

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF PSYCHOLOGISTS
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Teleconference/Video Conference
January 17, 2025

Members Present: Thomas Stanage, Ph.D., (President); Matthew Christiansen, Ph.D. (Vice President); Trisha Miller, Ph.D., (Secretary); Rosalie Ball, Ph.D., Member; Justine Ashokar, Ph.D., Newly Appointed Psychologist Member (First Meeting); Terry Dosch, Newly Appointed Lay Member (First Meeting)

Members Absent: Brian Roegiers, Lay Member

Others Present: Brooke Tellinghuisen Geddes, Executive Administrator; Katie Funke, Executive Assistant; Greg Tishkoff, DSS Legal Services – Board Counsel; Tracy Mercer – DSS Special Projects Coordinator (Board Liaison to DSS)

Call to Order/Welcome and Introductions: Stanage called the meeting to order at 9:36am CDT. All present introduced themselves and their roles, given new members present.

Roll Call: Tellinghuisen Geddes called the roll. A quorum was present (Stanage, Christiansen, Miller, Ball, Ashokar, & Dosch). Roegiers was noted as absent.

Corrections or Additions to the Agenda: Tellinghuisen Geddes suggested that the list of board members be updated considering new board members appointed since the agenda was made.

Approval of the Agenda: Christiansen motioned to approve the agenda with the suggested corrections by Tellinghuisen Geddes; Ball seconded the motion. Motion carried on a unanimous vote of board members present; Roegiers absent.

Public Testimony/Public Comment Period (9:36am CDT / 8:36am MDT): None.

Approval of Minutes from September 6, 2024 Meeting: Ball motioned and Christiansen seconded, to approve meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously; Roegiers absent.

FY Financial Update: Tellinghuisen Geddes reported that as of November 30, 2024, year-to-date revenue was at \$10,115.71, year-to-date expenditures were at \$27,230.39, and cash balance was at \$119,604.54. Tellinghuisen Geddes reminded the board that the bulk of the board's income comes in during the spring months as the licensure renewal deadline is June 30 annually. Stanage made the board aware he'd asked Tellinghuisen Geddes to look into applicant numbers, per passing of legislation allowing SD's entry into the interstate compact (PSYPACT) which allows psychologists to apply for a license to provide telehealth services into any other PSYPACT state. The suspicion was that SD may lose licensees of those out-of-state psychologists as they would now be able to provide services into SD using their telehealth license. Tellinghuisen Geddes reported that SD had 15, 10, and 11 non-renewals of licensees in 2024, 2023, and 2022, respectively. Tellinghuisen Geddes reported it is likely too early to tell, as SD licensure renewal deadline had already passed when the legislation took effect in July 2024. Regarding new application numbers, Tellinghuisen Geddes reported SD had 15 new in FY 2022 (12 already licensed elsewhere), 13 new in FY 2023 (9 already licensed elsewhere), 11 new in FY 2024 (all already licensed elsewhere), and in the first half of FY 2025 there have been 8 new (6 already licensed elsewhere). Stanage stated perceived importance of tracking these numbers over time to be able to be aware of PSYPACT's impact. Ball mentioned 20 licensees from SD applied for the telehealth licensure and 13 declared SD as their "home state" in that process.

Board Member Appointment Update: Governor Noem approved Dr. Justine Ashokar to the board, as well as Terry Dosch to fill the open lay member position on the board.

Election of Officers: Stange reported a slate of officers the Nominating Committee proposed wherein Miller would be President, Christensen would be Vice President, and Ball would be Secretary. Stange explained Miller has been heavily involved in ASPBB proceedings so is aware of pertinent issues. Tellinghuisen Geddes inquired regarding interpretation of legislation passed last year regarding board member term limits, as Miller's term limit will end October 30, 2025. Tellinghuisen Geddes stated understanding from communications by the other departments, that if a member's term limit ends, their involvement ends immediately, not once they are replaced. Stange requested Tishkoff's interpretation and initially, Tishkoff cited they have 120 days to remain in place but upon further review did state it is likely the board member cannot remain on board after term limit has expired. Stange moved to accept the slate of officers proposed by the Nominating Committee and Ball seconded this; motion carried unanimously, Roegiers absent. Tellinghuisen Geddes inquired about clarification on whether there is a timeline, such as a year of absence, when a previous board member can again be reappointed to the board; Mercer agreed to review this. Given Miller's continued involvement with ASPBB, Christiansen and others inquired whether a special appointment or special representation, or even board contract, would be allowable to put into place to allow Miller's continued involvement and representation at the national level. At that time, Dosch inquired into term limit lengths and amounts and Tellinghuisen Geddes made him aware of the three limits, three consecutive years each statute limitations. Dosch mentioned interpretation may depend on whether someone is completing a single term limit or whether completing the full allowance of consecutive term limits.

EPPP Part 2 Update from ASPBB: Tellinghuisen Geddes reminded board members that the board had previously taken the position that if an applicant seeking SD licensure was already licensed elsewhere and were in good standing, the orals examination would not be required for SD licensure ("licensure by endorsement"), but that new applicants without prior licensure would still continue to be required to pass the orals examination as part of licensure. This was to be the plan until we were going to adopt EPPP Part 2 in addition to the EPPP, at which time the incorporation of EPPP Part 2 (Skills portion) would replace the orals examination requirement completely. This was to be an Administrative Rules change. However, Miller explained that since the board's last meeting, ASPBB has now decided to incorporate the Skills portion addressed via the EPPP – Part 2 into the EPPP to require one robust examination to eliminate multiple complications that were presented by states in response to the two-part examination requirement being announced. Stange stated this unexpected change in examination formats and SD's patience rather than hurried implementation reiterates the advantage of not being one of the first states to make the change. For now, the board will continue with the current position, aforementioned, until a newly proposed all-in-one EPPP is decided.

PsyPACT Update: Ball, SD's PsyPACT Commissioner, reported that she did attend the first in-person PsyPACT national meeting held November 18-19, 2024, in Washington, D.C. Ball stated there were 28 of the 48 U.S. States represented at the meeting. She reported PsyPACT Commissioners were made aware ASPBB has provided 14,600 Authority to Practice Interjurisdictional Telepsychology (APIT) licenses thus far nationwide and they are working to provide a "Digital Badge" which will contain a QR code each licensee can show as verification they are licensed with an APIT, for authenticity and public protection purposes as there are concerns with how people are advertising their telepsychology practice. Ball explained there was discussion regarding providing a provision for seasoned psychologists (licensed psychologists who've held licenses for 15 years or more and are in good standing), but this was tabled as there was some opposition to this. There was also clarification at the meeting that any supervisee to a licensed psychologist would also need an APIT to provide telehealth services outside their home state (meaning, a supervisee cannot simply provide telehealth services to patients outside their state of residence under their supervising psychologist's APIT). There was also discussion to clarify that if there is an ethical complaint made in an interjurisdictional case, it is the obligation

of the “home state” (as designated on that licensee’s APIT) to investigate the complaint – the “home state” has the authority. Ball also reported it was confirmed that no APIT allows international telehealth services.

ASPPB Annual Meeting – October 30-November 3, 2024 (Dallas, TX): Miller attended this meeting. Primary topics to be discussed at the meeting included concerns re: some states’ opposition to the EPPP-2 as was being offered due to difficulties changing their statutes to accommodate, call for administrative changes within ASPPB governance decision-making and states’ role, considerations re: potential issues and considerations related to Artificial Intelligence (AI) utilization in the field, Master’s level licensing, and program equivalency considerations. Miller explained, as aforementioned in the current meeting minutes, that ASPPB stated intent to discontinue offering the EPPP-Part 2 (Skills Exam) as a stand-alone second test, but instead are now likely to pursue a single combination test evaluating both Knowledge and Skills but details, including cost, are yet to be determined or disclosed. Miller explained advances in technology are prompting APA and ASPPB to make changes to their ethical codes to incorporate language advising ethical decisions about the use of technology and AI and that the Draft of the APA Revised Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct is currently open for public comment and recommended board members read the document. With regard to program equivalency, Miller was made aware at the meeting that numerous states’ licensure requirements simply require applicants to have graduated from APA-approved degree programs and they do not review any particulars. Thus, as APA is now approving courses to meet more than one area of our statute requirements, it puts us in a decision of determining whether or not we “count” a single course as meeting more than one statute requirement (i.e., we require 3 course credits in Cognitive Psychology and 3 course credits in Social Psychology, so if an applicant has just one course that APA has approved in their program to cover both, are we to allow it to cover for both of our statute requirements?). Future discussion may be needed for Rules notation. Given these topics presented by Miller, Stange reiterated the importance of our presence in staying aware of the discussions on these topics at ASPPB conferences; Miller agreed and stated desire and intention to continue to stay involved with ASPPB.

ASPPB Mid-Year Meeting – April 24-27, 2025 (Montreal, Quebec, Canada): Miller stated intent to attend this conference as discussion regarding states’ input with regard to future decision-making authority within ASPPB will be involved and she has been part of that discussion the last several ASPPB meetings. Board members agreed this will be important. Miller questioned whether state will approve out-of-country travel for this; Mercer stated perception there is an opportunity for this and will review this but suggested submitting the requests necessary. Dosch motioned to approve Miller to attend to represent the SD Board, Matt Christiansen seconded; motion carried unanimously, Roegiers absent.

Schedule Next Meeting: After group discussion, the next board meeting was tentatively set for 8:30am MDT via teleconference on MS Teams on May 2, 2025.

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

As there were no current active complaints needing discussion and no applicants requiring the Oral Examination scheduled to do so at today’s meeting and all board members declined a need for executive session for Request for Bid (RFP) Approval discussion/vote, Stange declared no need for Executive Session as presented on the agenda.

Vote on RFP Approval to Issue: Miller made a motion to approve the presented RFP for issuance for the Executive Secretary contract and Ball seconded the motion; motion passed unanimously, Roegiers absent.

Applicant Approval: None.

Other Business: None.

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn was made by Ball; seconded by Christiansen. Stanage adjourned meeting at 10:47am CDT / 9:47am MDT following unanimous vote to do so (Roegiers absent).

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.

DRAFT