and the practice of Psychology has been a topic of much discussion among a number of the College committees and EC during the last year, especially in light of the ever-changing regulatory environment, and the College's experiences with regulation. Saskatchewan is the only jurisdiction in Canada that separates out diagnostic practice from the scope of practice of a Psychologist, and allows independent practice without diagnostic competency. As the College moves in the direction of the National Standard it will need to examine whether the APE should remain as a separate endorsement, whether this continues to make sense in light of the standards and practice of the profession, and importantly whether this is in the best interests of the public served. On a similar note, the scope of practice of Psychology is one that the College has wanted to address within the legislation for some time. Clear scope of practice language would be in the best interests of the public served, and would help to limit the use of the tools and practices typically unique to the training of this profession, by non-psychologists who have not obtained the formal training and/or established the competency necessary to do that work. Scope of practice within the legislation is likely something that the College will continue to lobby for in going forward.

In terms of our legislation and bylaws I regret to have to inform you again that we have not yet been successful in having the amendments addressed. In light of the provincial election it is unlikely that the proposed amendments will be addressed in 2016. The legislative changes are necessary to ensure that the standards of the profession are of high quality, and that we can move towards harmonizing our standards and processes with those of the other Canadian jurisdictions. As you may recall the significant legislative amendment we are seeking is to the wording of Section 20 of the legislation, which will allow the College to be more prescriptive in regard to what an academic program must be and must

look like in order to qualify for licensure in this province. The Regulatory Bylaws have been revised on an ongoing basis relative to issues that have arisen in the process of regulation (e.g. clarity around use of title, clarity around the communication of diagnoses by Provisional members and Psychology Residents), and commentary by the Ministry of Health. We have resubmitted these to the Ministry, and will hopefully present these to the membership of the College for ratification at the next AGM.

The issue of competency declaration has been one of significant consideration during the last year. This issue has become more pressing in light of the work on the National Standard, the legislative amendments, and the experiences of the College in licensing and regulating the profession. Currently according to our database there are 19 areas of practice competency that have been identified / declared by members of the profession, with the majority of members declaring more than one competency.

Competency	# Of Members	Competency	# Of Members
Applied Research	58	Counseling Psychology	221
Clinical Neuropsych.	24	Develop. Psychology	131
Clinical Psychology	309	Ed/School Psychology	258
Community Psychology	44	Forensic Psychology	102
Industrial/Org Psychology	3	Teaching Psychology	117
Geropsych.	9	Program Evaluation	49
Health Psych.	77	Rehabilitation *	90
Health Syst. Evaluation	1	Rehabilitation - Mental Health	5
Human Resource Management	3	Rehabilitation Physical	2
Other	1		

*Rehabilitation category was generic on earlier versions of the competency declaration form – later this was subdivided into mental health and physical health.

The license to practice as a Psychologist in Saskatchewan is a general license, and is not a license endorsing specialization or expertise. Declarations of practice competency are in reality practice limitations. That is as members, in declaring competency, we are placing a limit on our practice that is congruent with our training, supervision, and experience. At initial licensure members are required to identify their area(s) of practice competence or in the case of new members to the profession the area(s) that they aspire to establish competence in. For new members of the profession, declarations of competence are established through their formal education, supervision, experience, the supervised practice hours, the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), and the oral examination interview processes. Later career changes in practice competencies are self-declared. These claims should again be concurrent with further training, supervision / mentorship, and experience in the area claimed. Historically employers have had difficulty recruiting Psychologists, especially in the rural areas. Thus some employers have chosen to hire members whose training does not perfectly fit the position they are being hired for with the idea that they can be trained on the job, to do the job. Conversely many employers do not understand the profession or training for the profession, and believe that all Psychologists are the same. This is a potential risk for the member as well as the public that they serve. As I am confident you will appreciate, learning the skills necessary for a specific job is not a substitute for formal training in the practice area. A number of committees of the College are examining the issue of competence declaration for the purpose of licensure.

In terms of guidance and ethics, the EC recently established the Ad Hoc Committee on the Professional Practice Guidelines, which has been tasked with the review and revision of the guidelines document to ensure that it is relevant to the practice and congruent with the standards of the profession and best practice. You recently received a survey from the Ad Hoc Committee seeking input from you into how the guidelines can be improved to be of more assistance to your practice. Your comments and suggestions are invaluable to ensuring that this guiding document is as useful as possible and I encourage you to participate.

The College has continued its discussions with the Saskatchewan School Boards Association (SSBA) in regard to Psychologists working in Saskatchewan Schools and the ethical bind that they are often put in when the expectations of the employer conflict with their responsibilities as members of the profession. The College has worked hard to try to come to agreement in

regard to the expectations, and for the past many months have been working on a joint advisory in regard to the specific issues of consent, and record keeping. Unfortunately we do not yet have agreement on the fundamental principle of jurisdiction.

The College continues to work collaboratively with the Canadian regulators, the Association of Canadian Psychology Regulatory Organizations (ACPRO), and the North American regulatory group the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) as member organizations. I continue to serve as a director of ACPRO and on the Board of Directors of ASPPB. There are many interesting and important initiatives being carried out by these groups which you will hear about in the future, in particular a plan for licensure of Masters trained within the context of the National Standard (ACPRO), Foreign Qualification Recognition (ACPRO) , workforce data study (ACPRO /ASPPB), North American job task analysis study to revalidate the EPPP (ASPPB), and the assessment of practice competency (ASPPB). On a more local level the College continues to be a member of the provincial health regulatory group Network of Intra-provincial Regulatory Organizations (NIRO) and to work on issues of common concern related to professional regulation.

I hope that I have provided you with a sense of the work of the College, its importance in the larger scheme of things, and the issues that we will need to address together as a self-regulating profession in going forward. I believe that the College has worked hard to ensure that the profession is one of high standards and has the respect of the public and our stakeholders. I sincerely hope that you are proud to be a member of the profession and this College.

Respectfully submitted by,
Karen Messer-Engel, M.A., R. Psych.
Executive Director / Registrar

FINANCE & PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Members: Tim Claypool, Ph.D., R.D. Psych (Chair); Mike White, M.Ed., R.Psych., Kathy Chisholm, BScN (Public Representative)

Number of meetings held: Three meetings were held as of March 12, 2016. Two additional meetings are planned: one on April 16th in Saskatoon and a final meeting on April 30th in Regina.

Number of hours per month: approximately 1 hour per meeting

Highlights/items addressed:

Completed: Based on information gathered from the previous Finance and Personnel Committee chaired by Dr. Glenn Pancyr a decision was made to place a hold on yearly cost of living increases. Executive Council recognized that the cumulative effect of these yearly increases was substantial and requested this committee to review current benefit packages, holidays and salary ranges before additional cost of living increases were considered.

In progress: We are currently reviewing benefits packages with particular attention to life insurance packages and employer RRSP contributions. Additionally salary grids for staff positions are also being reviewed against comparable industry standards.

Recommendations for next year: Continue discussions related to long-term transition planning and a part-time Deputy Registrar position with some duties to align with the current Investigator position that is included in our yearly budget plan.

Respectfully submitted by:
Tim Claypool, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.
Chair, Finance & Personnel Committee

TREASURER

As mentioned in previous reports, the biggest financial challenge faced by the College is the unpredictable nature of some significant expenses. Of these expenses, legal and investigative costs related to discipline issues vary considerably from year to year.

In keeping with past practice, the budget for the current year is a deficit budget. However, it is important to note that in recent years costs for legal and investigative purposes are purposely estimated on the high end. Costs have typically come in much lower and we have had surpluses at the end of the year. Even if costs do end up higher, College reserve funds are sufficient to handle a current deficit. Careful planning by the Executive Council, and College staff, have enabled us to keep registration fees stable in recent years.

I wish to thank the staff of the College for the assistance they have provided as I assumed the role of Treasurer. Every question I may have asked was always answered with clarity and transparency. Members can rest easy knowing that their registration fees are being managed judiciously.

Respectfully submitted by:
Mike White, M.Ed., R. Psych.
Treasurer

REGISTRATION COMMITTEE

Membership: The Committee membership includes Nathalie Berard, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Tammy Ferguson, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Liz Ivanochko, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Beverley Lane, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Melissa Derrow, M.Sc., R.Psych., Cindy McFadyen, M.Ed., R.Psych, and this writer as an ex-officio member.

Since the last AGM the Marion McKenzie (Public Representative), Bridget Klest, Ph.D., R.D.Psych., and Dave Gorrie, M.Ed., R.Psych. stepped down from the Committee. These individuals made significant contributions to this work and we owe a debt of gratitude to them.

The Committee is charged with responsibility to review and determine eligibility for applicants with foreign credentials or credentials of a complex nature; to review, evaluate and endorse the Supervision Agreements, Supervision Plans, practice logs, and supervisor evaluations of Provisional members; to review and endorse Provisional members for their readiness to take the oral examination interview; to review unsuccessful attempts of oral examination interviews; to confirm Full Practice status; to monitor practice sanctions that are the result of the investigation and/or discipline processes; to approve all leaves and extensions of the Provisional licensure period; to consider requests for exemptions under the CEC policy, and to make recommendations to Executive Council in regard to licensure standards and policy.

Since the 2015 AGM and up until the end of March 2016 the Committee met in-person on 9 occasions. The Committee typically does not meet during the summer. During that time the Committee followed the licensure of approximately 95 Provisional members, as well as addressed licensure questions or concerns relating to Full Practice members, made recommendations to Executive Council regarding licensure, addressed

licensure questions posed by members (e.g. consultation on a plan to gain a new competency), and made recommendations to Executive Council regarding removals from the membership. In total, the Committee conducted approximately 162 file reviews, including the review of one unsuccessful oral examination result.

Issues Discussed/Considered by the Committee:

- Supervision – revision of the supervision documents - clarity for supervisors and supervisees in terms of the expectations and requirements – clarity that supervision must contain direct observation of the supervisee’s practice – consideration of what supervision should look like in the case of a discipline sanction.
- Consideration of what happens when the supervisory relationship falls apart.
- Additions of practice competencies both by Provisional and Full Practice members – consideration of the differences between early career and mid/late career additions – consideration of how practice competency is gained (training, supervision, experience)– discussion of concerns about the “go around strategies” used by some employers to provide psychological services, and how this is not in the interest of the public or the membership.
- Consideration of when complaints are received by the College in regard to Provisional members and/or their supervisors and how this should be managed.
- Concerns in regard to members practicing in isolation and in particular Provisional members in private practice.
- Foreign applications and the difficulty in some situations with verification of the credential and the reported work history.
- Consideration of what constitutes practice to be counted toward the 1500 hour supervised practice requirement.
- Title usage – proper usage for those licensed at the Master’s level but completing a pre-Doctoral residency.
- Requests for recognition of degrees which are not clearly in Psychology.
- Consideration of fitness to practice concerns and how to address these.

Financial status: Expenditure \$898 (year end 2015)

The work of the Committee is incredibly interesting and incredibly challenging. It requires attention to detail, strong problem solving skills, sound judgment, and while never a comfortable task, the willingness to make difficult decisions which are not always popular. The Committee works hard to meet their responsibilities in a consistent, fair and sensitive manner. It is important to stress that decisions made by the Committee must be

congruent with the legislative authority afforded the College and with the policies of the College. Many decisions and processes of the Committee are prescribed by the legislation and consequently are not optional. I am grateful to the committee for their work and the support they provide in regard to the work of the Registrar.

Respectfully submitted by,
Karen Messer-Engel, M.A., R Psych.
Executive Director / Registrar
on behalf of the Registration Committee

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE

Current Members: Greg Stevens, Ph.D., R.D.Psych. (Acting-Chair); Timothy Leis, Ph.D. R.D.Psych.(Vice-Chair); Shelley Adams, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Sheila Bellrose, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Laurie Garcea, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Deb Kemp-Koo, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Susan Nadon, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Kevin Tunney, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Wendy Petrisor (ex-officio/Assistant to Registrar).

Past Year Members: Lisa Berg-Kolody, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Patty Crassweller, M.A., R.Psych.; Carleen Desautels, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Shelley Hengen, M.Ed., R.Psych.

Alternates: Bryan Acton, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Della Hunter, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Terry Nicholaichuk, Ph.D. R.D.Psych.; Kathleen Walls, M.Ed., R.Psych.

Past Year Alternates: Sandy Gardiner, M.Ed., R. Psych.

Investigator: Joanne Frederick, M.A., R.Psych.

Legal Counsel: Karen Prisciak, Q.C.

Meetings held: Nine in-person meetings were held, alternating between Regina and Saskatoon.

Mandate: The mandate of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) is to receive, review, and investigate complaints against members of the College wherein professional misconduct and/or incompetence is alleged. The investigation process can be wide ranging, and may include gathering information from various parties, reviewing documentation, conducting interviews, and/or requesting expert review of materials. Possible investigative outcomes include: a determination that the matter in question is not subject to the mandate of the PCC; a recommendation that no further action be taken; a recommendation to refer the matter to alternate dispute

resolution, which includes either a mediation or negotiated resolution process; or a referral of the matter to the Discipline Committee.

2015 Complaints and Dispositions:

In 2015 the PCC received seven new complaints. Complaints often contained several allegations of either misconduct and/or incompetence. Among others, behaviours complained about included members transmitting a diagnosis without the authority to do so, practicing psychology without being properly registered, misrepresenting credentials, incompetence, and unprofessional behaviour. One of these complaints was withdrawn, one was determined to be unrelated to the individual's role as a psychologist, one was addressed through an ADR process, and one was determined to be unfounded. Two of the remaining complaints are under active investigation, while the third is nearing completion.

Other Activities:

As in previous years, the PCC was active in considering, refining, and developing new policies. The PCC is often faced with new issues and are responsive in developing effective procedures to address these issues. Perhaps the most significant development of the last year was the hiring and use of an investigator. Under the direction of the PCC members assigned as the primary and secondary file managers in relation to any complaint, the investigator coordinates and collects all information requested and required to determine the merits of the complaint. This process allows the PCC to spend its time more effectively, considering the merits of the information collected and developing policies to address emerging issues.

Financial status: Annual Expenditure **\$4,792**
Legal Fees **\$3,665**

We are very appreciative and thankful for the hard work of all individuals involved with the committee.

Respectfully submitted by:
Greg Stevens, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.
Acting Chair, Professional Conduct Committee

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

Members: T. Robinson, Ph.D, R.D. Psych., Chair; Audrey Kinzel, Ph.D., R.D. Psych.; Carole Eaton, M.A., R. Psych.; Kendra Nesbitt, M.Ed., R. Psych.; Daniel Ash, M.D. (Public Rep); Alternates: MacAusland-Berg, M.A., R. Psych.; Tanya Lyons-Belt, M.A., R. Psych.

Number of meetings held: The Discipline Committee and Professional Conduct Committee were provided a training session intended primarily for new members. The session was held in Saskatoon on October 3, 2015, and the presenter was Bryan Salte of the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Number of hours per month: The Discipline Committee does not convene for set hours, as hearings are contingent on the number of matters referred by the Professional Conduct Committee and scheduled accordingly.

Items addressed: Five hearings were completed in 2015, and two remain to be scheduled in 2016.

Financial status: Annual Expenditure: **\$ 3,376**
Legal Fees: **\$32,242**

Highlights/Concerns: This past year the Discipline Committee saw a number of changes to its membership, including former Chair Mary Hampton stepping down as of July 1, 2015. Also departing was member Regan Hart. The Committee expresses appreciation for the service provided by these past members. New members welcomed to the Committee included Ian MacAusland-Berg, Kendra Nesbitt and Tanya Lyons-Belt. The Committee is grateful Dr. Dan Ash agreed to continue in the role of Public Representative.

Recommendations for next year: A concern that arose during a recent hearing was the question of whether there should be restitution of billed services in cases where the member's conduct was found to be in breach. When there is a negotiated submission from the Member and the PCC, including corrective actions and costs, the Discipline Committee may be unable to alter the submission based on legal precedents. The Discipline Committee therefore suggests that during negotiated submissions between the PCC and Members subjected to disciplinary action, there should be consideration of restitution for costs of services that fall within the complaint.

Respectfully submitted by:
Tom Robinson, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.
Chair, Discipline Committee

ORAL EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

Members: Tammy Dusterbeck-Colhoun, M.Ed., R.Psych. (Co-Chair); Don Berg, M.Ed., R.Psych. (Co-Chair); Kristin Bellows, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Ian MacAusland-Berg, M.A., R.Psych.; Iris Rowlett, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Kristi Wright, Ph.D., R.D. Psych.; Lorrie Anne Harkness, M.Ed., R.Psych.; and Karen Messer-Engel, M.A., R.Psych., Executive Director/Registrar (ex-officio)

Over the last year, the Oral Examination Committee (OEC) has continued to work to oversee the administration and evaluation of the oral examination process with the goal of ensuring that this last step in the registration process is conducted in a timely, fair and standardized manner. The committee typically meets to prepare for the exams and to review the oral examination process and make improvements as identified. The committee members also participate on the oral exam panels serving as Chair. Since the last AGM, 26 candidates have been examined over the course of two set examination dates. In addition over the past year the committee has been working on a manual for supervision, consideration and revision of the declared areas of competency form, revision of the exam handbooks, revision of the exam process itself, and consideration of the establishment of a standalone jurisprudence examination.

Thanks to the 32 Full Practice Psychologists from across the province who 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 on an oral examination panel.

As always, we are appreciative of the support from the office in managing the arrangements for the exams.

We look forward to continue improving the exam process to ensure that it is conducted in a timely, fair and standardized manner.

Financial Status: Annual Expenditure **\$11603**

Respectfully submitted by:
Tammy Dusterbeck-Colhoun, M.Ed., R. Psych.
Don Berg, M.Ed., R. Psych.
Co-Chairs, Oral Examination Committee

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

Members: Lynn Loutzenhiser, Ph.D., R.D.Psych (Chair); Evelyn Steginus, M.A., R.Psych.; Keith Powell, M.S., R.Psych.; Diane Bodnarchuk, M.E., R.Psych.; Kathy Chisholm, BScN (Public Rep).

Past Year Members: Francis Stewart, M.A., R.Psych.; Doug Jurgens, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.

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 seven years. I want to thank the other members of this committee who have generously donated their time and expertise. Unfortunately, two of these long-serving, hard working members, Francis Stewart and Doug Jurgens, submitted their resignations from our committee this year. Good luck in your new endeavours, and we will miss you!

This year, our committee met in Regina, as well as completed our work through electronic discussions.

Items addressed: In the past year, the committee provided feedback to Council on issues including:

- a) Questions regarding what information provided by third parties should be kept in client files
- b) Questions regarding file storage in forensic settings
- c) Questions regarding reporting information about non-clients
- d) Questions regarding access of other disciplines to psychological files

We look forward to continuing to provide assistance to Executive Council and members of the College.

Financial status: Annual Expenditure **\$312**

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

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Members: Leslie Young, M.Ed., R.Psych. (Chair); Heather Switzer, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.; Cindy Focht, M.Ed., R.Psych.; Renee Schmidt, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.

Number of Meetings held: Initial Meeting Sep 2/15 (2 hours in length). Teleconference/email: (Nov/15, Dec/15, Jan/16, Feb/16).

Number of hours per month: Averaging 2 hrs/month (included as total for all members). Outside of meetings there are follow up letters and preparation specific to election processes and emails/telephone contact to confirm the planning and work related to the committee efforts.

Highlights/items addressed: The primary focus of the Nominations Committee has been and continues to be planning and completing the Executive Council Election process. The election for President-Elect, Secretary and two Members-at-Large. The final call for nominations will be sent to members on March 7, 2016. In the event that no nominations are received, the four positions will move to an appointment process.

Financial Status: Annual Expenditure \$0

Respectfully submitted by:
Leslie Young, M.Ed., R.Psych.
Chair, Nominations Committee

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES

Representatives: David Butt, Kathy Chisholm, RN; Dan Ash, M.D.

We have attended all of the board meetings and provided advice and public oversight. We have enjoyed working with a thoughtful and informed board.

Financial Status: All costs for the Public Representatives are borne by the provincial government.

Respectfully submitted by:
Dan Ash, M.D.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN SENATE

Representative: Stephanie L Martin, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.

Number of meetings held: Senate meetings are held twice per year (Saturdays, full day meetings). Meetings were attended on April 25 and October 17, 2015.

Highlights/Concerns: The April 25, 2015 meeting focused on updating the members of the Senate about administrative changes and current searches for a number of executive positions at the University of Saskatchewan. At the October 17, 2015 meeting the appointment of Dr. Peter Stoicheff, the 11th President of the University of Saskatchewan. His 5-year term began on October 24, 2015. The Senate Education Committee polled senators in September 2015 regarding suggestions for education opportunities. At the October meeting Dr. Ivar Mendez, the Dean of the College of Nursing and the Vice-Dean Education of the College of Medicine delivered sessions on distributed learning and training and community impact using advanced computer media. A number of reports were received and discussed; a presentation and discussion on the new draft campus-wide sexual assault policy was a highlighted.

Recommendations for next year: Continue to seek opportunities to highlight the importance of mental health within the campus community, local and provincial mental health initiatives and issues related to education and training.

Financial status: Annual Expenditure \$0

Respectfully submitted by:
Stephanie L. Martin, Ph.D., R.D.Psych.