

The CAP Monitor

College of Alberta Psychologists

Winter 2004, Issue 18

To serve the interests of the public and guide the Profession of Psychology.

Psychologists' Duty to Protect

by Derek Truscott and Kenneth Crook

This article is an excerpt from *Ethics for the Practice of Psychology in Canada, an upcoming publication of the University of Alberta Press.*

There can be few, if any, psychologists who are unaware of the *Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California* (1976) decision and the impact it has had on the profession of psychology. Psychologists are often privy to the most intimate aspects of clients' lives. But this knowledge can be a double-edged sword when concern arises that a client may pose a threat to others. An ethical conflict arises between the psychologist's professional obligation to respect the autonomy of the client, and an obligation to protect the foreseeable victims of the client's violent actions.

Legal practitioners frequently speak in terms of legal duties owed between people. In stating that a legal duty exists they are saying, in shorthand, that in light of all policy considerations a particular standard of conduct is owed by one person to another. In the absence of such a duty there is no obligation to act in a particular manner. Such duties may be created by the legislature, by the courts or by the general understandings of everyday existence. What is important to understand is that to state that a legal duty exists is to draw a conclusion based on the facts of a certain situation, and not a statement of fact in itself.

For psychologists the most obvious legal duty is that owed to their clients to exercise "that degree of care and skill which could be expected of a normal, prudent practitioner of the

same experience and standing" (*Crits v. Sylvester*, 1956). Failure to meet this standard of care is considered negligence; if it results in harm to the client it is considered malpractice, and may form the basis for civil liability.

Prior to *Tarasoff*, psychologists tended not to be concerned about legal liability arising out of their clients' behaviour outside the professional relationship. The *Tarasoff* court ruled, however, that psychotherapists in California have a duty to exercise reasonable care to protect the potential victims of their clients' violent behaviour. Although relevant only in California, almost every other jurisdiction in the United States as well as Canada has applied analogous legal reasoning (Truscott, 1993). Although some jurisdictions differ, the duty to protect generally exists where a client has been (or reasonably should have been) assessed to be a serious threat of physical violence to a reasonably identifiable victim or victims and the chain of causation that results in harm is clear.

There are two important facts of note regarding the *Tarasoff* ruling. First, *Tarasoff* did not establish a "duty to warn," as is often incorrectly asserted. An earlier, and much publicized, 1974 decision (*Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California*, 1974) did rule that California psychotherapists had a duty to warn, but that ruling was reheard by the California Supreme Court and superseded by the 1976 duty to protect decision. Second, there is no duty to protect third parties or to warn third parties

in the case of suicide. There is a legal requirement that parents of minors be notified when their children are suicidal (Truscott & Crook, *in press*), and there certainly are circumstances where other individuals should be involved in order to properly implement a treatment plan, but psychologists should not confuse their legal responsibility to protect third parties when a client is homicidal with their legal responsibility when a client is suicidal.

The facts of the *Tarasoff* case make for instructive reading from both a professional and legal point of view.

The *Tarasoff* Case

Prosenjit Poddar was a 26-year-old graduate student in naval architecture at the Berkeley campus of the University of California when he was brought to the Cowell Memorial Hospital of the University of California in July of 1969 by his friend. He was seen by Dr. Gold, a psychiatrist. Mr. Poddar's friend told Dr. Gold that he believed Mr. Poddar had become pathologically obsessed with Tatiana Tarasoff, a 19-year-old student he had met at a dance in the fall of 1968. Mr. Poddar had tape-recorded conversations with the young woman and spent hours replaying the tapes in order to ascertain her feeling for him, had threatened to kill Ms. Tarasoff, and had said that he planned to purchase a gun. Dr. Gold did not believe that Mr. Poddar required hospitalization and arranged weekly outpatient psychotherapy at the University's student counselling centre with Dr.

Psychologists Duty to Protect - Cont'd

Moore, a psychologist. Mr. Poddar later indicated that he did not trust Dr. Moore and asked Dr. Gold if he could see him again, which Dr. Gold refused. During therapy with Dr. Moore, Mr. Poddar reluctantly revealed his fantasies of harming Ms. Tarasoff and of his plans to kill her when she returned to school in September from vacation in Brazil. Dr. Moore told Mr. Poddar that he would have to take steps to prevent him from doing so if he continued to talk in this way. Mr. Poddar did not return for any further appointments.

After consultation with Dr. Gold, Dr. Moore notified the campus police by telephone and in writing that Mr. Poddar was dangerous and should be involuntarily committed for observation and treatment. The campus police went to Mr. Poddar's apartment, where he was living with Ms. Tarasoff's younger brother, interviewed him extensively in the brother's presence, and then left without detaining him, noting that he was "rational" and that he promised to stay away from Ms. Tarasoff.

When Ms. Tarasoff returned from her vacation she continued to see Mr. Poddar occasionally and his obsession intensified. A few weeks later, Mr. Poddar went to the Tarasoff home and shot and stabbed Tatiana to death. He then phoned the Berkeley city police and told them that he thought he had just killed someone.

Tatiana Tarasoff's parents initiated a civil action against Dr. Moore, the university and the campus police, claiming that her death was a result of their negligence. The Tarasoffs claimed that the defendant's therapists should have warned their daughter that Mr. Poddar presented a danger to her.

The defence argued, among other things, that therapists are obligated to protect the confidentiality of their clients and that warnings would compromise the practice of psycho-

therapy. The Court disagreed, holding that "the protective privilege [to not disclose confidences] ends where the public peril begins." The Court ruled that Dr. Moore had accurately determined that Ms. Tarasoff was in peril, so he was obligated to take some action to protect her. The Court determined that if the facts in the Tarasoff suit were as alleged by the plaintiffs, then Dr. Moore had an obligation to protect Ms. Tarasoff, and her parents were allowed to file suit on those grounds, stating:

Where a therapist determines, or pursuant to the standards of his profession should determine, that his patient presents a serious danger of violence to another, he incurs an obligation to use reasonable care to protect the intended victim against such danger. The discharge of this duty may require the therapist to take one or more of various steps, depending upon the nature of the case. Thus, it may call for him to warn the intended victim or others likely to apprise the victim of danger, to notify the police or to take whatever steps are necessary under the circumstances.

The Court's opinion noted that the plaintiffs would be hard-pressed to win such a suit as the therapists might in fact have done as much as could be legally required of them. As with 85 to 90 percent of professional liability claims, the case was settled out of court for what was rumoured to be a very small amount.

Tarasoff in Canada

In Canada, the *Tarasoff* principle has only been addressed directly in the single case of *Wenden v. Trikha* (1991) in which Mr. Trikha was placed under close supervision in a psychiatric ward under the care of a psychiatrist. Shortly after his admission he eloped from the hospital and was involved in a car accident in which

College of Alberta Psychologists

Council, 2003-04

President

Sandra Collins

Past President

Eric Haffenden

President-Elect

Horst Mueller

Treasurer

Bonnie Rude-Weisman

Public Member

Barry Ashton

Public Member

Wayne Wright

Dennis Brown

Wendy Hawkins

Teresita Jose

Michael King

Terry Wilton

Ex Officio Members

Chair, Chartering Committee

Jean Pettifor

Chair, Credentials Evaluation Committee

Walter Goos

Chair, Discipline Committee

Patrick Baillie

Chair, Oral Examinations Committee

Lee Handy

Chair, Practice Review Committee

Paul Jerry

Chair, Registration Committee

Roy Frenzel

Registrar

Alexandra Kinkaide

Staff of the College of Alberta Psychologists

Registrar

Alexandra Kinkaide

Complaints Director

Eileen Baril

Office Manager/Controller

Wendy El-Issa

Assistant to the Registrar

Gail Leicht

Credentials Evaluation and Examinations Coordinator

Karen Crosswell

Registration Coordinator

Leanne Vanderhelm

Health Professions Act Coordinator / Administrative Assistant (Discipline)

Kathy Semchuk

Receptionist / Office Assistant

Cheryl Ferguson

Psychologists Duty to Protect - Cont'd

Ms. Wenden was seriously injured. A civil action was commenced by Ms. Wenden against the hospital and the psychiatrist.

The Court held that when a psychiatrist becomes aware that a patient presents a serious danger to the physical well-being of a third party or parties there arises a duty to take reasonable steps to protect such a person or persons provided they can be identified. In *Wenden* there was no identifiable victim, making the question of identifiability difficult. Ultimately, the Court held that the psychiatrist had not acted negligently in his care of Mr. Trikha and thereby the question was not addressed.

The Supreme Court of Canada in the decision of *Smith v. Jones* (1999) accepted the reasoning in *Wenden*, as well as the general principle of *Tarasoff* and provided more clarity around the issue of identifiability by noting that a duty may arise "if a class of victims, such as little girls under five living in a specific area, is clearly identified." The court in *Smith v. Jones* also commented on the issue of the nature of the threat:

I believe it is more appropriate to speak of a person making known his or her intentions. While speech is perhaps the most common means of making intentions known, it is certainly not the only manner of indicating a clear intention. It could be accomplished soundlessly yet with brutal clarity by thrusting a knife through a photograph of the intended victim.

It should be noted, however, that the Court was principally concerned in that case on the issue of privilege and thus this comment is likely an incidental opinion and therefore not binding, although almost certainly to be followed in any subsequent Canadian decision.

Efforts to protect third parties from a client's violent behaviour may involve having to breach a confidential rela-

tionship. It is important to keep in mind that a violation of confidentiality should only be considered under circumstances of possible serious physical harm or death. In a Nova Scotia case, *R. v. R. (K.A.)*, 1993, involving a physician who violated the confidentiality of a patient he had reason to believe was lying in a criminal case, the physician was suspended for three months by the College of Physicians and Surgeons for inappropriately violating confidentiality.

Avoiding liability

When a threat is of a serious nature and the circumstances are such that a reasonable psychologist would be concerned, then some duty to protect owed to the third party almost certainly arises under Canadian law (Truscott & Crook, 1993). These circumstances may arise in the context of therapy, assessment or research. If, however, the risk is extremely low and the potential damage is slight, then the courts would likely not impose such a duty. The test, again, is based on the legal fiction of the reasonable psychologist. It is "justifiable not to take steps to eliminate a real risk if it is small and if the circumstances are such that a reasonable man [sic] ... would think it right to neglect it" (Chambers & Heuston, 1981).

As in all issues of avoiding liability, the psychologist's most powerful defence is careful documentation and consultation with qualified colleagues. Thorough records are critical to document that appropriate procedures were followed and reasonable steps were taken in light of the facts, and consultation provides evidence of professional consensus about the action taken. Liability is usually imposed for failing to follow appropriate procedures, especially in gathering or communicating information, not for errors in judgment in light of the known facts. The degree to which relevant information can be obtained will depend upon the circumstances

of the case. If a client presents with problems related to angry or violent behaviour, a thorough assessment of violence-related factors should be undertaken at intake. If concerns arise unexpectedly in the course of providing services, every reasonable effort should be made to obtain the information needed.

If a psychologist is concerned about whether or not a client may act upon a threat to a third party, efforts should be made to obtain and take into account the following information: (a) the client's history of violence (especially noting any similarities to the current situation), (b) the client's relationship to the threatened person (less than a quarter of homicides in Canada involve strangers), (c) the client's opportunity to act on the threat (especially the availability of weapons and accessibility to the intended victim as most homicides involve weapons and most occur in the home or other private place), (d) the factors that provoked the threat and whether they are likely to continue (especially alcohol abuse and relationship difficulties) and (e) the client's response to any treatment already provided.

If a consideration of these factors convinces the psychologist that the threat is genuine and that violence is imminent, the next step to take is to attempt to dissuade the client from the threatened violence by treating the violent behaviour as one would any therapeutic issue (Truscott & Evans, 2001). This step is very important. Once third parties become involved, particularly the police, further therapy is unlikely to be desired by the client. The best legal advice in these matters is to remember to think like a practitioner. If one is inexperienced or unskilled in such cases, consultation with a skilled colleague would be prudent.

Involving the client in as much of the process as possible is not only good psychological practice, but may also decrease the imminence of

Psychologists Duty to Protect - Cont'd

violence (Truscott, Evans & Mansell, 1995). The client may be enlisted, for example, to reduce the imminence of violence by removing weapons or alcohol from their home, and/or to warn the victim by phone or in writing, not in person.

If attempts to forestall the violent act are unsuccessful, the client should be informed of the limits of confidentiality and the steps which will be taken. Civil commitment proceedings should then be initiated – even if there is some doubt as to whether or not the client meets the appropriate criteria. Under this circumstance the psychologist would be responsible for following up to ensure that the client had indeed been committed (Truscott & Goodkey, 2003).

If the client is not committed, or commitment procedures cannot be initiated quickly enough (e.g., the client leaves the office stating that they are about to carry out their threat), the psychologist should then not hesitate to warn the victim(s) or family and the police, even if there is fear of legal reprisal by the client. Ideally, permission will be obtained from the client to warn the intended victim(s), thereby circumventing any violation of confidentiality. When contact is made with others, only that information that is necessary to prevent the foreseen violent act should be divulged.

References

Chambers, R.S., & Heuston, R.F.V. (1981). *Sweet and Heuston on the law of torts* (4th Ed.). London: Sweet & Maxwell.

Crits v. Sylvester, (1956), 1 D.L.R. (2d) 502.

R. v. R. (K.A.), (1993), 121 N.S.R. (2d) 242.

Smith v. Jones, (1999), 1 S.C.R. 455.

Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, (1974), 118 Cal. Rptr. 129, 529 P.2d 533.

Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, (1976), 17 Cal.3d 425, 551 P.2d 334.

Truscott, D. (1993). The psychotherapist's duty to protect: An annotated bibliography. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 21, 221-244.

Truscott, D., & Crook, K. H. (in press). *Ethics for the practice of psychology in Canada*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta Press.

Truscott, D., & Crook, K. H. (1993). *Tarasoff in the Canadian context: Wenden and the duty to protect*. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 38, 84-89.

Truscott, D., & Evans, J. (2001). Responding to dangerous clients. In E. R. Welfel & E. Ingersoll (Eds.), *The mental health desk reference: A sourcebook for counselors and therapists* (pp. 271-276). New York: Wiley.

Truscott, D., Evans, J., & Mansell, S. (1995). Outpatient psychotherapy with dangerous clients: A model for clinical decision-making. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26, 484-490.

Truscott, D., & Goodkey, L. (2003). Ethical principles of the psychology profession and involuntary commitment. In W. T. O'Donohue & K. E. Ferguson, (Eds.), *Handbook of professional ethics for psychologists: Issues, questions, and controversies* (pp. 167-180). New York: Sage.

Wenden v. Trikha, (1991), 8 C.C.L.T. (2d) 138 (Alta. Q.B.); aff'd. (1993) 14 C.C.L.T. (2d) 225.

“How to Survive in a Regulated World” Annual Meeting and Information Sessions Edmonton, May 12

Plan now to be at the Coast Terrace Inn in Edmonton on May 12, 2004, for the CAP Annual Meeting and Information Sessions. This year's theme is “How to Survive in a Regulated World.”

Agenda

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Information Sessions

How Do Legislative Changes Affect the individual Practitioner?

Session 1

- “Hot Issues in Discipline”
- Health Professions Act Update
- New Privacy Legislation – What does it mean to us?

Session 2

- Code of Conduct Amendments
- Continuing Competence
- Supervision within the Chartering Process

3:30 – 5:30 p.m.
CAP Council Meeting

5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Wine and Cheese Reception
“Thank you, Volunteers”

6:30 – 8:00 p.m.
CAP Annual Meeting

News

News and Announcements

Welcome to New Complaints Director

The College and staff extend a warm welcome to Ms. Eileen Baril, the newly appointed Complaints Director under the *Health Professions Act*. Since there is a delay in proclaiming the *Health Professions Act* for psychology (see below), Ms. Baril will perform the duties of the Complaints Director under the *Psychology Profession Act* through a delegation of power from the Registrar.

Ms. Baril comes to the College from private practice. She has an extensive background in forensic assessment; with a particular focus on custody and conflict resolution. Ms. Baril is expected to assume her new duties March 1st.

Update on the Health Professions Act

Alberta Health and Wellness has recently advised that Schedule 22, Profession of Psychologists, will not be proclaimed under the *Health Professions Act* by the Spring of 2004 as originally anticipated. The government has given no indication of a new proclamation date at this time. Watch the website for further updates.

The College's request for an amendment to the Scope of Practice in Schedule 22, Section 3 of the *Health Professions Act* has been passed and has received Royal Assent. The Scope of Practice will now read:

In their practice, psychologists do one or more of the following:

- (a) assess, diagnose, treat, guide and support persons or groups of persons in order to enhance development, effective living and quality of life or to prevent, remedy or ameliorate mental, emotional, cognitive, behavioural and interpersonal difficulties;
- (b) teach, supervise or consult in the practice of psychology;
- (c) provide restricted activities authorized by the regulations.

Private Sector Privacy Legislation Introduced

The *Personal Information Protection Act* passed by the Alberta government on January 1, 2004, affects the College and its members. This legislation, which governs the collection, use and disclosure of personal information by organizations, defines an "organization" as:

- a) a corporation
- b) an unincorporated association
- c) a trade union
- d) a partnership as defined in the *Partnership Act*
- e) **an individual acting in a commercial capacity, or any person acting on behalf of a corporation, unincorporated association, trade union or partnership**

Copies of the *Personal Information Privacy Act* are available on the Queen's Printer website, www.gov.ab.ca/qp. Also, several publications about this legislation are available from the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, www.oipc.ab.ca/publications/pipa.cfm.

The College has appointed the Registrar of the College to act as Privacy Officer until the Complaints Director begins employment. Policies related to this legislation are currently being developed. Please watch the website for further information and updates.

Member Feedback Requested on Proposed Amendment to the Code of Conduct: Standards for Handling Money Held in Trust by a Psychologist

The Practice Review Committee has recommended standards in relation to a psychologist receiving monies in contemplation of professional services yet to be provided. Council agreed at its November 2003 meeting to ask members for their comments and feedback on the follow-

ing proposed amendment to the Code of Conduct. A copy of this proposed amendment is available on the CAP website, www.cap.ab.ca, or by calling the CAP office.

Please provide feedback to Kathy Semchuk, k.semchuk@cap.ab.ca, by March 31, 2004.

Proposed amendment to the Code of Conduct:

Definition:

- (k) "trust money" shall mean money that is requested or received from, or on behalf of a client, to be used in whole or in part for payment for professional services yet to be provided.

- 38(1) A psychologist shall only accept or request from or on behalf of a client trust money or money in payment for professional services already provided.
- (2) A psychologist shall maintain, or cause to be maintained, a record containing, at a minimum, the following information:
 - (a) the date of receipt and source of all trust money received and identifying the client to whom the money belongs or on whose behalf the money is received;
 - (b) all withdrawals of trust money, including the cheque number, date of the withdrawal, the name of the payee and identification of the client with respect to whom the withdrawal is made; and
 - (c) the balance remaining in the account.
- (3) A psychologist shall maintain a trust money account at a chartered bank, treasury branch or credit union, separate from any operating account utilized by the psychologist.
- (4) A psychologist shall not use or withdraw any trust money unless the psychologist has issued a bill or receipt for professional services rendered.

News

News and Announcements

(5) At the termination of the professional relationship between the psychologist and the client, or within twelve (12) months of the last date of the provision of professional services to or on behalf of the client, whichever date occurs first, the psychologist shall return to the client or the person who provided the trust money any unused portion of the trust money.

Be sure to submit your comments on the following important documents on or before March 31:

- Proposed amendment to the Code of Conduct: Standards for handling money held in trust by a psychologist
- Ethical Guidelines for Supervisors and Supervisees

Member Feedback Requested on New Ethical Guidelines for Supervisors and Supervisees

Council has approved the draft guideline entitled "Ethical Guidelines for Supervisors and Supervisees," which is available on the College website, www.cap.ab.ca, or by calling the CAP office. Council asks that members provide their comments and feedback on this important guideline to Kathy Semchuk, k.semchuk@cap.ab.ca, by March 31, 2004.

Bylaw Amendment: Waiver of Part or All of the Requirement for 1600 Hours of Supervised Practice

The Council of the College approved the following amendment to Bylaw 11(13) at its meeting of January 10, 2004.

13) Waiver of Part or All the Requirement for 1600 Hours of Supervised Practice (03/98 amended 11/01 and 03/02 and 06/02 and 01/04)

i) Regulations specify that supervised practice hours must take place subsequent to the approval of a supervision plan by the Registration Committee (6.2). However, **three** special circumstances may occur whereby an applicant has completed acceptable supervised practice prior to becoming a provisional psychologist. **These three circumstances are candidates from other jurisdictions; candidates reapplying and / or candidates who have completed Ph.D. internships.** In such circumstances, an applicant wishing to have previous practice experience considered as part or all of the supervision requirement must make specific application for such consideration to the Registration Committee. To be accepted, such practice experience must:

- a) be over and above the requirements for, and subsequent to granting of, the Master's degree or be part of a pre-doctoral internship; and
- b) be obtained within the last five (5) years prior to the date the waiver request was received by the Registration Committee.

Waiver of supervision requirements will not be granted for supervised practice hours completed while an applicant was making up course work subsequent to receiving a deferral decision by the Credentials Evaluation Committee. (amended 06/02 and 09/03)

ii) The applicant must provide a detailed description of the previous supervised practice experience, including:

- a) type of practice; description of supervised activity;

- b) amount of practice (including description of institution where practice occurred);
- c) amount of supervision time received from a registered psychologist;
- d) name of supervising psychologist and his/her area of specialty;
- e) length of time the supervising psychologist has been registered with a licensing authority for psychology;
- f) any further information relevant to the practice which could assist the Registration Committee in assessing the equivalency; and
- g) a letter of confirmation with relevant details from the supervising registered psychologist.

iii) Applicants currently registered and in good standing in another jurisdiction who can provide evidence that they have practiced independently for a minimum of two (2) years during the previous five (5) years may apply to have the supervision requirements for chartering waived. (amended 05/02)

Payment of Annual Registration Fees: Rules and Procedures

Under current legislation, regulations and bylaws, psychologists and registrants must pay an annual registration fee by **March 31** in order to practice under the title of psychologist. Those who fail to submit their fees on time must be charged a late fee and informed of the possibility of de-listing on a certain date. College staff who administer fee payment policies and practices do not have the option of making exceptions to this rule.

News and Announcements

You can avoid the inconvenience caused by late payment of fees by noting carefully the following standard procedures:

1. The College mails out a fee notice near the beginning of February. The College is not responsible for ensuring that the fee notices are actually delivered by Canada Post and received by the intended recipient.
2. If fees are not received by March 31, the College is obligated to send a notice to the psychologist or registrant by registered mail. This notice states that the fees are overdue, along with a late fee of \$100, and that de-listing will occur by a certain date.
3. If the fees and late fees are not received on or before the date set for de-listing, Council is obligated to de-list the psychologist or registrant.

Annual Meeting

May 12, 2004
6:30–8:00 pm
Coast Terrace Inn,
Edmonton

Committee News

Chartering Committee

New appointment

Walter Goos, committee member

Thanks to Eileen Baril, who is stepping down as a member after serving in this capacity since April 2001.

Discipline Committee

New appointments

Michael Enman and Irene Estay, panel chairs; John Roshak, committee member

Reappointments

Ted Cadman, panel chair; Kerry Bernes, Howard Saslove and Ali Al-Asadi, committee members

Oral Examinations Committee

New appointments

Lee Handy, chair of the committee; Ted Cadman, panel chair, Rosemary Moulden, Sophia Lang, Tanya Beran, Mary Lee and Tanja Haley, committee members

Reappointments

Simon Sheh and Marilyn Samuels, panel chairs

Thanks to Terry Pezzot-Pearce, who is stepping down as committee chair after serving in this capacity since September 1998. Ms. Pezzot-Pearce will continue serving on the committee as a panel chair.

Practice Review Committee

New appointment

Paul Jerry, chair of the committee

Thanks to Derek Truscott, who is stepping down as committee chair after serving on this committee since December 1997.

Registration Committee

New appointments

Roy Frenzel, chair of the committee
Anne-Marie Dewhurst, panel chair

Thanks to Eileen Baril, who is stepping down as chair after serving on this committee since May 1996.

Examination Results

Summary of EPPP Results

A total of 31 candidates wrote the EPPP examinations between September 1, 2003, and November 30, 2003.

Pass 20 (65%)

Fail 11 (35%)

Summary of Oral Examinations

A total of 53 candidates undertook the oral examination between September 1, 2003, and December 31, 2003.

Pass 52 (99%)

Fail 1 (1%)

Sincere thanks to all who volunteer to serve on the College's committees. Without your active participation, the work of the College could not continue. Your support is very much appreciated!

Resources

Resources

Pay Your Fees Online!

You can now pay your membership fees online. For details visit the College website at www.cap.ab.ca

CAP Publications

Available on a cost-recovery basis from the College office:

- a) copies of CAP practice guidelines (individually or as a package)
 - Addressing Recovered Memories
 - Advertising and Other Public Communication
 - The Use of Aversive Techniques in Behaviour Management
 - Child Custody Assessment
 - Control of Psychological Tests by Psychologists
 - Non-Discriminatory Practice
 - Release of Confidential Information
 - Service Fees for the Provision of Copies of Client Files
 - Psychological Evaluations for Child Protection Decisions
 - Limits to Confidentiality and Consent for Services: Special Issues in Working with Minors and Dependent Adults
- b) "Status of Codes of Ethics, Codes of Conduct & Guidelines in the Regulation of the Psychology Profession in Alberta"
- c) "Receiving Services from a Chartered Psychologist..." (brochure)

Websites

CAP's website at www.cap.ab.ca serves two purposes: communication with the public and communication with College members. The website is updated regularly and is a good source of information for everyone.

Other useful websites for CAP members:

- Psychology Profession Act and Regulations, www.gov.ab.ca/qp
- Health Professions Act, www.gov.ab.ca/qp
- Psychologists' Association of Alberta, www.psychologistsassociation.ab.ca
- Canadian Psychological Association, www.cpa.ca
- Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, www.asppb.org

Supervision Consultants

Jon Amundson and Walter Goos, Supervision Consultants for the College, provide consultation to provisional psychologists and supervisors and assist in the resolution of conflicts between provisional psychologists and supervisors.

Contact information:

Jon Amundson
1614 – 8th Avenue NW
Calgary, AB T2N 1C2
Phone: (403) 289-2511
E-mail: amundsoj@shaw.ca

Walter Goos
13 Allen Place
Leduc, AB T9E 5J7
Phone: (780) 986-7592
E-mail: waltergoos@shaw.ca

Update

Calendar

Council Meetings

March 13, 2004
May 12, 2004
June 19, 2004

Anyone planning to attend should notify the CAP office to confirm the time and location. The most recently approved minutes can be found on the CAP website.

Credentials Evaluation Committee Meetings

Meeting Date	Deadline for Application
May 7, 2004	April 8, 2004
June 11, 2004	May 14, 2004
August 13, 2004	July 16, 2004
September 17, 2004	August 27, 2004
November 5, 2004	October 8, 2004
December 10, 2004	November 12, 2004

Oral Examinations

Date	Deadline for Application
June 21-25, 2004	May 21, 2004
October 4-8, 2004	August 20, 2004
Dec. 6-10, 2004	October 22, 2004

Registration Committee Meetings

Meeting Date	Deadline for Submission of Materials
March 26, 2004	March 12, 2004
April 26, 2004	April 13, 2004
May 26, 2004	May 12, 2004
June 25, 2004	June 11, 2004
August 16, 2004	August 3, 2004
September 22, 2004	September 8, 2004
October 29, 2004	October 15, 2004
November 22, 2004	November 8, 2004
December 13, 2004	December 1, 2004

Opportunities to Get Involved

Note: If you wish to be considered by Council for service on a College committee, please complete and submit the Application for Committee Service form provided on the website (under "Registrants").

Discipline Committee

The Discipline Committee is seeking several additional members. Training will be provided.

Under the *Psychology Profession Act*, the purpose of the Discipline Committee is:

- 1) To hear complaints into the conduct or skill in practice of chartered psychologists and registrants referred to the Committee by the Registrar or by a member of the Discipline Committee, and to make findings and orders upon the injunction of the Committee, and to make findings and orders upon the adjudication of the complaints.
- 2) To hear an appeal by a complainant pursuant to Section 36 of the *Psychology Profession Act*.

Oral Examinations Committee

The Committee requires additional members. Examiners receive an honorarium of \$50 per examination.

Registration Committee

The Registration Committee is seeking additional members. Under the *Psychology Profession Act*, the Registration Committee is responsible for:

- Approving registrations.
- Refusing to approve registrations.
- Deferring the approval of registrations until applicants have obtained further experience of a kind and for a period set by the Registration Committee.

The Registration Committee is also responsible (under the *Psychology Profession Regulation*) for approving applications for registration as a courtesy registrant and psychological assistant.

Annual Meeting

May 12, 2004, 6:30–8:00 pm
Coast Terrace Inn, Edmonton

Update to the Register

New Members

Congratulations and welcome to the 56 new Chartered Psychologists and 3 new Psychological Assistants who have been added to the Register.

Chartered Psychologists (Practicing)

Ms. Stacey A. Bablitz
Ms. Bernadette Benson
Mr. Anthony L. Bjorge
Mr. John Bossio
Ms. Allison Boudreau
Ms. Jennifer Chambers
Ms. Anna-Lisa Ciccocioppo
Dr. John B. Connors
Ms. Tammy Dalrymple-White
Ms. Kyla Eaton
Dr. Tansel Erdem
Ms. Constance Finlay-Joy
Ms. Trudy Finnson
Ms. Jaswinder Forth
Ms. Linda Foti-Gervais
Mr. Robert Frerichs
Ms. Tanya Fudyk
Ms. Lori Goodkey
Ms. Petrina Hough
Ms. Tania Januszkowski
Ms. Naheed Jawed
Dr. Sherryl Jeffries
Dr. Eunice E. Johannson
Ms. Patricia A. Kostouros
Dr. C.I. Gayle Kumchy
Mr. Nhan Lau
Ms. Christa Leibel
Ms. Yvette Macarthur
Mr. Lyle MacDonald
Ms. Tania Makarenko
Dr. Daniel McIvor
Dr. Lindsay McLeod
Dr. Maureen Milligan
Ms. Andrea L. Mott
Dr. Michele Nanchoff-Glatt
Ms. Virginia Nemetz
Ms. Elizabeth R. Pace
Ms. Michele Pentyluk
Ms. Shauna Ruygrok
Ms. Jody Sark
Ms. Cheryl Seaman
Ms. Amy Shaw
Ms. Celeste Sinclair
Ms. Monica A. Sliwa
Ms. Lori Stevens

Ms. Lesley Sugden
Dr. Kristina Towill
Ms. Valerie Umscheid
Mr. Jeffrey VanderWerf
Dr. Caroline Westwood

Chartered Psychologists (Non-Practicing)

Dr. Dawn L. McBride
Dr. Lesley J. Deprey
Mr. Trevor Olson
Dr. Clare M. Russell
Dr. Michelle (Shelly) Russell
Ms. Catherine Victoria Sannuto

Psychological Assistants

Ms. Joyce J. J. Dias
Ms. Charlotte Ferguson
Ms. Suzanne LaMarre

Death

The College has learned, with regret, of the death of Ms. Valerie White and sends sincere condolences to her family, friends and professional colleagues.

Reinstatement

Ms. Megan McElheran, Psychological Assistant (Practicing)

Delisting for Non-Payment of Fees

Dr. Janie Powell, Provisional Chartered Psychologist

Changing Your Address?

Please notify the College promptly in writing of changes in your address, phone/fax or e-mail address. A change of address form is enclosed or visit our website at www.cap.ab.ca

The **CAP Monitor** is a regular publication of the College of Alberta Psychologists. Contact us at:

2100 Sun Life Place
10123-99 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3H1
Phone: (780) 424-5070
1-800-659-0857 (in Alberta)
Fax: (780) 420-1241
E-mail: psych@cap.ab.ca
Website: www.cap.ab.ca



To serve the interests of the public and guide the profession of psychology.

Canadian Publication Mail Sales Agreement 40050155

Current Membership

Membership Category	Number of Members
Chartered Practicing Psychologist	1674
Chartered Non-Practicing Psychologist	389
Provisional Chartered Psychologist	330
Psychological Assistants Practicing	69
Psychological Assistants Non-Practicing	41
Courtesy Registrants	4