
Meeting of the Transitional Council of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario — March 30, 2012

After the usual business of a Board meeting (call to order; approval of agenda) the audience was asked to leave the meeting room as the TC had legal business to attend to *in camera*. Just over one hour later the observers were allowed back into the room.

The *in camera* meeting had been called to discuss letters received from the OACCPP and the OAMFT claiming an undisclosed conflict of interest for Pat DeYoung due to her work associations. The TC had discussed the claims and had decided that there was no conflict of interest. Motions to state that and to affirm Ms. DeYoung in her positions. Both motions were carried unanimously and several Council members made supportive statements.

After those announcements and statements the meeting commenced with reports which were either kept very short or postponed to the committees' or task force's presentations later in the day.

REPORTS

President's Report:

- The administration has been and will continue to be very busy with the tasks of 'disentanglement' (working towards administrative and financial independence from the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care) and preparing for registration of members in April 2013.
- The Executive committee spent several hours evaluating and re-affirming the committee memberships.
- The President appealed to the TC members to keep working on harmony, stretching beyond the personal preference, and working towards compromise for the completion of their task.

Quality Assurance Committee Report:

- Had two meetings since the last TC meeting
- Reviewed and planned main projects:
 - Jurisprudence and Professional Practice Guides (need to be ready for registration date)
 - Guide for Standards / Information / Guidelines (need to be ready latest in 2014)
 - Quality Assurance Program (needs to be finished around 2014)

Registration Committee Report:

- Had one meeting since the last TC meeting
- Got information from the task groups
- Dealt with responses from stakeholders

Report of the Competency Profiles Task Force:

- Postponed

Education Framework Task Group:

- Postponed

Prior Learning Assessment Task Group:

- Postponed

Registrar's Report:

- Mostly covered in the President's report
- Most work around 'disentanglement' issues
 - Setting up banking and financial processes
 - Becoming independent in April 2012
- Several meetings past and upcoming for the Registrar

REGISTRATION REGULATION — RECIRCULATION FEEDBACK

- Stakeholder feedback was partly supportive, partly not to the question asked
 - The change of wording to "indigenous practice" was accepted with a clarification stating that this applies only to Canadian indigenous culture and to *all* Canadian indigenous culture.
 - Several stakeholders took the opportunity to question the definition of RMHTs and their right of practicing independently at all
 - Many letters were similar, indicating strong lobbying action
 - Committee took a long time to review and discuss; didn't come to a unanimous decision; bringing issue to full Council for direction
 - Two general positions have been discussed in committee and a third came up right at the end of the meeting and couldn't be discussed in any detail:
1. In the interest of protection of the public, RMHTs should be barred from independent practice, only being allowed to practice within a group or institutional setting or under supervision of a psychotherapist etc. One voice from outside the committee suggested that even one-on-one practice *with* supervision should not be allowed. The committee didn't fully agree on that and also allowed for the possibility of exceptions in some cases (such as an RMHT working in rural areas where supervision requirements may lead to lack of necessary professional support. However, in general, if a RMHT wants to practice independently (without supervision) he or she would have to train to become an RP and switch into that category of registration.
 2. The regulation as is is sufficient to protect the public as RMHTs who want to practice one-on-one have to either be under supervision or do additional training. This would ensure appropriate supply of trained professionals in rural areas. It would be up to the College to educate the general public as to the differences between RMHTs in private practice (with or without supervision), independently practicing RMHTs (without supervision), and RPs.
 3. RMHTs should be allowed to practice independently *within their speciality only* but be required to either upgrade to the RP designation or to be under supervision if they stray into the area of psychotherapy; e.g. an addiction counsellor could see and support recovering

addicts without supervision as long as he or she stayed within support of cessation etc. If / when the work moved into areas that would support and may result in core changes in the client's personality, he / she would have to either refer or request supervision.

All three options were discussed in detail.

A lengthy discussion revolved about the definition of "independent" vs. "in private practice".

It was mentioned that in the grandparenting process, RMHTs who already practice independently would be allowed to continue to do so.

It was pointed out that all professional members of the TC consider themselves as RPs and that any decisions made for RMHTs will have to be made with special awareness of fairness and inclusiveness.

At the end of the discussion it seemed that most TC members favoured the third option as one that is most closely related to already existing reality. The matter was referred back to the Registration Committee for further consideration.

PRIOR LEARNING ASSESSMENT (PLA) TASK FORCE

- Most for the last few meetings with focus on the grandparenting process
- General requirements were a given through law and / or the registration legislation:
 - Grandparenting applicants must have at least 750 hours of practice within the 3 years leading up to application, 500 of which have to be in Ontario
 - Applications must provide a statutory declaration with sufficient information and documentation to support their application
 - Applicants have to have a certain number of client hours and of supervision hours
 - Applicants have to have an 'appropriate level of education'
- Task force had to find and formulate ways to measure 'appropriate levels of education', weigh experiences in different areas of the applicants professional life, and allow for evaluation not of *specific* experiences but on a *scale* of experiences.
- Clarifications:
 - **Only the 750 hours of currency (incl. 500 in Ontario) have to be within the three years leading up to the application; supervision, training, the remaining 250 hours etc. count from the beginning of the applicant's career**
 - **Scoring matrixes will allow for 'weak' areas to be balanced by 'stronger' areas**
 - **The application forms will be posted online with guidelines and examples.**
 - **Most applications will be evaluated virtually. Where there are questions or difficulties, the application will be extracted to be evaluated manually. Some applications will be pulled randomly to be evaluated manually.**
 - **Manual evaluation will require a review of the physical portfolio information**
- Applications will be in seven sections:
 - Sections 1 & 2: collecting information to determine general readiness
 - CV
 - Applications, portfolio, statutory declaration
 - Practice in Ontario
 - Supervision hours and practice hours
 - Etc.
 - Sections 3 to 6: collecting information about professional experience
 - Education and training
 - Clinical experience

- Supervision experience
- Safe and effective use of self
- Etc.
- Section 7: collecting information about related experiences (bonus)
 - Teaching and research experience
- The task force and the registration committee are aiming at having the information online for public access within the coming few months, before June 1, 2012.
- Questions still to be investigated:
 - Who will be assessors and what training would they need?
 - Is the scoring matrix sufficient (was given to TC members for review and comments)
 - What is considered “appropriate evidence”?
 - Etc.

COMPETENCY PROFILES TASK FORCE

- Quick review of the process the task force has gone through so far
- Reminders:
 - **The profiles are to be understood as inter-dependent and integrated sets of abilities, not individual abilities**
 - **These are *Entry to Practice* requirements only**
 - **These are abilities that the applicant would have to have *if called on*; they are not abilities the applicants *has to practice***
 - **These are general requirements, *not specific to a special modality or approach***

The final draft of the Competency Profiles as brought to the TC was approved unanimously for submission to the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care as schedules A and B (RMHT and RP respectively) of the Registration Regulation.

EDUCATION FRAMEWORK TASK GROUP

- The process of the task group was explained
 - Each member of the task group was given one category on which he / she was to report back with suggestions and research
 - The full task group then discussed and compiled the information thus gathered and developed the framework to the point that it is now
 - The current draft will, after input from the TC at this meeting has been implemented, be send out to several training institutes, incl. APTI, universities, community colleges, etc. for evaluation and feedback
- The framework, when finalized, will serve several purposes:
 - Help students evaluate the training program of their choice
 - Allow training institutes to become recognized by the College
 - Allow training institutes who decide not to apply for recognition to self-evaluate their training programs for compliancy
 - Allow the College’s registration committee to quickly and easily assess an applicant’s training
- Framework is based on and working towards the competency profiles that have been developed
- Training programs that apply for recognition with the College will have to meet *all* the requirements of the framework. If they don’t meet those requirements, they will be allowed to re-apply at a later point.

- Students of not-recognized training programs still can apply. Their application will be handled on its own merits and the training they received will be evaluated against the framework. If their training shows lack in some areas they may be required to partake in additional training.
- Organizational requirements will be part of the requirements, as will curriculum, process etc. Organizational requirements incl.
 - Number of core staff
 - Qualification of core staff
 - Published policies
 - Complaint processes
 - Etc.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS OF CHAIRS

A different approach was used this year with every TC member asked his / her preference of committee. Each TC member is required to be on one committee, and only one, with the exception of the president and vice-president who are required to sit on all committees.

A question was raised as to the balance between public and professional members on each committee and the president and vice-president laid out how that has been taken into consideration and the by-laws have been complied with.

The proposed committee constellations and the appointments for Chairs were accepted with one abstention.

FURTHER BUSINESS

At this point I had to leave the meeting. Further business after this point, according to the agenda, included

- Disentanglement from the MHLTC
- New Business
- Closing Comments

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday May 11, 2012

Disclaimer:

The notes in this document are **not** official minutes. The author does not claim the content to be 100% correct or to express the intent of the discussions perfectly. These is purely the notes of the meeting as understood by the author from her position as silent observer.

For official minutes of the meetings, visit the College's website at http://www.cprmhto.on.ca/pages/Home/Council/Council_Minutes