

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

TIME: 10:30 A.M.

Held at

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

2525 North 7th Street

CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

October 7, 2024

State Board of Psychology
October 7, 2024

BOARD MEMBERS:

Steven K. Erickson, JD, Ph.D., LLM, Chair
Matthew Eaton, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of
Professional and Occupational Affairs, on behalf of
Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner
Donald McAleer, Psy.D., Vice Chair
Katherine Bradley, Ph.D., Secretary
David Zehrung, Ph.D.
LaJewel Harrison, MBA, Public Member

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Judith Pachter Schulder, Esquire, Board Counsel
Michael Merten, Esquire, Board Counsel
Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Senior Regulatory
Counsel
Adam J. Williams, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison
Heather J. McCarthy, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecutor
Patrick Greene, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
Berk V. Demiral, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
Adrienne Rachelle McClendon, Esquire, Board
Prosecutor
Courtney J. Restemayer, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
Thomas Leech II, Board Administrator
Anthony Hong, Board Administrator
Carlton Smith, Deputy Chief Counsel, Prosecution
Division
Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Deputy Policy Director,
Department of State
Holly Hoffman, Law Clerk, Department of State

ALSO PRESENT:

Molly Cowan, Psy.D., Director of Professional
Affairs, Pennsylvania Psychological Association
Rachael Baturin, MHP, JD, Pennsylvania Psychological
Association
Michael Pogue-Geile, Ph.D., Clinical Program Chair,
Psychology Professor, Department of Psychology,
University of Pittsburgh
Valerie Stacy, Adult Outpatient Mental Health
Therapist, Pittsburgh Mercy
Rachel Wilbur-Adams, Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

1 ***

2 State Board of Psychology

3 October 7, 2024

4 ***

5 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,
6 at 9:30 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session
7 with Judith Pachter Schulder, Esquire, Board Counsel,
8 for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial
9 deliberations on a number of matters that are
10 currently pending before the Board and to receive the
11 advice of counsel. The Board returned to open
12 session at 10:30 a.m.]

13 ***

14 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State
15 Board of Psychology was held on Monday, October 7,
16 2024. Steven K. Erickson, Ph.D., Chair, called the
17 meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

18 ***

19 [Judith Pachter Schulder, Esquire, Board Counsel,
20 noted the meeting was being recorded, and voluntary
21 participation constituted consent to be recorded.]

22 ***

23 Introduction of Board Members/Attendees

24 [Steven K. Erickson, Ph.D., Chair, requested an
25 introduction of Board members and attendees. A

1 quorum of Board members was present.]

2

3 Approval of minutes of the August 5, 2024 meeting

4 CHAIR ERICKSON:

5

The first item on the agenda is

6

approval of the minutes.

7

Is there any discussion about that

8

item? Hearing no discussion.

9 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

10

Is there someone who would make the

11

motion to approve the minutes of August

12

5, 2024?

13 DR. MCALEER:

14

So moved.

15 MS. HARRISON:

16

I'll second.

17 MR. LEECH:

18

Dr. Erickson, abstain; Deputy

19

Commissioner Eaton, abstain; Dr.

20

McAleer, aye; Dr. Bradley, abstain; Dr.

21

Zehrunge, aye; Ms. Harrison, aye.

22

[The motion carried. Steven Erickson, Matthew Eaton,

23

and Katherine Bradley abstained from voting on the

24

motion.]

25

1 Report of Prosecution - No Report

2 ***

3 Report of Board Counsel - No Report

4 ***

5 Report of Regulatory Counsel

6 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Senior Regulatory
7 Counsel, experienced technical difficulties.]

8 ***

9 Report of Board Administrator - Application to
10 Request Approval to Sit for the Psychology
11 Licensing Examinations

12 MR. LEECH:

13 The first Application today is for an
14 Application Request Approval to Sit for
15 the Psychology Licensing Exams.

16 Agenda item 4 is Valerie Stacy,
17 Ph.D.

18 CHAIR ERICKSON:

19 Is there any discussion on this item?
20 Hearing none. I believe that there is
21 a motion that would for the Board to
22 approve the item.

23 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

24 The motion would be to approve Valerie
25 Stacy's Application to Request Approval

1 to Sit for the Psychology Licensing
2 Examination.

3 DR. MCALEER:

4 So moved.

5 MS. HARRISON:

6 Second.

7 MR. LEECH:

8 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
9 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
10 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
11 Harrison, aye.

12 [The motion carried unanimously.]

13 ***

14 Report of Board Administrator - Applications to
15 Practice Psychology for Persons Licensed in Other
16 States

17 MR. LEECH:

18 Agenda item 5 is Noelani Rodrigues,
19 Ph.D.

20 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

21 Is there a motion to approve the
22 Application to Practice Psychology for
23 Persons Licensed in Other States of
24 Noelani Rodrigues, Ph.D.?

25 DR. MCALEER:

1 So moved.

2 MS. HARRISON:

3 Second.

4 MR. LEECH:

5 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
6 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
7 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrunge, aye; Ms.
8 Harrison, aye.

9 [The motion carried unanimously.]

10 ***

11 [Judith Pachter Schulder, Esquire, Board Counsel,
12 noted the Board engaged in quasi-judicial
13 deliberations on the matters listed on the agenda as
14 the Applications to Request Approval to Sit for the
15 Psychology Licensing Examinations, Applications to
16 Practice Psychology for Persons Licensed in Other
17 States, Review of Supervised Experience, and Approval
18 of the Fictitious Name.]

19 ***

20 Report of Board Administrator - Applications to
21 Practice Psychology for Persons Licensed in Other
22 States

23 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

24 Item 6 is Neal Kimble, Ph.D. That is
25 an Applicant from Kansas.

1 Is there a motion to approve Kansas
2 as being an equivalent state for Act 41
3 purposes?

4 DR. MCALEER:

5 So moved.

6 MS. HARRISON:

7 Second.

8 MR. LEECH:

9 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
10 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
11 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
12 Harrison, aye.

13 [The motion carried unanimously.]

14 ***

15 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

16 Item 7 is the Application for Taylor
17 Bonanni Hawk, Psy.D. This is our first
18 Applicant from Virginia.

19 Is there a motion to approve
20 Virginia as an equivalent state?

21 DR. MCALEER:

22 So moved.

23 MS. HARRISON:

24 Second.

25 MR. LEECH:

1 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
2 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
3 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrunge, aye; Ms.
4 Harrison, aye.

5 [The motion carried unanimously.]

6 ***

7 Report of Board Administrator - Review of Supervised
8 Experience

9 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

10 Item 8 is Review of Supervised
11 Experience, and you reviewed the
12 Application of Michelle Godzinski,
13 Ph.D. This was the Applicant who has a
14 number of practicum hours verified;
15 however, the remaining hours were done
16 under supervision, where the supervisor
17 was paid for the supervision.

18 Is there a motion to approve the
19 Application subject to receive the
20 letter from the supervisor attesting
21 that notwithstanding the payment of the
22 supervision, the supervision was not
23 diluted by the payment?

24 DR. MCALEER:

25 So moved.

1 MS. HARRISON:

2 Second.

3 MR. LEECH:

4 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
5 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
6 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
7 Harrison, aye.

8 [The motion carried unanimously.]

9

10 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

11 Item 9 is the Application of Julie
12 Ache, Psy.D., who holds an inactive
13 license in New York, so she would be
14 required to apply for a full
15 Application before the Board; however,
16 she has not provided you with all of
17 her postdoctoral supervision.

18 Is there a motion to provisionally
19 deny her Application and provide her a
20 right for a formal hearing on the
21 grounds that she does not have an
22 active license in another state and has
23 not provided evidence of current
24 practice or current education and
25 knowledge regarding the practice of

1 psychology and has not provided
2 sufficient documentation evidencing her
3 postdoctoral supervision?

4 DR. MCALEER:

5 So moved.

6 MS. HARRISON:

7 Second.

8 MR. LEECH:

9 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
10 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
11 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
12 Harrison, aye.

13 [The motion carried unanimously.]

14 ***

15 Report of Board Administrator - Application for
16 Approval of Corporate or Fictitious Name

17 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

18 Item 10 is Approval of a Corporate or
19 Fictitious Name of Neurospective
20 Psychological Group. They have since
21 provided additional documentation
22 regarding the use of the word
23 neurospective.

24 Is there a motion to approve the
25 Corporate or Fictitious Name

1 Neurospective Psychological Group?

2 DR. MCALEER:

3 So moved.

4 MS. HARRISON:

5 Second.

6 MR. LEECH:

7 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
8 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
9 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
10 Harrison, aye.

11 [The motion carried unanimously.]

12 ***

13 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Senior Regulatory
14 Counsel, continued to experience technical
15 difficulties.]

16 ***

17 Discussion Items - 2025 PPA Conference Presentation
18 [Steven K. Erickson, Ph.D., Chair, referred to the
19 the Pennsylvania Psychological Association (PPA)
20 Conference presentation next summer. He reported an
21 inquiry was made concerning a plan by PPA to serve
22 alcohol at this meeting in which the Board will be
23 giving a presentation.

24 Chair Erickson noted the Board wanted to make it
25 clear that they are not directing PPA to serve

1 alcohol at that event and would not be part of their
2 presentation. He mentioned that it is fine if PPA is
3 doing that on its own, but the Board is not directing
4 them.

5 Ms. Pachter commented that the question about
6 whether to serve alcohol or not would be for PPA.

7 Dr. McAleer stated the Board needed to decide who
8 would give the presentation at the convention and
9 which of them attending will be completing the call
10 for proposals outlining the content of their
11 presentation.

12 Dr. McAleer volunteered to attend the conference,
13 along with the Dr. Zehrung.]

14 MS. HARRISON:

15 I'll make the motion to approve two
16 members to attend.

17 DR. MCALEER:

18 So moved.

19 DR. ZEHRUNG:

20 I second the motion.

21 MR. LEECH:

22 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
23 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
24 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
25 Harrison, aye.

1 [The motion carried unanimously.]

2

3 Discussion Items - ASPPB Letter to Members

4 [Steven K. Erickson, Ph.D., Chair, addressed the
5 Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards
6 (ASPPB) letter to members regarding Texas wanting to
7 introduce a bylaw change to what is referred to as
8 the second part of the the Examination for
9 Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). He
10 mentioned being in support of the bylaw change and
11 believed ASPPB has not made a sufficient showing that
12 the skills section of the test will add appreciably
13 to the level of confidence for incoming
14 psychologists.

15 Chair Erickson noted that very few states have
16 enacted or taken advantage of Part 2 and believed
17 Arizona recently dropped it. He also noted that it
18 was his position to give jurisdictions the option,
19 which is how he understood the proposed bylaw change.

20 Dr. McAleer agreed with Chair Erickson. He noted
21 it to be a complex situation, where there has been
22 increasing pressure from regulatory bodies to assure
23 in all professions that competence can be assessed
24 and demonstrated amongst the practitioners. He
25 mentioned that the State Board of Medicine has had

1 board certification for many years, and psychology
2 has been moving in this direction for some time.

3 Dr. McAleer stated psychology has specialty
4 boards, but only a small portion of psychologists
5 actually pursue that specialty credential that
6 demonstrates through peer review that the person is
7 practicing at a level of competence. He reported a
8 great deal of back and forth about the wisdom of a
9 second part to the EPPP assessing competence. He
10 noted there has been much discussion in the
11 professional literature about the psychometric
12 adequacy of this particular exam.

13 Dr. McAleer commented that Texas has taken a
14 rather strong position in opposition to requiring or
15 mandating that the states adopt Part 2. He mentioned
16 that their argument is in the way it has been rolled
17 out, where ASPPB has stated very clearly that any
18 jurisdiction that does not also accept Part 2 of the
19 EPPP will no longer be allowed to use Part 1, which
20 is the basis of all licensures in all jurisdictions
21 at this time.

22 Dr. McAleer noted it is written into their state
23 law and specifically named as the test they use. He
24 mentioned that he was designated as the voting
25 delegate from Pennsylvania and requested guidance as

1 to how they should proceed. He noted the Board may
2 have to create their own test if they choose not to
3 use Part 2 of the test and are unable to use the main
4 part.

5 Ms. Pachter Schulder requested information
6 regarding what the Psychology Interjurisdictional
7 Compact (PSYPACT) does in terms of the test.

8 Dr. McAleer explained that PSYPACT is a little
9 different and simply requires someone be licensed in
10 their home jurisdiction, and all jurisdictions
11 require the use of the EPPP-1, where PSYPACT may very
12 well fall apart as well.

13 Dr. McAleer mentioned that he has not made up his
14 mind and sees value in demonstrating competency in an
15 unbiased way, where they have relied on testimony and
16 documentation from supervisors about the clinical
17 competency of their students and residents and
18 potential licensees since the beginning, but are not
19 always reliable.

20 Dr. McAleer believed this is a stab at trying to
21 use some type of a repeatable standardized measure
22 but many of them did not care for the way it was
23 presented, where it will be difficult to do anything
24 else with ASPPB if they leave it.

25 Dr. Zehrung echoed comments from Drs. Erickson

1 and McAleer, where he sees some virtue at a different
2 level than the individual supervisor ratings
3 regarding demonstrating competency. He noted there
4 is another virtue, which is autonomy of the local
5 jurisdiction for how they make decisions about
6 licensing people within their jurisdiction.

7 Dr. Zehrung also had some personal discomfort
8 with how this had been presented, where it seems to
9 diminish autonomy of local jurisdictions. He
10 commented that he would feel more comfortable if
11 there was a way to juggle both the competency virtue
12 and the autonomy virtue.

13 Molly Cowan, Psy.D., Director of Professional
14 Affairs, Pennsylvania Psychological Association,
15 stated the association echoes the concerns the Board
16 raised. She mentioned that there has been a lack of
17 transparent research support from ASPPB in terms of
18 this being a viable test.

19 Chair Erickson added that there is a significant
20 cost associated with the test that will have to be
21 borne by predominantly people who are just entering
22 the profession and believed it is incumbent upon the
23 Board to be sensitive to those costs. He mentioned
24 that without a showing from the organization that
25 this section of the test appreciably increases the

1 confidence level of entry-level psychologists that
2 the test is unwarranted at this time.

3 Chair Erickson also recollected that it would be
4 optional for jurisdictions when Part 2 was first
5 introduced, and once it became apparent that very few
6 states were availing themselves of Part 2 is when
7 ASPPB had become more strident in requiring the
8 adoption of Part 2, which is more of a strong-arm
9 tactic.

10 Chair Erickson mentioned being the PSYPACT
11 Commissioner for the Commonwealth, and it wa not
12 apparent to him that not having Part 2 would diminish
13 PSYPACT directly, where anyone licensed in the
14 jurisdiction home state should be sufficient.

15 Dr. Bradley noted being strongly in favor of
16 allowing jurisdictions the opportunity to choose
17 whether they adopt the second portion of the test.
18 She mentioned that it may be worth considering
19 adopting it once more psychometric data are available
20 but wanted to see more data. She stated the second
21 portion of the test seemed to be more like minimal
22 competence being assessed after reviewing preliminary
23 work on the tests and is hoping to see more data.

24 Dr. McAleer mentioned that materials from ASPPB
25 were forwarded to all of the members and included an

1 offer on a limited basis for Board members to
2 actually take a version of the exam. He reported
3 trying to take the test over the last three and a
4 half years and not being able to take it.

5 Ms. Pachter Schulder suggested asking ASPPB to
6 make a presentation to the Board about Part 2 before
7 the ASPPB Meeting as a hint that the Board may just
8 be in a tabled or abstained position.

9 Dr. Bradley stated she would also like to take
10 some version of the test or some variant if they are
11 willing to release it. She reported seeing the
12 initial work when she was working on test development
13 with ASPPB for the assessment and diagnosis division
14 of the test development committees, and it may have
15 come a long way since then. She noted that the
16 competence at that time was more common sense for any
17 individual rather than specific to psychologists.

18 Chair Erickson referred to a presentation in
19 Harrisburg on Part 2 and being unimpressed with the
20 sample questions because they did not meet minimal
21 standards of what he considered to be skills-based
22 testing. He expressed concern, in addition to kind
23 of the strong-arm tactics, that there has not been a
24 showing that this will improve.

25 Chair Erickson noted it is incumbent upon the

1 Board to have evidence that this is worthwhile if
2 they are going to put another burden on the applicant
3 but did not believe ASPPB has done that and would be
4 quite opposed until they do so.

5 Dr. McAleer clarified that the amendment to the
6 ASPPB bylaws does not specifically address the use of
7 Part 1 and Part 2 but talks about a state's rights to
8 work independent of ASPPB without repercussions or
9 recrimination or any penalties by the organization
10 itself and is what will be up for a vote.

11 Dr. McAleer noted the importance of protecting
12 the public and not being convinced Part 2 would add
13 anything above and beyond Part 1. He commented that
14 the Board seems to be doing okay with protecting the
15 public, given that they have not had many complaints
16 before the Board of incompetence or unethical
17 practice. He asked whether it is the will of the
18 Board that he vote in favor of the amendment as
19 proposed by Texas, and Board members agreed.]

20 MS. PACHTER SCHULDER:

21 Could the Board vote to request ASPPB
22 make a presentation at the December 2
23 meeting about Part 2?

24 Somebody would need to make that
25 motion.

1 DR. ZEHRUNG:

2 So moved.

3 DR. MCALEER:

4 Second.

5 MR. LEECH:

6 Dr. Erickson, aye; Deputy Commissioner
7 Eaton, aye; Dr. McAleer, aye; Dr.
8 Bradley, aye; Dr. Zehrung, aye; Ms.
9 Harrison, aye.

10 [The motion carried unanimously.]

11 ***

12 Report of Regulatory Counsel - Status of Regulations
13 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Senior Regulatory
14 Counsel, provided a Status of Regulations Report for
15 the Board's review. She noted that she is hoping to
16 finalize the Regulatory Analysis Form for the
17 continuing education regulation within the next month
18 or two.

19 Ms. Wolfgang informed Board members that she is
20 senior regulatory counsel and has many boards but
21 wants to get these regulations moving.

22 Ms. Wolfgang stated the Psychological Clinical
23 Science Accreditation System (PCSAS) parity
24 regulation is on the move. She mentioned that the
25 Board received approval from the Office of General

1 Counsel (OGC) in July and the Policy Office on
2 September 25 and was then sent to the Office of
3 Attorney General on September 26.

4 Ms. Wolfgang explained that the Office of
5 Attorney General has 30 days for review and would
6 submit a tolling memorandum if they have issues or
7 that it would go out to be published as proposed if
8 they approve it. She stated she would work with
9 Board Counsel and hopefully get any issues resolved
10 from a legal standpoint as soon as possible.]

11 ***

12 Report of Regulatory Counsel - 16A-6320 General
13 Revisions

14 [Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Senior Regulatory
15 Counsel, referred to the 16A-6320 regarding the
16 general revisions package, noting it was submitted
17 for review by regulatory counsel and then pulled back
18 by Board Counsel. She requested guidance on what
19 needed to be done to get the regulation moving
20 concerning supervision requirements and updating the
21 exam, which was an effort to get regulations up to
22 speed with the changes in the law that happened
23 under Act 53 some years ago.

24 Ms. Wolfgang noted it to be her understanding
25 that it was pulled back because the Board wanted to

1 do something additional or maybe different. She
2 mentioned going through a transition last year, where
3 regulatory counsel is more involved in writing regs,
4 noting Board Counsel was involved prior to that. She
5 mentioned being unsure of the logistics of what the
6 Board and/or Board Counsel had in mind in terms of
7 making changes and offered to do some research on the
8 minutes to get more of a handle on it.

9 Ms. Wolfgang referred to the Board's website and
10 the special notice on Act 53 of 2006 regarding
11 supervised experience. She mentioned there was a
12 discussion about the Board wanting to waive certain
13 parts of its regulations and not all of it and is
14 maybe when Board Counsel said they need to change the
15 regulation instead of waiving the regulation.

16 Dr. McAleer recollected there were a number of
17 moving pieces, some of it having to do with changes
18 that were included in the new law that allowed for
19 the use of practica experience for those enrolled in
20 programs after the fall of 2016. He noted there was
21 some discussion a couple of meetings ago about also
22 beginning to examine the requirements of supervisors
23 and whether those would be sufficient and revisiting
24 the idea that 2 hours of face-to-face individual
25 supervision versus other models of supervision that

1 have since been developed since that regulation was
2 put in place many years ago.

3 Ms. Pachter Schulder requested information
4 concerning models of supervision.

5 Chair Erickson explained that group supervision
6 does not count toward the minimum required
7 supervision, and it must be one-on-one in a face-to-
8 face platform, which can be distance. He noted many
9 training facilities and residencies do group
10 supervision as a way of imparting knowledge and
11 providing supervision.

12 Ms. Wolfgang offered to put it on the agenda for
13 next time but do some research with Board Counsel to
14 make sure from a legal standpoint that the revisions
15 in these regulations are appropriate and consistent
16 with the changes in Act 53 and any other issues. She
17 also mentioned an issue with behavior specialists and
18 again offered to look through that from a legal
19 standpoint making sure the regulations are consistent
20 given the changes in the laws. She also suggested
21 forming a committee if there are additional things
22 the Board thinks they should add to this regulation.

23 Dr. McAleer also suggested modernizing the way
24 the Board receives information other than receiving
25 it in a signed envelope.

1 Dr. Zehrung asked whether the continuing
2 education revision is in the last step in terms of
3 the regulatory process and asked whether she could
4 provide a general sense of when that might be
5 finalized.

6 Ms. Wolfgang noted she would like to have that
7 finalized by the end of this year and sent to OGC,
8 Budget, and Policy for approval and then to the
9 Office of Attorney General. She further explained
10 that it would be published as proposed in the spring
11 but still has to go through the final rulemaking
12 process.

13 Ms. Wolfgang referred to the general revision,
14 noting an exposure draft went out in 2020, but she
15 may want to do another exposure draft if the Board is
16 adding more provisions.

17 Ms. Wolfgang referred to the continuing education
18 regulation, noting there is a 30-day public comment
19 period after it is published as proposed, along with
20 IRRC having another 30 days to submit its comments.
21 She stated it would come back to the Board to review
22 the comments and then the final rulemaking would be
23 drafted after that. She mentioned that it could be
24 within a that year if they do not receive many
25 comments and will work to hit the November 25

1 renewal.

2 Ms. Pachter Schulder referred to the conversation
3 regarding the ASPPB vote and EPPP, where Dr. McAleer
4 mentioned it was ensconced in the law to take EPPP.
5 She also referred to the annex, where a section of
6 their regulation says an applicant shall obtain a
7 passing score on the EPPP and the Pennsylvania
8 Psychology Law Exam to qualify for licensure.

9 Ms. Pachter Schulder stated there is nothing
10 saying it is only Part 1 and not Part 2 if EPPP adds
11 a second part, and the Board would need to revise the
12 regulation in order for Part 2 not to be
13 automatically accepted. She asked the Board to keep
14 that in mind if they would want to limit it to Part
15 1, noting the Board would be able to do that in that
16 regulation.

17 Chair Erickson noted the Board of Ethics has been
18 waiting for APA to revise its ethics code, and it
19 should be another year.]

20

21 FYI Items - PSYPACT 2nd Quarter 2024 Compliance
22 Report

23 [Steven K. Erickson, Ph.D., Chair, again noted he
24 would be attending the PSYPACT Meeting virtually
25 November 18-19, 2024.]

1 ***

2 Report of Acting Commissioner

3 [Matthew Eaton, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of
4 Professional and Occupational Affairs, on behalf of
5 Arion Claggett, Acting Commissioner, announced
6 that their ongoing licensing modernization project is
7 continuing to move along. He announced the new
8 vendor is System Automation, and the department will
9 start working with them in the fall and into next
10 year as well. He also noted the new licensing
11 platform is called Evoke, which is a platform being
12 used in other states and will be the name of the new
13 licensing system once they are fully integrated.]

14 ***

15 Report of Board Chair - No Report

16 ***

17 Report of Board Members - No Report

18 ***

19 Public Session

20 [Molly Cowan, Psy.D., Director of Professional
21 Affairs, Pennsylvania Psychological Association,
22 asked whether Dr. McAleer and Dr. Zehrung are okay
23 with the Friday, June 20, 2025, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.
24 time frame for the PPA Convention presentation, and
25 they agreed.]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Psychology meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Psychology meeting.



Rachel Wilbur-Adams,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
REFERENCE INDEX

October 7, 2024

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

TIME	AGENDA
9:30	Executive Session
10:30	Return to Open Session
10:30	Official Call to Order
10:30	Introduction of Board Members/Attendees
10:32	Approval of Minutes
10:34	Report of Board Administrator
10:42	Discussion Items
11:03	Report of Regulatory Counsel
11:20	FYI Items
11:20	Report of Acting Commissioner
11:22	Public Session
11:24	Adjournment