



The

BULLETIN

THE • COLLEGE • OF • PSYCHOLOGISTS • OF • ONTARIO

COUNCIL CONSIDERS MANDATORY INSURANCE

Members will recall in the last issue of the Bulletin (Volume 21 No 1 August, 1994), the inclusion of a draft regulation on insurance. A number of registrants responded by writing to the College with their thoughts and concerns respecting the proposed regulation.

At its meeting in mid-September, Council deferred making a final decision about the regulation pending the receipt of further information from the Client Relations Committee, respecting insurance for the program for funding therapy and counselling for individuals found to have been sexually abused by a member.

Some of the comments and questions from registrants suggested that further information might be needed to clarify the types of insurance coverage which Council is considering in the proposed regulation:

1) Professional liability: The Regulated Health Professions Act, Procedural Code gives the Colleges the authority to write regulations requiring that members buy professional liability insurance. The Council considers it to be consistent with the College's mandate, of protecting the public in professional relationships with members of the College, to require that members carry such insurance to redress any harm which might be caused through negligence or malpractice.

Specifically, professional liability insurance covers the member for civil suits launched by a client against the member. In such a suit, the client will seek to demonstrate in court that the practitioner is guilty of negligence or malpractice and to establish that harm has occurred as a result. The insurance covers the legal costs incurred by the member during the legal proceedings and damages assessed up the policy limit.

The member may wish to determine whether or not supervised services provided by students or by unregulated providers are covered or if those individuals should purchase independent coverage.

Some registrants have insurance coverage through their employers. It is important to confirm the exact nature of coverage. Some plans will cover the legal costs of defending the employee, but only if the employee is exonerated. If the employee is found to have been at fault, or not to have acted in good faith, he or she may be disqualified from coverage by the plan and have to pay his or her own legal costs and any damages awarded to the person who launched the suit.

Some plans offer protection to the employee provided that the employer is joined in the lawsuit. Should the employee be sued individually, it is possible that the employer plan would not respond to protect the individual.

2) Funding for therapy or counselling: The requirement for the College to provide funding for up to 100 hours of therapy, for a complainant found to have been sexually abused by a member, is enshrined in the RHPA. Currently funding is set at a maximum of approximately \$ 10,000.

The Council was of the view that funding the program directly out of the College's operating budget presented a potential conflict of interest; any Discipline decision finding a member not guilty of sexual abuse might be interpreted as bias due to the College's avoiding having to pay for therapy.

Therefore, the Council determined that the fund would be best kept at arm's length from the College through some type of

insurance scheme administered by a third party. The provisions of the RHPA permit the Colleges to establish the required fund through such a means.

3) Matters which arise after the member ceases to be registered but which relate to conduct which occurred while the member was registered: A civil proceeding (lawsuit) may be launched by a former client after a member of the College has resigned, retired or had his or her certificate revoked. The Limitations Act determines the time period during which such an action may be initiated after the occurrence of the alleged negligence or malpractice. Therefore it is conceivable that a former registrant may be subject to a lawsuit and a possible court order to pay damages at a time after the individual ceased to practise.

Under the Regulated Health Professions Act, after a person's certificate is revoked or the person resigns as a member, the person continues to be subject to the College for professional misconduct referable to the time when the person was a member.

continued on page 3

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Insurance	1
Temporary Registrants:	
Payment and supervision	2
College Notices	
Discipline	3
Obituary	13
New Public Member	13
Election Notice	13
EPPP	13
Delegation	14
New Temporary Registrants	15
Fees Notice	15
The Barbara Wand Symposium	16

TEMPORARY REGISTRANTS IN PRIVATE PRACTICE SETTINGS

Under certain conditions, some individuals on the Temporary Register may be permitted to be employed by a registered psychologist in a private practice. The College publishes guidelines, "Private Practice and the Temporary Registrant", which are provided to all Temporary Registrants seeking approval for work in private practice settings. These guidelines may be obtained from the College upon request.

The College had received a number of requests for guidance respecting arrangements for payment of Temporary Registrants employed in private practices. Additionally, the College became aware of confusion over the appropriateness of Temporary Registrants paying for supervision for the purpose of registration. Consequently, Council approved the following Guidelines in January, 1994. These Guidelines are provided to Temporary Registrants and are reproduced for the information of all registrants interested in providing supervision to Temporary Registrants. ■

Guidelines Respecting Payment of Temporary Registrants in Private Practice Settings

In compensating a candidate on the temporary register for services provided in a private practice, it is recognized that the supervisor bears the burden of professional responsibility and that the candidate is not yet certified to practise as an autonomous professional. It is recognized that, in view of these differences, a temporary registrant could be paid at a rate lower than that paid to a registrant.

Registrants are encouraged to seek an arrangement that is fair in recognizing the circumstances of both parties to the supervisory relationship.

Registrants are encouraged to consider the range of fees recommended by the professional association for various services and to provide payment which reflects the training and experience of the candidate, and level of service provided by the candidate.

If a candidate is to be compensated on a salaried basis, then a similar consideration of salaries offered to new registrants and the relative experience of the temporary registrant is encouraged.

Approved by Council January 14 and 15, 1994 ■

Guidelines Respecting Payment for Supervision on the Temporary Register

It is anticipated that members of the College will assist in the training of future members and, if feasible, will donate some of their professional time to this activity. In institutional settings, members frequently participate in the supervision and training of temporary registrants employed in the same setting.

Private practitioners may also supervise temporary registrants, either in the member's own practice or in another setting where there is no registrant available to provide professional supervision of psychological services.

When a member of the College supervises a temporary registrant in the provision of services to the member's client, it would not be appropriate for the member to seek payment from the temporary registrant for the supervision. The supervision occurs in the normal course of providing services to the client and is part of the member's professional responsibility to the client.

At times a member may provide professional supervision to a

temporary registrant who sees clients in another setting independent of the member's professional practice. If the member intends to charge for the time spent in supervision, it is important to discuss the matter with the candidate and to take into consideration the candidate's ability to pay.

When a private practitioner provides training to a temporary registrant beyond that which occurs in the normal course of supervising the provision of services to the member's clients, the member may consider charging a nominal amount for this supervision, if such supervision would otherwise affect the earnings of the member. Again, discussion with the candidate in setting a reasonable fee is encouraged.

Just as in billing clients, members are expected to exercise discretion in the fees charged for supervision to avoid hardship for the temporary registrant.

Approved by Council January 14 and 15, 1994 ■



COLLEGE NOTICES

THE • COLLEGE • OF • PSYCHOLOGISTS • OF • ONTARIO

DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A hearing of a quorum of a Discipline Committee panel of the College of Psychologists of Ontario convened to hear allegations against a psychologist, Dr. John Machry, on September 8, 1994.

THE ALLEGATIONS

The Notice of Hearing alleged that Dr. Machry was guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a psychologist, in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession with respect to his assessment of and reports related to the X family and with respect to information provided to the Complaints Committee of the College.

THE DECISION

The Panel found Dr. Machry guilty of having conducted himself in a manner that, having regard to all the circumstances, would be reasonably regarded by psychologists as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional, contrary to subsection 1(za) of Regulation 995 of the Psychologists Registration Act. In particular, it was alleged that Dr. Machry provided information to the Complaints Committee of the College, with respect to his description of the procedures which he followed in conducting a custody/access assessment and writing a custody/access assessment report with respect to the X family, which he knew or ought to have known was inaccurate.

THE PENALTY

The Panel ordered that Dr. Machry's certificate of registration be suspended for a period of three months, commencing on September 16, 1994, the date on which the decision was issued. Furthermore, the Panel ordered that, immediately following completion of the period of suspension, Dr. Machry be required to conduct all custody and access assessments under the supervision of an expert, selected by the College, for a period of six months or six custody and access assessments, whichever is longer.

The supervision is to include review by the expert of every custody/access report prepared by Dr. Machry during the period of supervision, prior to providing the report to the client. The

expert shall have access to all custody and access files maintained by Dr. Machry, both past and current, for the purpose of supervision. Dr. Machry is responsible for all expenses associated with the supervision, including the preparation of quarterly reports by the expert which are to be provided to the Registrar.

At the completion of the initial period of supervision, the terms of supervision shall continue for a further six months or six custody/access assessments, whichever is longer, should the quarterly reports submitted by the expert indicate that Dr. Machry's performance of custody/access assessments remains unsatisfactory in the determination of the Registrar.

The panel ordered that the College publish forthwith information concerning Dr. Machry's name, the finding of guilt with respect to the charges, the immediate suspension of his certificate of registration and the supervisory arrangement. ■

Insurance – *cont'd from page 1*

Anyone who resigns or has had his or her certificate revoked since December 31, 1993 is still subject to discipline by the College for any misconduct which occurred while the person was still registered. Therefore, if a former member of the College is found to have sexually abused a client, while the person was still registered, and if the abuse occurred following proclamation of the RHPA (December 31, 1993) the complainant would be eligible to receive funding for counselling or therapy.

Some members carry insurance coverage for legal expenses incurred by the member during a complaint investigation or discipline proceeding. Such coverage is usually purchased as a separate rider on the professional liability insurance policy. The nature and extent of coverage is a matter between the member and the insurance carrier as the College does not mandate such coverage. As members may be subject to discipline proceedings after revocation, retirement, or resignation, some may consider extending such coverage; however, that is an individual decision.

Council will be reconsidering the proposed regulation on insurance at its meeting of December 9 and 10, 1994. Registrants are encouraged to submit any further comments or to seek any further clarifications on the proposed regulation by December 1, 1994. ■



DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A hearing of a quorum of a Discipline Panel of the College of Psychologists of Ontario took place at Toronto on February 15, April 18, April 19 and April 23, 1994 to consider allegations against Dr. Daniel Bird, a registered psychologist.

THE ALLEGATIONS

It was alleged that Dr. Bird was guilty of professional misconduct, malpractice and conduct unbecoming a psychologist under the Psychologists Registration Act, ("the Act") in his treatment of and relationship with his client, Ms. X.

Dr. Bird began providing services to Ms. X in or about November of 1992 when she was a hospital in-patient and he continued to see her as an out-patient after she was released from the hospital in or about January of 1993.

THE DECISION

After hearing evidence, the Panel found that Dr. Bird was guilty of professional misconduct in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in his treatment of and relationship with his client, Ms. X. Specifically, the Panel found that Dr. Bird failed to provide Ms. X with the treatment that she required while she was his client, that he shared with Ms. X a great deal of information about his personal life and his personal problems while she was his client and while she was attending at his office for psychological services and that he terminated his professional relationship with Ms. X on or about January 19, 1993, in order to begin a sexual relationship with her.

Dr. Bird admitted to having engaged in sexual relations with Ms. X on or about January 25, 1993, at a time when she continued to be under his professional influence.

The Panel also found that Dr. Bird used confidential information obtained in the course of his professional relationship with Ms. X in an abusive manner and that he visited Ms. X for the purpose of having sexual relations with her on or about February 1, 1993.

THE PENALTY

The Panel reconvened on June 27, 1994 at Toronto, in order to hear submissions as to penalty.

In a written decision dated July 28, 1994, the Panel imposed the following penalty under the provisions of the Psychologists Registration Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.36.

1. The revocation of Dr. Bird's certificate as a registered Psychologist in the Province of Ontario.

2. The cancellation of his registration, to commence one month following the date of the decision.

REASONS FOR PENALTY

The Panel affirmed that any single act of sexual intercourse with a client always constitutes serious professional misconduct, regardless of the circumstances. The circumstances of Dr. Bird's act of sexual intercourse were also serious.

It was evident to the Panel from Ms. X's testimony, and recorded in the report of the expert who had assessed her that Ms. X had experienced significant harm subsequent to her sexual relationship with Dr. Bird. Dr. Bird failed to recognize transference and countertransference issues during his professional conduct with her. He ought to have been aware of the serious effects a personal and/or sexual relationship would inevitably have had on Ms. X's mental health.

Dr. Bird terminated his professional relationship with Ms. X for the purpose of establishing a sexual relationship with her at a time when she required continuing treatment for a number of co-existing emotional disorders. Dr. Bird should have assumed professional responsibility for Ms. X's disturbance, as a result of his relationship with her, subsequent to January 19, 1993. He should have provided for appropriate health care for her continuing distress and related problems. His failure in this respect is also seen by the Panel as serious professional misconduct.

Dr. Bird demonstrated repeatedly an insensitivity to Ms. X's distress and emotional needs.

As for the protection of the public, the Panel found that there was no evidence before it indicating that Dr. Bird's prognosis for rehabilitation was favourable.

It was the Panel's decision, in light of the seriousness of its findings of professional misconduct, and in light of its observations of Dr. Bird and the conclusions arrived at from the evidence, that the public would best be served by revoking, rather than suspending, Dr. Bird's certificate.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

On August 25, 1994, the College of Psychologists received notice that Dr. Bird intends to appeal the Decision of the Discipline Panel. ■

DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A Hearing of a Panel of the Discipline Committee of the College of Psychologists of Ontario (the "Panel") convened at Toronto on May 10, 1994 to hear allegations against Dr. X, a registered psychologist.

BACKGROUND

Dr. X supervised his wife, Dr. Y, in the provision of services to the A family. Mr. CA had been convicted of sexually abusing his daughter, BA, and the Children's Aid Society had placed her in a foster home.

THE PLEA

Dr. X pleaded guilty to the charge of professional misconduct in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in connection with his supervision of Dr. Y with respect to the services that she provided to the A family and with respect to the services that she provided to the Children's Aid Society concerning the A family contrary to Sections 1(o) and 1(q) of Regulation 955 under the Psychologists Registration Act.

Dr. X admitted to the following particulars of the allegations in the Notice of Hearing:

1. He became involved in a dual relationship which in this set of circumstances resulted in a conflict of interest when he agreed to be the supervisor of his wife, Dr. Y.
2. He permitted Dr. Y to become involved in a dual relationship leading to conflicts of interest by permitting her to agree to various requests for services made of her by the Children's Aid Society as follows:
 - a) to provide individual therapy to BA to assist BA in dealing with abuse by her father, CA, and to assist her in dealing with other family problems;
 - b) to provide recommendations to the Children's Aid Society with respect to CA's visitation with his daughter, BA;
 - c) to provide opinions and to make recommendations with respect to the treatment and sentencing of CA
 - d) to provide family therapy to the A family;
 - e) to provide recommendations to BA's school with respect to her academic difficulties;
 - f) to provide therapy to BA's foster family;

7. He co-signed a report entitled "psychoeducational assessment" which Dr. Y prepared to address BA's emotional and cognitive functioning and to provide recommendations with respect to BA's academic difficulties, although he knew or should have known that this report was inadequate for both purposes, for reasons including, but not limited to the following:

- a) the tests used by Dr. Y were not adequate for a psychoeducational assessment;
- c) it was not appropriate to prepare one report to attempt to satisfy the objectives of the Children's Aid Society and to attempt to satisfy the objectives of the school.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Panel was presented with an Agreed Statement of Facts.

THE DECISION

The Panel accepted the Guilty Plea of Dr. X based upon the facts set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts.

THE PENALTY

1. Dr. X was reprimanded.
2. The Panel accepted Dr. X's executed undertaking and Agreement.

Dr. X undertook and agreed to the following:

1. That he had received and reviewed with his legal counsel the Notice of Hearing in the matter.
2. That he would make immediate alternate arrangements for the continued supervision of his wife, Dr. Y, by a psychologist registered in Ontario who will supervise any psychological services provided by her so long as she is not registered with the College of Psychologists of Ontario
3. That he would register for and perform all course requirements for the scheduled session of the course in Ethics in Psychology at Z University and that all costs associated with this course of study would be borne by him and that it would be completed by him within one year.
4. That he would advise the Registrar of the College of the grade in that course, when completed, and if necessary to repeat the course until he achieves a passing grade.

continued on page 13



DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A hearing before a Discipline Tribunal of the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology took place at Toronto on May 28, 1993.

THE ALLEGATIONS

It was alleged that Dr. Z was guilty of professional misconduct in that she failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in connection with reports that she prepared December, 1991 and February, 1992 regarding A and B, the children of Ms. C and Mr. C.

THE PLEA

Dr. Z pleaded guilty to the charge of professional misconduct.

THE DECISION

The Tribunal found that Dr. Z was guilty of professional misconduct under the Psychologists Registration Act and under Regulation 825 in that she failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession as alleged in the Notice of Hearing.

The Tribunal noted that Dr. Y, an expert in the area of custody and access, had been retained by the Board to provide an assessment and opinion with respect to Dr. Z's reports of December, 1991 and February, 1992. Dr. Y's opinion was that Dr. Z had contravened acceptable professional standards in two major areas which were detailed in the particulars of the Notice of Hearing.

In summary, first Dr. Z failed, with a legal joint custodial agreement in place, to secure permission from both parents to assess and treat the children, and second, in an otherwise legitimate attempt to advocate for a client, Dr. Z drew conclusions and made recommendations concerning the children's father without ever meeting him, let alone interviewing him and observing him with the children.

THE PENALTY

The Tribunal accepted the Joint Submission As to Penalty made by counsel for the Board and counsel for Dr. Z and made the following penalty determination:

1. The Discipline Committee will administer a reprimand to Dr. Z.

2. The facts and decision of the Discipline Committee are to be published in the Bulletin of the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology together with Dr. Z's name.

3. Dr. Z's Certificate of Registration will be suspended for a period of six months.

4. The penalties described in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 above will be suspended conditional upon the agreement by Dr. Z to undergo an assessment of her general assessment and report writing skills by an appropriate individual to be selected by the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology and to carry out any refresher training recommended by the assessor. The services of the assessor and any refresher training directed by the assessor to be carried out by Dr. Z will be paid for by her.

Following the assessment and the completion of refresher training, if any, a report will be prepared by the assessor and the within hearing will be reconvened before a panel of the Discipline Committee. If the report provided by the assessor is favourable and acceptable to the Discipline Committee, the penalties referred to in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 herein will not be entered or made effective. However, in that eventuality a summary of the facts of this case without Dr. Z's name or the name of others involved will be included in the Bulletin for educational and informational purposes of the profession.

5. The assessor will be chosen and instructed by the Board who may delegate those functions to the Registrar.

6. Dr. Z will undertake not to carry out any assessments or provide any services in the area of custody and access until and unless she can furnish proof satisfactory to the Board that she is competent to do so.

7. Dr. Z recognizes and agrees that any breach of the terms and conditions of this disposition will be grounds for further disciplinary action.

8. Dr. Z and the Board agree that the complainant in this matter may be advised by the Board of the fact and nature of the within disposition.

REVIEW OF PENALTY

The Panel reconvened to consider this matter on July 20, 1994.

continued on page 13

DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A hearing of a quorum of a Discipline Panel of the College of Psychologists of Ontario took place at Toronto on March 28 and 29, 1994, to consider allegations against Dr. Henry Tamowski, a registered psychologist.

THE ALLEGATIONS

The Notice of Hearing alleged that Dr. Tamowski was guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a psychologist under the Psychologists Registration Act (the "Act"), in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in connection with the services that he provided to Ms. X and Mr. X.

THE PLEA

Dr. Tamowski entered a plea of not guilty to all the allegations.

THE PROCEEDINGS

During the course of the March 28 and 29 hearing, the Panel heard evidence from Ms. X, Mr. X, an expert witness for the College and Dr. Henry Tamowski. Additional evidence at the hearing included expert testimony for the defence.

THE DECISION

The Panel found Dr. Tamowski guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a psychologist, in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in connection with the services that he provided to Ms. X and Mr. X.

The Panel reached this decision based upon its findings that the particulars in eight of the allegations, set out in the Notice of Hearing, were established on the evidence:

ALLEGATION #1:

Dr. Tamowski made statements to Ms. X that were insensitive and unprofessional including but not limited to the following: (a) "You are using your sex abuse to scam the insurance at work"; (b) "I do not want to pay you to take time off work to be a wife and mother"; (c) "If I were your boss I would fire you the first chance I got"; (d) "My wife took time off work over the years and she did not f.k her father to get the time off with pay"; (e) "Your parents had very little brains, therefore you or your children will not be very smart."

The Panel found Ms. X's testimony to be credible. The Panel found her evidence to be given in a truthful manner concerning the statements made by Dr. Tamowski. Her evidence of Dr. Tamowski's statements was clear and convincing. The Panel agreed with the opinion of the expert witness for the College that statements (b), (d) and (e) would be both unprofessional and harmful in a clinical situation. With respect to statements (a) and (c), while the Panel acknowledged that statements such as these might be made in a legitimate clinical confrontation, it agreed with the expert that they were not made in the context of a carefully planned intervention.

ALLEGATION #2

Dr. Tamowski treated Ms. X in a manner that he knew or should have known would cause her distress.

The Panel based its findings on the behaviour of Dr. Tamowski during the October 7, 1992, session and on some issues raised throughout the hearing. The Panel agreed with the opinion of the expert witness for the College that the behaviour of Dr. Tamowski during the October 7, 1992 session was beyond the norm of psychological practice both in terms of the manner in which he conducted himself and in terms of the length of the session. Much of the evidence disclosed that Dr. Tamowski was not aware of the particular sensitivity of survivors of childhood sexual abuse to any behaviour that might be interpreted as intimidating. Dr. Tamowski seemed unaware of the need to be especially vigilant of his own behaviour when dealing with this client population.

ALLEGATION #9

Dr. Tamowski attempted to thwart Ms. X's efforts to obtain an opinion from another professional to whom she had been referred to as to whether or not she was able to return to work.

The Panel accepted Dr. Tamowski's explanation that he attempted to inform Ms. X that the individual who was to provide a second opinion was not a registered psychologist and agreed that it was appropriate for him to provide her with this information in view of her apparent misunderstanding as to the title and qualifications of the individual concerned. However, the Panel found Ms. X's testimony to be credible and convincing and concluded that the lengths to which Dr. Tamowski went in order to attempt to discourage Ms. X from seeing another professional went beyond what could reasonably be described as providing information. The Panel also agreed with the testimony of the expert for the College that Dr. Tamowski's conduct amounted to

continued on page 8



Dr. Tamowski – *continued from page 7*

active discouragement and as such constitutes unprofessional behaviour and failure to maintain the standards of practice of the profession.

ALLEGATION #10

Dr. Tamowski failed to provide a summary of his contact with Ms. X to another professional although this information was requested in a letter dated October 6, 1992, and a Form 14 signed by Ms. X and dated October 5, 1992, was provided to him.

The Panel concluded that Dr. Tamowski withheld this information in view of his attitude toward the second opinion, and in particular toward the individual who was to render this opinion, and that this behaviour was not in the best interests of his client. When Dr. Tamowski finally did respond following the letter of complaint, the Panel agreed with the expert witness for the College that his response was most inadequate.

ALLEGATION #11

In providing therapy to Ms. X, Dr. Tamowski led her to believe that she had no choice but to follow his directives as he indicated to her that if he ever felt that she was not trying to help herself or to keep her marriage together he would not want to see her any more which he knew or should have known would cause her harm.

The Panel found Ms. X's testimony to be credible on this issue. Given Dr. Tamowski's version of the events, the Panel concluded that "homework" assignments were given to Ms. X that included having sexual relations with her husband. This type of "homework" indicated a lack of awareness of and sensitivity to issues relating to therapy with survivors of childhood sexual abuse, particularly in view of his comments regarding his perception of some aspects of his relationship with Ms. X as "father/daughter". The Panel agreed with the expert witness for the College that homework assignments which are used to test the loyalty of a client, even if logically related to the treatment plan are coercive and potentially harmful. The type of homework suggested by Dr. Tamowski for Ms. X, including having sexual relations with her husband, was seen by the Panel as inappropriate.

ALLEGATION # 12

Dr. Tamowski failed to maintain adequate records of his treatment of Ms. X.

The Panel found Dr. Tamowski's records, in terms of therapy notes, information relating to length of sessions and details of accounting/receipts, were clearly inadequate and certainly failed to meet minimal standards. The Panel affirmed that it is always the duty of the psychologist, never of the client, to keep such information.

ALLEGATION #5

Dr. Tamowski failed to provide receipts for the fees paid to him by Mr. and Ms. X although receipts were requested.

Dr. Tamowski admitted that he did not provide any receipts to Mr. and Ms. X. The expert witness testified that the provision of a receipt when requested is a normal part of any professional relationship. The Panel agreed that receipts are critical when a client pays in cash, since there is no other means by which the transaction may be verified by either party.

ALLEGATION # 16

He entered into a barter arrangement with Ms. X which resulted in a dual relationship between himself and Ms. X.

While the Panel accepted that there may be circumstances under which barter relationships could be construed as falling within the ethical standards of the profession, in the circumstances of the relationship between Dr. Tamowski and Ms. X, there were clinical contraindications to the establishment of such a barter system. In particular, the fact that Ms. X was placed in a "servant" role by cleaning Dr. Tamowski's house was felt to reflect the imbalance already present in the professional relationship. The Panel accepted the evidence of the expert witness for the College that it is never the role of the client to determine whether or not a barter arrangement is in his or her best interests, but rather the psychologist should always err on the side of caution if there is ever any doubt. In particular, the Panel was of the opinion that any barter arrangement with any client who could in any way be perceived as being emotionally vulnerable is clearly contraindicated. There was no doubt that Ms. X should have been seen that way.

The Panel found that Dr. Tamowski failed to understand the nature of his professional relationship with a female client who had suffered sexual abuse. He failed to understand or appreciate the nature of professional boundaries in the relationship. The Panel agreed with the expert witness' testimony that providing such personal services did not help maintain the degree of boundaries needed to help Ms. X, and indeed could have confused her about the nature of the relationship.

continued on page 9

Dr. Tamowski – *continued from page 8*

The Panel determined that the evidence presented at the hearing was not sufficient to find that other allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing had been established against Dr. Tamowski.

PENALTY AND REASONS FOR THE PENALTY

The panel reconvened on Monday, August 15, 1994, in order to review written submissions as to penalty from counsel for the College and for Dr. Tamowski, and to determine penalty.

The Panel affirmed that Dr. Tamowski was guilty of professional misconduct as a result of his failure to maintain the standard of practice of the profession.

THE PENALTY

The Panel imposed the following penalty under the provisions of the Psychologists Registration Act, R.S.O. 1990,c.P.36.

1 Dr. Tamowski is hereby reprimanded and the reprimand will be recorded on the College Register.

2 Dr. Tamowski is suspended from practising as a Registered Psychologist in Ontario commencing October 1, 1994, for a period of 180 days.

3 The latter 90 days of the 180 days of the suspension set out in paragraph (2) is itself suspended upon Dr. Tamowski providing a written undertaking on or before October 1, 1994, that is satisfactory to the Registrar in the following terms:

a. At least 25 hours of continuing education over a period of 18 months, to be specifically directed at gender sensitivity training and general ethics; proof of attendance and successful completion of this continuing education is to be filed with the Registrar by April 30, 1996.

b. Attendance at the Third International Conference on Sexual Exploitation by Health Professionals, Psychotherapists and Clergy, to be held in Toronto on October 13, 14 and 15, 1994, or equivalent as approved by the Registrar; proof of attendance is to be filed with the Registrar within 14 days of the conference;

In the event that a written undertaking is provided, but the requirements of subparagraphs (a) and (b) are not met, the second 90 day suspension shall cease to be suspended and shall take effect commencing May 1, 1996.

4. Costs in the amount of \$5,000.00 are awarded to the College to defray a portion of the expenses of this investigation and hearing.

5 The facts, circumstances, conviction and penalty involved in

this case shall be published in the ordinary course, but the names of the complainants shall not be published.

REASONS FOR PENALTY

In determining the penalty, the Panel gave particular weight to Dr. Tamowski's treatment of Ms. X as a survivor of childhood sexual abuse and in particular his insensitivity to the various issues involved in dealing with such clients. More specifically, the Panel found that much of the evidence disclosed that Dr. Tamowski was not aware of the particular sensitivity of survivors of childhood sexual abuse to any behaviour that might be interpreted as intimidating, including but not limited to verbalizations, expressions of frustration, anger, homework assignments involving sexual activity, and active discouragement of seeking a second opinion. In addition, the placing of Ms. X in a "servant" role through the barter arrangement failed to recognize the specific emotional vulnerability of an incest survivor in a younger female/older male fiduciary relationship.

In addition to general issues regarding the treatment of sexual abuse survivors, Dr. Tamowski, in remarks made during the hearing, minimized or discounted the expert's expressed concerns for the importance of professional boundaries when dealing with such clients. The Panel thus determined that Dr. Tamowski requires exposure to specific issues that evolve for professionals in order to develop an awareness of and sensitivity to the potential for revictimization in the therapeutic setting.

The issue regarding Dr. Tamowski's obvious dearth of record keeping was considered to be symptomatic of a lack of awareness of ethical issues and respect for clients in general and was thus dealt with as part of this broader issue. The Panel noted Dr. Tamowski's attempts to rectify his report-writing difficulties in the past by undergoing a period of supervision. Through continuing education focused on ethics, the Panel anticipated that Dr. Tamowski would be committed to the critical importance of adequate record-keeping in order to protect both the public and the professional from inaccurate memories.

The Panel anticipated also that Dr. Tamowski, through his continuing education, would develop an awareness of and sensitivity to the power imbalances that exist between a therapist and his client and would therefore take steps in the future to avoid intentional or unintentional exploitation of this type of situation.

The Panel believes that the penalty as described above serves to protect that public, acts as a specific and general deterrent to members of the profession, and provides an opportunity for rehabilitation for Dr. Tamowski. ■



DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A Hearing of the Panel of the Discipline Committee of the College of Psychologists of Ontario ("the Panel") took place at Toronto on February 9, 10, 11, and April 20 and 21, 1994 to hear allegations against Dr. Anthony Bellissimo, a registered psychologist.

THE ALLEGATIONS AND PLEA

The Notice of Hearing alleged that Dr. Bellissimo was guilty of professional misconduct, conduct unbecoming a psychologist and malpractice in that he failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in his treatment of Ms. X and in his treatment of Ms. Y. Dr. Bellissimo pleaded not guilty to all of the charges.

THE DECISION Re: Ms. X

It was alleged that Dr. Bellissimo focused a significant portion of his treatment of Ms. X on exploring her sexual experiences although she did not request assistance in that area and she did not indicate that she was having sexual problems, that Dr. Bellissimo used coarse sexual language in therapy sessions with Ms. X although he knew or should have known that this would cause Ms. X to become distressed and that he was insensitive to Ms. X's needs in that he persisted in engaging her in discussions of sexual matters and in using coarse sexual language although she advised him that she was uncomfortable with discussions of that nature.

The Panel found that the particulars set out in these allegations had been established on the evidence, and that the conduct of Dr. Bellissimo constituted professional misconduct for failure to maintain the standards of the profession, and also constituted malpractice. The Panel found that the remaining allegations in the Notice of Hearing had not been established on the evidence presented.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION Re: Ms. X

Ms. X was referred to Dr. Bellissimo through an Employee Assistance Program service. She had been in two closely spaced robbery situations as an employee. In stating the nature of her main problems she wrote "afraid of being robbed again and afraid of going into work".

The Panel agreed that there was nothing in Ms. X's self report of her presenting problem or her therapeutic goals that was related to any sexual content. The Panel found nothing in her assessment

data that suggested any reason to pursue a therapeutic interaction with a sexual content.

The Panel also agreed with the opinion of an expert witness for the College who testified that there was no substantive sexual cause for Ms. X's presenting problems. The expert testified that therapy with her involving sexual content was not appropriate or indicated in her case. Moreover, the Panel felt it was important to reconfirm the importance of the client's view of the presenting problem; Ms. X did not see or report any sexual component to her presenting problem.

Ms. X indicated that, during a particular therapy session, she had been asked by Dr. Bellissimo to relive her first sexual experience while she was in a relaxed state. The Panel accepted Ms. X's testimony as credible. Dr. Bellissimo's clinical record of this session did not detail this occurrence. The Panel found that, although gathering sexual information as part of history taking is a normal therapeutic activity, reliving a sexual experience in a relaxed state goes beyond history taking and was the kind of intervention which was not indicated by Ms. X's presenting problems.

The Panel found that the change in focus and direction of Dr. Bellissimo's provision of services to Ms. X was not indicated, and was pursued in the absence of Ms. X's informed consent.

The Panel also found that in exploring Ms. X's dream, Dr. Bellissimo's prompts led Ms. X to an actively sexual fantasy scene. Again, this line of therapeutic activity was pursued without gaining a renewed informed consent from Ms. X. Dr. Bellissimo had information that such sexually base material was a source of discomfort to Ms. X.

The Panel found Ms. X to be a credible witness to the events occurring during her contact with Dr. Bellissimo. The Panel accepted her evidence that the fantasy descriptions used by Dr. Bellissimo included explicit sexual words and phrases which Dr. Bellissimo should have known would be a source of discomfort to Ms. X. The Panel found this behaviour on the part of Dr. Bellissimo to be abusive to Ms. X as a client.

THE DECISION Re: Ms. Y

It was alleged that Dr. Bellissimo focused a significant portion of his treatment of Ms. Y on attempting to improve her sexual relationship with her husband although she did not request assistance in dealing with sexual problems and she indicated that her sexual relationship with her husband was satisfactory, that he used coarse sexual language in therapy sessions with Ms. Y although he knew or should have known that this would cause

continued on page 11

Dr. Bellissimo – *continued from page 10*

Ms. Y to become distressed and that he was insensitive to Ms. Y's needs in that he persisted in using coarse sexual language in asking her to fantasize about engaging in sexual intimacies with someone other than her husband although she advised him that she was offended by his language and his request.

The Panel found that these allegations against Dr. Bellissimo had been established on the evidence. The panel found that the remaining allegations in the Notice of Hearing had not been established on the evidence.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION Re: Ms. Y

Dr. Bellissimo's clinical notes indicated that Ms. Y's presenting problem was: "she wants to address the problem of stress. She also wants to look at the abuse since she links it with her feelings of low self esteem and unhappiness." In her life history questionnaire Ms. Y stated the nature of her main problems as being "I feel overwhelmed by stress".

By session three, Dr. Bellissimo made a link between Ms. Y's earlier abusive experience and her "current difficulties in responding to her husband (sic) sexual intimacy."

While expert witnesses for both the prosecution and the defence indicated that sexual intimacy problems within a marriage, in which one partner has an earlier history of sexual abuse, would not be surprising, the panel found no data to support that Ms. Y was experiencing a sexual intimacy problem with her husband.

The Panel found that Dr. Bellissimo's pursuit of this direction in therapy was not supported by the presenting problem or by the assessment data. As a result, the Panel found Dr. Bellissimo's suggestion that Ms. Y fantasize about intimacy with other men or her husband was not an indicated activity.

There was no indication that this change in focus of therapy ever gained the informed consent of Ms. Y. Furthermore, the panel accepted the testimony of an expert witness for the College, that any sexually oriented material could only be used with the greatest of care with a history of sexual abuse.

The Panel also accepted Ms. Y's testimony as credible where she testified that Dr. Bellissimo used coarse sexual phrases and words. Given her history of sexual abuse, Dr. Bellissimo knew or should have known that any such reference would not be indicated as part of any sexually oriented fantasy material for Ms. Y.

In conclusion, the Panel found that Dr. Bellissimo was guilty of professional misconduct concerning his treatment of Ms. Y, in that he failed to maintain the standard of practice of the

profession, and that his conduct also constituted malpractice.

THE PENALTY AND REASONS FOR PENALTY

The Panel reconvened at Toronto on August 5, 1994, to hear evidence and submissions concerning penalty.

At the hearing, before the Panel dealing with penalty, the parties appeared to generally agree that the Panel could impose penalties provided in the Regulated Health Professions (Code) rather than being restricted to the penalties of "suspension or cancellation" of a certificate as provided in Section 9 of Regulation 955 under the Psychologists Registration Act. Certainly counsel for the parties agreed that the Panel could require Dr. Bellissimo to reimburse the College the cost of the discipline proceedings. Counsel for Dr. Bellissimo also suggested that the Panel might place certain terms or conditions upon Dr. Bellissimo's Certificate of Registration.

In light of these submissions, the Panel decided to provide a more remedial penalty, and a shorter period of suspension, than it would have otherwise provided if confined to the penalties set out in Section 9 of Regulation 955.

THE PENALTY

1. Dr. Bellissimo is hereby reprimanded and the fact of the reprimand will be recorded on the College register.
2. Dr. Bellissimo is suspended from practice as a registered psychologist in Ontario for 180 days commencing October 1, 1994. This suspension will cover all of Dr. Bellissimo's psychological activities related to his clinical practice with clients.
3. 90 days of the 180 days of suspension set out in paragraph 2 is itself suspended upon Dr. Bellissimo providing a written undertaking that is satisfactory to the Registrar in the following terms:
 - a. Dr. Bellissimo agrees that his individual psycho-therapy practice will be the subject of peer review supervision following the initial suspension of 90 days, for a period of six months by Dr. C and Dr. D. The period of peer review shall be from January 1, 1995 to June 30, 1995. Drs. C and D shall confirm in writing to the Registrar, following the six months of supervision that they have provided the aforementioned peer review supervision.
 - b. Dr. Bellissimo will undertake at least 25 hours of continuing education over a period of 18 months, to be specifically directed at gender sensitivity and ethics, and proof of

continued on page 12



DISCIPLINARY HEARING

On August 29, 1994, a panel of the Discipline Committee of the College of Psychologists of Ontario found Dr. Gordon Hope, a registered psychologist, guilty of professional misconduct with respect to his conduct and provision of services to his client, Ms X.

Specifically, the panel found Dr. Hope guilty of the following allegations:

1. You are guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a psychologist in that you engaged in sexual impropriety with Ms. X in contravention of subsection 1(u) of Regulation 995 of the Psychologists Registration Act, Principle 8.4 of the Standards of Professional Conduct and Principle 6(a) of the Ethical Standards of Psychologists.
2. You are guilty of professional misconduct in that you failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in your treatment of Ms. X, contrary to subsection 1(o) of Regulation

995 of the Psychologists Registration Act in that you failed to maintain an appropriate professional boundary in your relationship with Ms. X.

3. You are guilty of professional misconduct in that, in your treatment of Ms. X, you engaged in conduct relevant to the practice of psychology that, having regard to all the circumstances, would be reasonably regarded by psychologists as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional, contrary to subsection 1(za) of Regulation 955 of the Psychologists Registration Act, by, inter alia,

- a) engaging in sexual impropriety with Ms. X while she was your client;
- b) failing to maintain an appropriate professional boundary in your relationship with Ms. X.

The Discipline Committee suspended Dr. Hope's certificate of registration to practice as a psychologist in Ontario, effective immediately and continuing until the conclusion of the penalty proceeding in this matter, scheduled to commence November 9, 1994. ■

Dr. Bellissimo – continued from page 11

attendance and successful completion of the continuing education will be filed with the Registrar.

c. Dr. Bellissimo will attend the Third International Conference on Sexual Exploitation to be held in October, 1994 and file proof of registration and attendance with the Registrar.

In the event that Dr. Bellissimo fails or refuses to provide written undertaking as specified, or any of the requirements of this paragraph are not met by Dr. Bellissimo, the second 90 day suspension shall cease to be suspended and shall take effect. Once Dr. Bellissimo completes the requirements of this section he shall not thereafter be required to serve the balance of the suspended period of suspension.

4. Dr. Bellissimo shall reimburse the College of Psychologists the sum of \$5,000.00 towards the legal costs and expenses of the discipline hearing. The Panel was informed by counsel that the actual costs far exceeded this amount.

5. The facts, circumstances, conviction and penalty involved in this case shall be published in the ordinary course, but the name of the complainants shall not be published.

REASONS FOR THE PENALTY

The Panel agreed that public protection, deterrence and rehabilitation were the key elements in this decision on penalty.

The Panel concluded that it was necessary to send a significant message to the public and to members of the College of Psychologists on the seriousness of this behaviour by a professional who knew or ought to have known that such behaviour was abusive.

The seriousness of these charges was considered in light of today's social climate. It was the Panel's view that this climate, as it relates to gender sensitivity and appropriate therapeutic behaviour, has significantly evolved so that the conduct of Dr. Bellissimo is now considered a serious departure from what is expected of a registered psychologist. This was the case when Dr. Bellissimo committed the acts of professional misconduct.

The Panel found that the violation of the trust relationship by Dr. Bellissimo has led two clients to experience serious emotional distress, and may cause them to be much less trusting of the profession of psychology. Accordingly, the Panel strongly recommends to Dr. Bellissimo that he send a letter of apology through the Registrar to the two complainants. ■

Dr. X – continued from page 5

5. That he acknowledged and agreed that he had received correspondence from the College dated October 1, 1992, regarding the misrepresentation of his wife, Dr. Y, of herself as a psychologist registered in the Province of Ontario. He further acknowledged that the College considered that complaint to have been dealt with promptly by him and he confirmed on behalf of himself and Dr. Y, their agreement to continue to honour the undertaking given to correct the misrepresentations which occurred and to ensure that such misrepresentations would not be repeated.

6. He recognized and agreed that any breach of the terms and conditions of his undertaking may be grounds for further disciplinary action by the College including, but not limited to, a charge of professional misconduct for failure to comply with an Undertaking given to the College. ■

Dr. Z – continued from page 6

With reference to part #4 of the penalty, the panel accepted the report of the College's assessor who indicated that Dr. Z was ready to resume independent practice with the exception of child custody and access assessment. Dr. Z supplied the Panel with a written undertaking (dated July 5, 1994) that she would not perform or participate in child custody and access assessments without the written permission of the Registrar after completing the required remedial training. This undertaking remains outstanding and effective and, if the undertaking is breached, the breach may result in discipline proceedings against Dr. X.

The Panel then ordered that, based on the accepted fulfillment of part #4 of the penalty, parts 1, 2, and 3 of the penalty would not take effect. ■

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology was administered on October 12, 1994, in London, Ottawa, Thunder Bay and Toronto. The College appreciates the assistance of Dr. David Evans, Ms. Connie Learn, Dr. Jane Ledingham, Dr. William Melnyk, Dr. Roderick Martin, Ms. Dana Wilson, and Dr. Alastair Younger. ■

NOTICE OF COUNCIL MEETING

The Council of the College of Psychologists of Ontario will meet December 9 and 10 and March 3 and 4 at the College office. For further information please contact the College.

New Public Member

The College of Psychologists welcomes Ms. Mary Jane Handy of Mississauga as a public member of the Council appointed by the Ministry of Health. Ms. Handy currently works in the position of Project Manager, Strategy and Analysis (Finance) for Southam Newspaper Group. ■

OBITUARY

DR. MARJORIE WHITNEY

The College regrets to announce that Dr. Marjorie Whitney passed away on October 19, 1994 at North York General Hospital. Dr. Whitney was Senior Psychologist of the Adult Service of the Department of Psychology at the North York General Hospital where she also consulted to the medical and psychiatry units and established the employee assistance program. Dr. Whitney's contributions during her time as a member of the Board of Examiners and Transitional Council from 1991 to 1994 have been greatly valued. Her dedication, warmth and humor will be remembered.

NOTICE OF ELECTIONS - MARCH, 1995

Elections will be held in the following Districts:

1. North; including Kenora, Rainy River, Thunder Bay, Cochrane, Algoma, Manitoulin, Nipissing, Sudbury, Timiskaming and Parry Sound, the District Municipality of Muskoka and the Regional Municipality of Sudbury.
2. Central West; including the counties of Brant and Dufferin and the regional municipalities of Haldimand-Norfolk, Halton, Hamilton-Wentworth, Niagara and Waterloo and Wellington.
3. East; including the counties of Frontenac, Hastings, Lanark, Prince Edward and Renfrew, Leeds and Grenville, Lennox and Addington, Prescott and Russell, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Nomination forms will be distributed in January, 1995.



Delegation of Authority to Perform the Controlled Act

I, (NAME OF PSYCHOLOGIST), Ph.D., C.Psych., delegating psychologist, hereby delegate to NAME OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATE, M.A., C.Psych.Assoc., the authority to perform the Controlled Act of diagnosis defined by the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, Section 27(2)1, and by the Psychology Act, 1991, Section 4, subject to the terms, condition and limitations imposed on the certificate of registration of the above named psychological associate.

The agreement commences (DATE)

The type(s) of clinical diagnosis to be undertaken shall be limited to (LIST)

The client population to be served shall be defined as (LIST)

The setting in which the Controlled Act may be undertaken under this agreement is (SETTING)

A review of the Delegation Agreement and the continued appropriateness of the delegation will be conducted with the above named psychological associate by the delegating psychologist, no later than (ONE YEAR FROM DATE OF COMMENCEMENT OF THE AGREEMENT, ABOVE), with a record of the review appended to the original agreement.

This Delegation Agreement may be terminated in writing at any time by the psychologist or the delegate, and must be terminated by the psychologist in the event the psychologist has reasonable grounds to believe that the delegation is no longer appropriate.

I, (NAME OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATE), M.A., C.Psych.Assoc., accept the delegation by the delegating psychologist, of the authority to undertake the Controlled Act, limited to the above restrictions and any other terms, condition and limitations imposed on my certificate of registration.

Psychologist

Psychological Associate

Dated at _____ this _____ day of _____, 1994.

cc: The College of Psychologists of Ontario
Distribution List (Optional)

Discussion:

The Agreement should name the parties to the agreement and the date of the agreement; most agreements simply incorporate this information in the preamble or in the signature section of the agreement.

The types of diagnoses specified should reflect areas of competency for both parties. Depending on the narrowness or breadth of the diagnostic competency, the description of diagnostic types may be quite specific or more general.

The client population to be served could be described broadly (adults, children, adolescents, families) or more narrowly (adults; injured workers/accident victims; children; developmentally delayed; adolescents; young offenders; families; chronic illness; and so forth), depending upon the mutual competencies of the Psychological Associate and of the Psychologist.

The setting(s) in which the controlled act will be undertaken could specify the type of institution or agency in which the service will be provided (correctional facility; rehabilitation facility; general hospital; community mental health agency; university counselling service; schools) or another type of setting such as private practice. The parties are responsible to determine and specify the nature of a review which they believe will permit an appropriate determination of the competence of the delegate to perform the controlled act as specified in the agreement. The parties may opt for a review of cases, a discussion of current diagnostic issues and trends, a review of the professional development strategy of the delegate for maintaining competence, or any other determination deemed by the parties to provide a reasonable determination of the delegate's competence respecting performance of the controlled act.

The above example is provided for illustrative purposes. So long as the signed Delegation Agreement addresses the requirements set out in the "Additions to Standards: Delegating" Section 4 and both parties have satisfactorily met the other requirements set out in the Standards for Delegating and for Accepting Delegation, a proposed agreement is likely to be satisfactory. ■

Placed on the Temporary Register since July, 1994

Lynn Andrews	Catherine Gow	Dianne O'Connor
Melanie Barwick	David Hall	Anne Pawluk
Micheline Beitel	Benamar Hanifi	Cheryl Reed-Elder
Charles Borsellino	Jayne Hanna	Ann Robson
Guy Bourgon	Gilles Hébert	Sherri Taras
Danielle Charbonneau	Ross Hetherington	Edward Taylor
Gina Fisher	Michèle Laliberté	Ayse Unsal
Angela Fountain	Joel Landau	Tamara Warren
Christiane Fradet	Myriam Mongrain	Arlene Young

PROPOSED FEE AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO MINISTRY

In the previous two issues of the Bulletin, registrants were advised that the operating expenses of the College had increased significantly due to the increasing costs associated with administration of the new legislation and with more complaints resulting in discipline.

To cover these costs, Council has approved a fee increase for registration renewal, effective June 1, 1995. Additionally, at its meeting of September 16 and 17, 1994, Council passed a motion approving a "stabilization fee" to meet operating expenses for the current fiscal year. Both fees must be approved by the Ministry of Health before they go into effect. Upon receipt of Ministry approval, members will be provided with 30 days notice of the amount and due date for each of the new fees.

Council approved a renewal fee for fiscal 1995-1996 of \$625 for members who "reside in Ontario or practise in Ontario" and \$200 for members who "reside outside Ontario and who do not practice in Ontario".

Council approved a one time stabilization fee of \$100 for members who reside in or practise in Ontario. For members who reside outside of Ontario and who do not practise in Ontario, the stabilization fee will be \$30.00.

Members need not pay the new fees until they have received written notice from the registrar that these fees have been approved by the Ministry and that payment is due.

DELEGATION OF THE CONTROLLED ACT

A number of registrants have written requesting further guidance respecting the development of a Delegation Agreement between a psychologist and a psychological associate.

The Standards and Guidelines for Delegation of the Controlled Act were published in the August, 1994 (Volume 21 No 1) issue of the Bulletin.

Most of those registrants inquiring have requested a sample agreement as guidance in drafting their own agreements. The College has now received a number of signed Delegation Agreements. The example on the preceding page is a composite of the types of information included with additional possibilities listed as well.

The Bulletin is a publication of the College of Psychologists of Ontario

PRESIDENT

Maggie Mamen, Ph.D., C.Psych.

VICE-PRESIDENT

Henry Edwards, Ph.D., C.Psych.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Huguette Boisvert

Gilles Gagnon

Margaret Hearn, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Nina Josefowitz, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Paul King, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Elaine Moroney,

M.A., C.Psych. Assoc. *Ex Officio*

Clifford Morris

Ronald Myhr, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Marilyn Norman

Janet Polivy, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Reg Reynolds, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Carolyn Roeser

Eugene Stasiak, Ph.D., C.Psych.

REGISTRAR

Catherine Yarrow, Ph.D., C.Psych.

STAFF

Claire Barcik

Susan Brooks

Debbie Kemp

Connie Learn

Stephanie Morton

Dana Wilson

Laura Worosz

CONSULTANTS

Bruce Quarrington, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Brian Ridgley, Ph.D., C.Psych.

Barbara Wand, Ph.D., C.Psych.

The Bulletin is published quarterly. Subscriptions for members of the College are included in their registration fee. Others may subscribe at \$10.00 per year, or \$2.50 per single issue. We will also attempt to satisfy requests for back issues of the Bulletin at the same price.

Les articles dans ce numéro de *The Bulletin* sont disponibles en français.

The College of Psychologists of Ontario Presents
THE BARBARA WAND SYMPOSIUM

FEBRUARY 15, 1995
The Toronto Marriott Eaton Centre
525 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M7Y 2W1

A BRAVE NEW WORLD

The 1995 Symposium will provide an up-to-date overview of the College of Psychologists' first year under the Regulated Health Professions Legislation, with a focus on the changing world of psychology and new directions for the near future.

Session I WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG

A bird's eye view of the College today; progress over the past year; what practitioners should be aware of regarding the current status of the legislation, regulations, standards and guidelines.

Session II GREAT EXPECTATIONS

Quality assurance as a new mandate of the health professions; issues relating to continuing competence and continuing education.

Session III WAR AND PEACE

An overview of the College's disciplinary process; risk-management for ethical practitioners to increase the probability of a complaint-free practice.

Session IV SENSE AND SENSIBILITY

Public protection from the viewpoint of the Client Relations Committee and public members of the College Council; issues relating to the sexual abuse of clients by members.

Speakers to be announced. This Symposium is open to members and non-members of the College. Registration is \$30.00 for members \$35.00 for non-members and will be on a first-come, first-served basis. For further information, please contact the College of Psychologists of Ontario at (416) 961-8817.

Please note that registration in the Barbara Wand Symposium is independent of the OPA convention.

This form may be photocopied.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TEL: _____

CPO MEMBER: \$30.00

NON MEMBER: \$35.00

AMOUNT ENCLOSED:

MAKE CHEQUES PAYABLE TO:
The College of Psychologists of Ontario

**SEND REGISTRATION FORM AND
PAYMENT TO:**
The College of Psychologists of Ontario
1246 Yonge Street, Suite 201
Toronto, ON M4T 1W5

Please note that registration in the Barbara Wand Symposium is independent of the OPA convention.