



Board of Allied Mental Health Practitioners
Office of Professional Regulation, Vermont Secretary of State

89 Main Street, 3rd Floor · Montpelier, VT 05620-3402
Tel. (802) 828-2390 - www.sec.state.vt.us/professional-regulation.aspx

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
VERMONT BOARD OF ALLIED MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS
JULY 19, 2018 MEETING

Present: Tammy Austin, William (Bill) Scarlett, Jaime Blouin, Scott Giles and Michael Doyle, Ad Hoc; Office of Professional Regulation Personnel: Diane Lafaille and Gabriel Gilman.

1. General Business
 - a. The Board called the meeting to order at 8:50 a.m.
 - b. Ms. Blouin moved, seconded by Mr. Scarlett, to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2018 meeting as written. Approved.
2. Hearings:
 - a. 2018-41 – Carolyn Scott – A hearing on preliminary denial of license application was heard at 9:30 a.m. The Board went into deliberative session at 11:10 a.m. and came out of deliberative session at 12:00 p.m. Ms. Blouin moved, seconded by Mr. Scarlett, to deny the appeal of the preliminary denial. Approved. Mr. Giles was opposed.
3. Correspondence:
 - a. Charity Eugair wrote the Board requesting a change in her license track which falls outside the rules of the Board. The Board responded that it does not have the latitude to change the rules. It can only make decisions based on the current rules and therefore, cannot make the accommodations she requested.
 - b. Leora Black emailed the Board concerning the acceptability of particular financial arrangements vis-à-vis clinical supervisees. The Board referred her to Rule 3.20 and added that the regulatory purpose of the Rule is to protect the independence and objectivity of the clinical supervisor by disallowing supervisory arrangements where a supervisor attains

pecuniary gain simultaneously from (a.) direct billing of a client and (b.) supervision of the clinician servicing that client.

Dr. Black also recommended in her email to the Board, that the State differentiate masters and doctoral LMFT's and LCMHC's with distinct licenses. The Board responded that this would require legislative action and at this juncture, the Board and Office of Professional Regulation do not find any reason to believe that additional complexity of the type described would offer enhanced protection to the public. It is, of course, lawful for a practitioner with supererogatory doctoral training to describe accurately his or her educational experience in advertising, disclosures, and business collateral. Through these existing mechanisms, all clients and payers in Vermont should be able to identify a practitioner's educational background.

- c. Barbara Pawluk emailed the Board questioning the deficiencies in her education and why her colleagues had not had the same challenges. The Board responded that her colleagues applications were reviewed under previous versions of the rules. The rules change periodically as the profession shifts. Applications are reviewed under the rules that are in effect at the time that the application was submitted.
4. Other
- a. The Board will begin reviewing rules for changes to reflect the new legislation that will go into effect July 1 2018.
 - c. Continuing education courses were reviewed.
 - d. The Board's next meeting is scheduled for August 7th, 2018.
 - e. The Board adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Diane Lafaille, Licensing Administrator I