

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF PSYCHOLOGISTS
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Teleconference/Video Conference
September 8, 2023

Members Present: Thomas Stanage, Ph.D., (President); Matthew Christiansen, Ph.D. (Vice President); Trisha Miller, Ph.D., (Secretary); Rosalie Ball, Ph.D., Member; Robert Overturf, Lay Member; Brian Roegiers, Lay Member.

Members Absent: Jeffrey Ellison, Psy.D.

Others Present: Carol Tellinghuisen, Executive Administrator; Brooke Tellinghuisen-Geddes, Executive Assistant; Katie Funke, Administrative Assistant; Greg Tishkoff, DSS Legal Services – Board Counsel; Tracy Mercer, DSS Special Projects Coordinator; Trevor Thielen, Attorney General's Office

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions: Stanage called the meeting to order at 9:30 am CDT.

Roll Call: Tellinghuisen Geddes called the roll. A quorum was present (Stanage, Christiansen, Miller, Ball, Overturf, and Roegiers). Ellison absent.

Corrections or Additions to the Agenda: None.

Approval of the Agenda: Overturf motioned to approve the agenda as presented; Roegiers seconded the motion. Motion carried on unanimous vote of members present; Ellison absent.

Public Testimony/Public Comment Period (9:33am CDT / 8:33am MDT): None.

Approval of Minutes from May 5, 2023 Meeting: Overturf moved, Ball seconded, to approve meeting minutes as written. Motion passed unanimously amongst those present; Ellison absent.

FY Financial Update: Tellinghuisen-Geddes reported on the most recent financial report (financials as of Fiscal Year End - June 30, 2023). Tellinghuisen-Geddes reported that as of June 30, 2023, revenue was at \$66,481.92, year-to-date expenditures were at \$63,110.19, and Cash Balance was at \$128,978.02. Tellinghuisen-Geddes also provided a financial comparison to a year ago, making the group aware the current cash balance is similar to last year at this same time with slightly more (about \$2,000) Cash Balance this year. Christiansen motioned to accept the financial report as read; Miller seconded. Motion passed unanimously amongst those present; Ellison absent.

EPPP- Part 2: Administrative Rules Update: Stanage reminded that EPPP, Part 2 is not yet a requirement of examinees, per ASPPB has combined Parts 1 & 2 in the EPPP to one examination as of January 2026. As a result, the board discussed changing our licensure requirements in Rules to reflect the change but in looking further into this, Stanage stated that because the date is so far out yet, it seemed too early to do so, however the long-term plan would be to utilize the EPPP that includes both Parts 1 and 2 to replace the current Oral Examination required in South Dakota for licensure. Tishkoff agreed this is what was discussed and that it is too early to make any changes at this time.

Oral Exam Policy Discussion/Vote: Stanage outlined that there are two parts to the current discussion – 1) Current requirement of an oral examination for all new applicants, and 2) Consideration of the

Governor's Bill 36-1D-1 (the licensure by endorsement bill). The licensure by endorsement statute provides authorization to waive the oral examination on those applicants. Stanage posed the question to board members as to whether they support starting the process of eliminating the oral examination requirement in SD by eliminating it for those licensed by endorsement. Ball stated agreement to doing so. Christiansen inquired whether we would be considering simply eliminating the orals examination only for those applicants who have passed an oral examination in their jurisdiction of licensure or waive the oral examination across the board. Stanage stated the intent would be to eliminate it for all applicants who meet criteria for licensure by endorsement. Miller inquired whether timeframe of licensure elsewhere is considered. Stanage clarified that Bill 361D-1 does not specify a required timeline of licensure at all. Christiansen inquired as to whether there is any financial impact in eliminating the oral examination for these applicants. Tellinghuisen-Geddes clarified there is a set licensure fee, but not a fee particular to the oral examination itself, so there would be no financial loss or gain in this decision. Tellinghuisen informed that some jurisdictions are decreasing the number of required hours of supervised work for licensure and there's currently discussion of Master's level licensed psychologists occurring in more states than there has been in the past. Stanage cited his perception that the oral examination process is antiquated and subjective, which is not ideal. Tellinghuisen agreed and cited that most states are indeed eliminating the oral examination requirement because of these reasons. Christiansen motioned, Ball seconded, to waive the orals examination requirement for applicants who meet the licensure by endorsement requirements as of September 9, 2023. Motion passed unanimously amongst those present; Ellison absent.

Post-Doctoral Supervision Question: Miller, who serves as Education Review Officer for the board currently, introduced discussion about formally agreeing upon a standard that clarifies expectations for post-doctoral supervision requirements. Miller stated there have been applicant and prospective applicant inquiries as to whether video-teleconferenced post-doctoral supervision is acceptable to meet the "face to face" supervision requirement and this is especially important in cases in which the postdoctoral supervisors are out of state. Miller stated she is in favor of allowing this, but would like to have this set by the full board. Stanage cited his agreement to allowing the video-teleconferenced supervision but desired Miller's input to clarify as he had perceived post-doctoral supervisors had to be licensed in SD. Miller clarified postdoctoral supervisors simply need to be licensed in the state in which the services are being provided by the supervisee. All board members cited agreement that video-teleconferenced supervision should be allowable. Tishkoff made the board aware this is a policy matter rather than a rule or statutory requirement, so it is at the board's discretion what policy to make. Ball made a motion for a board policy change to allow the face-to-face postdoctoral supervision requirement to include video-teleconferenced supervision. Miller seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously amongst those present; Ellison absent.

Post-Doctoral Start Date Question: Miller, who serves as Education Review Officer for the board currently, also introduced discussion about formally agreeing upon a standard that clarifies when postdoctoral supervision hours may begin accrual. Miller stated there have been applicant and prospective applicant inquiries as to whether they may begin counting postdoctoral supervision hours as soon as they have completed all of their doctoral degree requirements, rather than awaiting the actual graduation ceremony. Miller stated she is in favor of allowing this as long as there is documentation received by the educational institution officials citing the degree requirements have all been met, but would like to have this set by the full board. Stanage cited his agreement to allowing this but inquired whether there would be any need to set a length of time in which this is allowable for prior to receiving the degree, in thinking an applicant could drag out completing something such as their dissertation. Miller clarified these applicants would need to have already completed all components of their degree program and documentation that this is the case would need to be received by the educational institution. Ball

stated support for allowing postdoctoral supervision hours to begin accruing, per Miller's suggestion, as otherwise some persons would be awaiting a quarterly graduation ceremony for possibly two to three months without being able to count those months' hours. Miller made a motion for board policy to allow for accrual of postdoctoral supervision hours to begin as of the date our board receives documentation of a prospective licensee's full degree requirement completion by their educational institution. Christiansen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously amongst those present; Ellison absent.

PSYPACT Discussion/Financial Impact: Per board members' requests at last meeting, Tellinghuisen-Geddes and Tellinghuisen provided the board with the total number of current licensees (201) as well as the total number of licenses currently with out-of-state residences (53). Tellinghuisen-Geddes stated an estimate of the dollar amount received through application fees would be between five and six thousand dollars, with an estimate of four thousand of those dollars coming from out-of-state applicants' fees. This could be money lost if PSYPACT were to be enacted, as the out-of-state licensees would no longer need to get a SD license to practice in SD. Per other requests at last meeting, Tellinghuisen-Geddes reported speaking with Janet Orwig at ASPPB to determine what the cost commitment from the SD Board is, should PSYPACT be enacted. Tellinghuisen-Geddes stated Orwig informed her there would be a \$10 Authorization Holder licensed in their home state. Tellinghuisen-Geddes and Tellinghuisen reported the total impact, figuring in loss of annual renewal fees, licensure and applicant fees as well as costs to be a part of PSYPACT annually, could be approximately \$20,000. In attempting to estimate how much that would impact SD Licensees, then, Tellinghuisen stated there would need to be an approximate \$130-150 increase in licensure fee for those SD licensed psychologists, which then would raise the annual licensure fee to approximately \$450 rather than the current \$300 annual licensure fee. Ball inquired whether our board would receive any funds from ASPPB for being a part of PSYPACT. Tellinghuisen-Geddes reported Orwig informed her the states do not receive funds for being a member of PSYPACT. Ball inquired how comparable our current fee is to other states and how comparable the \$450 fee would be to other PSYPACT states. This information was unknown. Orwig did state she would be sending a document of the costs in other states to Tellinghuisen-Geddes, but this information has not yet been received. Stanage cited whether there is an additional fee for those individuals who join PSYPACT as well. Tellinghuisen-Geddes stated that yes and that an option could be to divide the fees amongst just those individual psychologists who desire to join PSYPACT, although it would be difficult to estimate, then, how much that would cost them as it would depend on who opted to purchase the e-passport each year. Stanage cited his continued perception that the licensure by endorsement bill solves the issue of expertise being available to South Dakotans, while sparing the financial issues. Ball inquired how other small states (e.g., WY, MT, ND) have joined PSYPACT and are making it work financially. Miller agreed this is important information to seek out, though it may be that those states' boards receive funding from their state to operate whereas our board financially operates only on our own fees. Stanage cited he would not be surprised to see legislation proposing PSYPACT coming forward, but these are the issues to consider. Ball inquired about perhaps a town hall discussion amongst SD psychologists. Stanage cited this is more of a state association role than a board role and he sees proposals legislatively involving PSYPACT moving forward to also be a responsibility of the state association. Stanage cited it is not that the board would want to block PSYPACT moving forward, but that SD psychologists should know the impact it would have on their licensing fees. Tishkoff also cited that the current statute cites a capped fee of \$300 for licensure, so this would also need to be included in the licensing bill proposed. All agreed.

ASPPB Annual Meeting – September 27-October 1st, 2023 (Cleveland, OH): Board staff made board members aware Miller intends to attend the meeting.

Schedule Next Meeting: After group discussion, the next board meeting was tentatively set for Friday, January 12, 2024 at 9:30 am CDT/8:30am MDT via Microsoft Teams.

In discussion, Christiansen inquired that given the board has always prior voted in our meetings to approve licenses being granted, how will this process work going forward. Tellinghuisen stated that licenses could be ratified via vote at meetings. Tellinghuisen-Geddes then offered that licensees could be approved through the application process, but then ratified at the very next board meeting. All agreed.

Executive Session – Pursuant to SDCL 1 – 25 – 2:

Christiansen motioned and Overturf seconded to enter executive session at 9:33am CDT/8:33am MDT for purpose of discussing the one complaint/investigations (#226), to complete the Orals Examinations of three applicants (#728, #729, and #733), and to discuss the Executive Secretary Contract. Motion carried unanimously.

A five-minute break was held, prior to beginning orals examinations, at 10:10am CDT/9:10am MDT. Overturf left the meeting at 10:26am CDT/11:26am MDT - before the last orals examination.

Stanage declared end of Executive Session at 11:50am CDT/12:50pm MDT.

Applicant Approvals: Miller recommended applicants #728, #729, and #733 be approved for licensure per passing of their oral examinations today, pending any outstanding licensure requirements that are applicable. Ball moved, Christiansen seconded, to approve applicants #728, #729, and #733 for licensure, pending any outstanding licensure requirements to complete. Motion carried unanimously, with Ellison and Overturf absent.

Complaint/Investigations: Stanage recommended the board accept the agreed disposition for Complaint #226. Christiansen motioned to do so, Roegiers seconded the motion; motion carried unanimously amongst those present (Ellison and Overturf absent).

Other Business: None.

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn was made by Roegiers; seconded by Ball. Stanage adjourned meeting at 10:54am CDT / 11:54am MDT following unanimous vote (Ellison absent) to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Trisha T. Miller, Ph.D.
Secretary

1-27-1.17. Draft minutes of public meeting to be available--Exceptions--Violation as misdemeanor. The unapproved, draft minutes of any public meeting held pursuant to § 1-25-1 that are required to be kept by law shall be available for inspection by any person within ten business days after the meeting. However, this section does not apply if an audio or video recording of the meeting is available to the public on the governing body's website within five business days after the meeting. A violation of this section is a Class 2 misdemeanor. However, the provisions of this section do not apply to draft minutes of contested case proceedings held in accordance with the provisions of chapter 1-26.