

JANET NAPOLITANO
Governor



HEIDI HERBST PAAKKONEN
Executive Director

JONI KALIS, P.T.
President

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF PHYSICAL THERAPY
1400 WEST WASHINGTON, SUITE 230 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
(602) 542-3095 Fax (602) 542-3093
E-mail: heidi.herbst-paakkonen@ptboard.state.az.us

REGULAR SESSION MEETING MINUTES
May 22, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joni Kalis, P.T., President
Mark Cornwall, P.T., Ph.D., Vice President
Randy Robbins, Secretary
James Sieveke, P.T., O.C.S., Member
Lisa Akers, P.T., Member

MEMBERS ABSENT: Merle Gossman, Member

OTHERS PRESENT: Heidi Herbst Paakkonen, Executive Director
Paula Brierley, Licensing Administrator
Keely Versteegen, Assistant Attorney General

CALL TO ORDER – 8:30 a.m.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Kalis welcomed recently appointed Ms. Lisa Akers, P.T. to the Arizona Board of Physical Therapy. Ms. Akers introduced herself as a physical therapist who has practiced in many different settings in Arizona and who currently is the managing partner of an outpatient clinic in Maricopa where she lives with her husband and two children. Ms. Kalis also welcomed Ms. Paula Brierley as the new Licensing Administrator for the Board. Ms. Brierley advised the Board that she has worked for two different health regulatory boards performing various tasks including investigation and licensing since 2001 and that she is delighted to be with the Arizona Board of Physical Therapy.

1. Review and Approval of Draft Minutes:

April 24, 2007; Regular Session Meeting

Ms. Kalis asked the Board to identify any revisions to the minutes; a typographical error was noted on page 5. Ms. Kalis moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

April 24, 2007; Executive Session Meeting

Ms. Kalis asked the Board to identify any revision to the draft minutes. Hearing none Ms. Kalis moved the Board approve the minutes. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS and COMPLIANCE

2. Initial Review of Complaint

#06-17; Roger Surette, P.T.

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen summarized the investigative report prepared by Ms. Hiller, P.T. The complaint was opened on November 24, 2006 in response to a complaint filed by G.R., a former patient of Mr. Surette from August 28 to

November 7, 2003. The complaint alleges Mr. Surette 1) received compensation for therapy that he never provided to G.R.'s left shoulder; 2) changed the prescription issued by the referring physician for therapy on G.R.'s right shoulder to read 'left shoulder' although he had already charged Medicare with 12 treatments on her left shoulder; 3) fraudulently billed Medicare for portions of her treatment, and 4) refused to provide to G.R. copies of her treatment records. G.R. subsequently sent a letter to the Board explaining that she and Mr. Surette had resolved their billing dispute. In response to the complaint, Mr. Surette stated that G.R. was referred to him by Dr. Laurence Susini for treatment of her right shoulder post-rotator cuff repair. Mr. Surette also stated that because G.R. complained of left shoulder and neck problems he treated her left shoulder on several occasions as a courtesy for no charge. However, when he recognized G.R. expected this treatment he recommended that she get a referral from a physician so he could bill for this treatment. Subsequently physical therapy care of G.R.'s left shoulder was authorized by Dr. Ulker Tok, G.R.'s rheumatologist in the form of establishing a Medicare case with the necessary form signed by Dr. Tok. Mr. Surette also explained that he was notified by the organization that handled administrative functions for his practice that G.R. had filed a complaint about inappropriate billings. When he learned that Medicare had been inappropriately billed for treatment of G.R.'s right shoulder he explained the error to the billing company and he was advised that Medicare would refund this amount. Mr. Surette further commented that he contacted G.R. several weeks later to discuss the Medicare billings, attempt to have her recognize that he treated her left shoulder concurrently, and advise that her records would be sent to her to clarify the different billing requirements. When G.R. again requested her records several months later he made certain her treatment and billing records were mailed. Finally, Mr. Surette's response included statements from current and former employees to corroborate his defense of the allegations, as well as letters of endorsement from colleagues and a patient. Ms. Kalis noted that Mr. Surette was present for this review of the case and the licensee indicated that he wanted to participate in this review to clear up the allegations. He explained that the treatment of G.R.'s shoulder was billed to Medicare erroneously but it was subsequently corrected and refunded. Mr. Surette stated that when G.R. realized that the treatment would be billed against her medical lien associated with the automobile accident that caused her injuries which would reduce her settlement, she filed this complaint with the Board. Mr. Surette also explained that in the beginning of the episode of care he had not completed the appropriate paperwork to have the shoulder treatment billed to Medicare, but he later attempted to have this remedied. He noted that he had begun treating G.R. for more than just the right shoulder; after several treatment sessions he advised G.R. that if she required that level of care it was appropriate for her to be properly referred for physical therapy care and that care should appropriately be billed to Medicare. Mr. Surette indicated that he has determined that it was only after G.R. realized how not billing Medicare would affect her insurance settlement did she get upset and file the complaint. The Board questioned where in Mr. Surette's response to the complaint did he supply a copy of the referral for the left shoulder. Mr. Surette explained that he had provided to the Board signed consent forms signed by G.R. which indicated that she approved the billing methodology. He explained that he had attempted to address areas other than G.R.'s right shoulder because she complained of a lot of pain. The Board questioned Mr. Surette relative to whether he had evaluated G.R.'s left shoulder; he indicated that he did but admitted that he did not document the evaluation or any care until the billing documentation was established through Medicare. The Board questioned whether he evaluated G.R.'s neck; Mr. Surette explained that he always evaluates the neck in conjunction with the shoulder. The Board pointed to notations of strength testing in the evaluation but noted that there was no mention of neuro (reflex) testing. Mr. Surette stated that he did manual muscle testing on both shoulders. The Board questioned why his discharge summary statement of G.R.'s right shoulder mentioned that her goals were met, but questioned what those goals might have been since none were

documented. Mr. Surette explained his concept of appropriate goals for this patient and noted that he discussed them with the referring physician and they agreed that the patient met reasonable goals. He admitted that he didn't record any objective goals in the plan of care. The Board discussed the fact that the investigative findings do not support the allegations made by the complainant: a violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(13), fraudulent billing, cannot be established because the billing was corrected. The Board members similarly concurred that there was no violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(12), failing to adhere to the recognized standards of ethics of the physical therapy profession, nor was there a violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(14), making fraudulent, misleading or untrue representations. The Board then discussed the fact that the evaluation Mr. Surette prepared did not address G.R.'s cervical spine, and that there is no documented plan of care for the shoulder. The Board further noted that the daily notations of G.R.'s treatment session didn't include any objective findings. Finally, the Board commented that it was difficult to correlate the treatments provided with the billing charges. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that it could direct staff to continue the investigation into these new documentation allegations which would continue the initial review process, or the Board could vote to invite Mr. Surette to an informal hearing; in either instance the licensee must be provided notification of the new allegations and have opportunity to respond to them. Ms. Kalis moved to invite Mr. Surette to an informal hearing and to provide him notice of his alleged violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(20), failure to maintain adequate documentation – specifically that he had provided treatment to G.R.'s left shoulder prior to conducting an evaluation, that he provided treatment of the cervical spine with no evaluation or neurological clearance, he failed to establish a plan of care for the treatment and that there were no rehabilitation goals established, and that his discharge summary referred to goals which were not recorded. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 5-1. Ms. Kalis moved to dismiss the original complaint allegations. Dr. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

3. Request for Termination of Probation

#05-18; Paul Hospenthal, P.T.

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Mr. Hospenthal had petitioned the Board for termination of probation relative to the complaint #05-18 under which he was placed on probation by Board for six months from October 16, 2006 to April 16, 2007 for violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(10), engaging in sexual misconduct, and A.R.S. §32-2044(12), failing to adhere to recognized standards of ethical conduct. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen stated that the Board had found that in 2000 Mr. Hospenthal engaged in a consensual sexual relationship with a 16 year old patient. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen summarized Mr. Hospenthal's probation terms including the requirement that he complete a patient care boundaries course and that he present the course material to the employees of his clinic, Desert Institute of Physical Therapy. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Mr. Hospenthal has complied with the terms of Order of Probation. The Board discussed concerns relative to whether Mr. Hospenthal's behavior was modified as a result of this case but concurred that the licensee had completed all of his probation requirements. Ms. Kalis moved to termination Mr. Hospenthal's term of probation. Dr. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

#05-19; Dawn Mortellaro, P.T.

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen stated that Ms. Mortellaro had requested the Board grant termination of her term of probation imposed as the final adjudication of complaint #05-19. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reminded the Board that Ms. Mortellaro was placed on probation for 12 months from May 10, 2006 to May 10, 2007 for violation of A.R.S. §32-2044(1), violating statutes; §32-2043 supervision, patient care management; A.R.S. 32-2044(6)

failing to supervise assistive personnel; and §32-2044(20), inadequate patient records. The Board had adopted findings that Ms. Mortellaro failed to demonstrate that she was managing all aspects of the patients' care at Sun Valley Physical Therapy, she failed to appropriately delegate tasks to physical therapy aides under her supervision, she failed to provide on-site supervision to an aide on several occasions, she failed to verify the credentials of an aide under her supervision, and she failed to maintain adequate records including a complete evaluation for one patient and a discharge summary for another patient. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that Ms. Hiller confirmed Ms. Mortellaro complied with the terms of Order of Probation, and she explained that Ms. Hiller worked with the licensee to promote her understanding of the probation terms and deadlines, although Ms. Mortellaro did complete some of the requirements late. The Board also discussed concerns with the statements made by Ms. Mortellaro in the essay she submitted. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen commented that Ms. Mortellaro has modified her practice in that she is no longer involved in Sun Valley Physical Therapy as that practice has dissolved and she no longer employs assistive personnel. Following discussion Dr. Cornwall moved to terminate Ms. Mortellaro's probation. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

4. Review and Possible Action on Semiannual Interview of Licensee on Substance Abuse Recovery and Monitoring Program

Trent Tripp, P.T.

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen stated that on November 8, 2006 Mr. Trent Tripp, P.T. entered into a consent agreement with the Arizona Board of Physical Therapy for purposes of participating in a substance abuse recovery and monitoring program. One of the terms of the program is that Mr. Tripp be interviewed by the Board for purposes of reviewing his success with the program and assessing his ability to practice physical therapy with skill and safety. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen called the Board's attention a chart reporting Mr. Tripp's status with respect to his compliance with the monitoring program terms, as well as copies of narrative reports from Mr. Tripp's chemical dependency rehabilitation aftercare program (Phoenix Shanti), Dr. Michael Sucher (who monitors Mr. Tripp's drug screenings, relapse prevention group and self-help meetings, and progress evaluations) and employment reports submitted by his supervisor, Ms. Lesa Wade, P.T., at HealthSouth Valley of the Sun Rehabilitation Hospital. Mr. Tripp was present for the interview and he advised the Board he that is currently practicing physical therapy. He reported that he has moved out of transitional housing and now has his own apartment and car. He explained that his support system consists of at least four 12-step meetings per week and the other participants have become important members of his social network. Mr. Tripp noted that he is in frequent contact with his sister, a physician in the Phoenix area, and with his mother who resides in the area. He indicates that his 12-step program sponsor is also a good source of support for him. Mr. Tripp states that he is happy to be living independently and to have his dog living with him again. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen summarized the content and the frequency of the reports submitted by Dr. Sucher and Mr. Tripp described the activities that Dr. Sucher is coordinating on his behalf relative to his 12-step meetings and body fluid screenings. Mr. Tripp reported his sobriety date as March 20, 2006. In response to the Board's questions Mr. Tripp indicated that he currently works in the inpatient side of a rehabilitation hospital which is a comprehensive facility. He explained that he serves on a team that rotates through the three units of the facility on a quarterly basis, and that the other team members include 2 occupational therapists, 2 speech-language pathologists, another physical therapist and a physical therapist assistant. Mr. Tripp commented that he is constantly around other professionals as well as working closely with his supervisor. He informed the Board that he works through 2 recovery groups – one facilitated by Shanti and another health professionals group that allows him to talk through his stress. Mr. Tripp also

stated that he has a good relationship with Ms. Wade and he feels comfortable going to her for work related stress. In response to the Board's questions he indicated that his employment situation is going well for him and that he stays motivated because he enjoys his job and it is similar to the work that he did previously. Mr. Tripp commented that he likes the team-oriented approach to patient care and enjoys going to work; he also looks forward to his social activities on evenings and weekends. Mr. Tripp stated that he does not believe that he has any problems practicing physical therapy with skill and safety. The Board questioned whether he had any pending legal actions; he stated that there are none but that his court ordered probation in Pima County is scheduled to end in August. He explained that he reports regularly to his probation officer who has allowed him to be in Phoenix, and that person communicates with Shanti staff and Dr. Sucher if necessary. Mr. Tripp stated that he is grateful every day for his job, his family and friends, and his ability to practice physical therapy. The Board thanked Mr. Tripp for participating in the interview, congratulated him on his recovery progress, and concluded there was no further action required at this time.

SUBSTANTIVE REVIEWS OF APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE & CERTIFICATION

5. Review and Possible Action Concerning Audited Licensees' Compliance with Continuing Competence Requirements for 2004-2006 Licensure Period

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen summarized the results of the most recent Continuing Competence Audit Committee meeting held on May 8, 2007. All 20 files audit submissions reviewed were those of licensees who were required to submit additional documentation in order to come into compliance with the continuing competence requirements for the 2004-2006 licensure period because they had all previously been found out of compliance by the Board. The Board reviewed the report and discussed the fact that the Committee had determined 18 licensees had come into compliance while 2 licensees remained out of compliance. Mr. Robbins moved to find the 18 listed licensees in compliance with the Board's continuing competence requirements. Dr. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Ms. Kalis moved to find Ms. Melody Pinkerton, P.T. and Ms. Sharon Rieger, P.T. out of compliance with the Board's continuing competence requirements. Mr. Sieveke seconded the motion. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that she will notify Ms. Pinkerton and Ms. Rieger of the fact that they are still out of compliance and that she will remind them of their respective due dates for coming into compliance which are established as 6 months after having received the lack-of-compliance notice from the Board of. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen discussed with the Board the need for the Board to appoint a task force that would review the administrative rules that prescribe the requirements for continuing competence of physical therapists for purposes of proposing revisions to those rules.

6. Substantive Review and Possible Action on Applications for Physical Therapist Licensure

Amy Bent	Patricia M. Fabian	Julian Gentili
Kim R. Gleason	Kathleen D. Hagen	Linda Klischer
Brandie J. McClinton	David S. Mellish *	Lynn T. Montoya
Antonio M. Reale	Michelle L. Turner	Erin K. Santilli
Cathleen M. Soper	Ty Wakefield	James M. Wortley

** Interview scheduled*

Ms. Kalis announced that Board staff had arranged a telephonic interview of Mr. Mellish to discuss questions relative to the fact that his application indicates he has not held a physical therapist license since late 2000 or early 2001. The Board asked Mr. Mellish to elaborate on his licensure and work history. Mr. Mellish explained that following his graduation from the physical therapy program at Northern Arizona University in 1995 he worked as a physical therapist in a variety of settings in Arizona and then in 1998 started a business that established and operated several assisted living facilities. He stated that his company expanded significantly

and consumed all of his time until the point at which he was operating several facilities. Mr. Mellis stated that his physical therapy skills were utilized and enhanced during this period of time while he worked with the patients who received services in his facilities. He noted that he saw patients with complex rehabilitation needs and consulted with many health care professionals while coordinating their services. Mr. Mellish indicated that he regretted his decision to allow his physical therapist license to lapse, but he believes he is now ready to re-enter the profession. He advised the Board that he is prepared to complete a Supervised Clinical Practice Period (SCPP) and complete continuing education courses in order to brush up on his competency. He mentioned that some possible employment options have been presented to him, but he has not accepted any offers as he is willing to follow the Board's directive. The Board asked Mr. Mellish whether he believed a SCPP would be of benefit him; he stated that he would feel quite comfortable observing a physical therapist for a few weeks as he is able to learn quickly. He also stated that he would not have difficulty consulting with other colleagues in the initial weeks and months that he returns to practice. Mr. Mellish noted that he has been offered a position in an outpatient clinic that would allow him to work with other physical therapists, physical therapist assistants, and physical therapy aides. He explained that the patients he would treat in this facility would probably require less care than the patients in his assisted living facilities. He also commented that he would like to work in orthopedics, although he is also very knowledgeable about home health practice and would be willing to work in that capacity as well. The Board discussed the fact that since Mr. Mellish left the profession 8 years ago, the field has changed significantly and that to successfully re-enter the practice he will need an opportunity to re-tool his knowledge and skills. The Board reviewed A.R.S. §32-2028 and discussed the options of requiring Mr. Mellish to complete continuing education in the form of a differential diagnosis course, a therapeutic exercise course, and a SCPP. Ms. Kalis moved to grant Mr. Mellish an Interim Permit for purposes of completing a 90-day SCPP (40 hours per week) and require him to complete 30 contact hours of continuing education in the form of a therapeutic exercise course and a differential diagnosis course. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. The Board determined that the application file for Mr. Wortley would not be reviewed; it is not administratively complete in that the applicant did not submit all of the information requested in conjunction with his application disclosure that he has previously been the subject of 3 malpractice investigations. Ms. Kalis offered to motion to grant licensure to all of the applicants listed with the exception of Mr. Mellish and Mr. Wortley. Mr. Sieveke seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

7. Substantive Review and Possible Action on Applications for Physical Therapist Assistant Certification

Kevin Alexander	Matt H. Anderson	Linda A. Jackson
Randy Moberg	Erika D. Packer	Sara A. Roberts
Richard W. Ruth	Debra A. Swain	

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and asked the Board for comments or questions relative to the files of the listed applicants. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen confirmed that Ms. Roberts passed the jurisprudence examination as the score report was not provided for review. The Board discussed the fact that Mr. Alexander currently has no active licensure or certification as a physical therapist assistant and noted that it was not clear from his application in what capacity he is currently employed. The Board directed staff to request from Mr. Alexander additional information specific to the fact that he is not licensed in any U.S. jurisdiction and clarification relative to his current employment; if the additional information indicates that he is currently working as a physical therapist assistant in the armed services, Board staff can confer the certificate but if he is employed in any other capacity the application and the requested information must return to the Board for review. Ms. Kalis moved to grant certification to the

applicants listed with the exception of Mr. Alexander. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

8. Substantive Review of and Possible Action on the Following Applications for Physical Therapist Licensure – Foreign Educated Graduates of Programs Not U.S. Accredited

a. Review of Supervised Clinical Practice Period Proposals

Thelma C. Caisip – secondary supervisor

Ms. Kalis read the name of the applicant and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that Ms. Caisip's proposal consists of adding a secondary supervisor to her Supervised Clinical Practice Period (SCPP). She affirmed that Ms. Caisip appears to be in a position to complete the SCPP within the 6 month time frame of the Interim Permit. The Board discussed the fact that Board staff should recommend to anyone who applies for an Interim Permit that a primary and secondary supervisor should be incorporated into SCPP proposals to prevent a situation where a supervisor becomes unavailable thus compromising the Interim Permit holder's ability to complete the SCPP. Dr. Cornwall offered a motion approving Ms. Caisip's secondary supervisor for her SCPP. Ms. Kalis seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Wendello L. Tanael – new facility

Ms. Kalis read the name of the applicant and Ms. Herbst Paakkonen stated that due to the fact that the facility at which Ms. Tanael had been approved for his SCPP being acquired by another company, he had submitted a request for the Board to approve the SCPP at the new facility, but under the same previously approved supervisor. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen advised the Board that Mr. Tanael is still within the 6-month time frame of the Interim Permit and that, if approved, he will only lose a month in this process. Ms. Kalis moved to approve the modified SCPP proposal with the previously approved supervisor in the new facility. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

b. Review of CPI for completion of Supervised Clinical Practice Period

Armando R. Adano Jr.

Ms. Kalis read the name of the applicant and the Board noted that Ms. Adano's SCPP supervisor had submitted a very positive Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) evaluation report addressing his skills and competency. Ms. Kalis moved to grant licensure to Mr. Adano. Dr. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Shelley DeLa Paz

Ms. Kalis read the name of the applicant and the Board reviewed and discussed the very complete and detailed CPI evaluation submitted by her supervisor that indicated Ms. DeLa Paz's clinical skills improved significantly during the course of the SCPP. Ms. Kalis moved to grant licensure to Ms. DeLa Paz. Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

9. Executive Director's Report

a. Financial Report: no additional information to report.

b. Board Staff Activities: Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reported that she has no new information relative to the anticipated relocation of the Board office but that she will continue to keep the Board members informed of any new developments via e-mail. She stated that the rental market appears to be more competitive from a renter's perspective and that rental costs are increasing. Additionally, it has been difficult to identify many options for rental space that meets the agency's needs with respect to the relatively small square footage.

c. FSBPT Initiatives and News: No additional information to report.

d. Rule Writing Update: Ms. Kalis reported that the small task force assembled for purposes of drafting proposed documentation standards language met recently to re-group and to establish some tasks and approximate deadlines for its work. She indicated that she and Ms. Hiller initiated work on this issue in 2002 which included the process of reviewing

many other sources of information such as Medicare standards and language from other states' practice acts. Ms. Kalis noted that the standards must be relevant to all practice settings. The Board members discussed the need to have physical therapists from other practice settings such as home health care and pediatric/school-based care to review and provide feedback to any proposed language prior to the public comment period as these perspectives will be essential to the adoption of appropriate rule language for practitioners in varied settings.

e. Legislative Update: The Board questioned why HB 2587, In-home care providers study committee was amended in the Senate to eliminate a representative from the Arizona Board of Physical Therapy serving on the in-home care study committee. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen commented that while she does not have any insight into why the composition of the study committee changed from the bill sponsor's original vision, she stated that she has observed that home-based care services have been under much scrutiny by the current legislature and that it is possible that some of the policy discussions that have occurred while debating this and other proposed legislation resulted in a change in focus of the study committee.

10. Board Training

a. Disciplinary Options and Considerations

Ms. Kalis introduced the agenda item and explained to the Board that several months ago she and Ms. Hiller had discussed with the Board's then Assistant Attorney General some potential benefits associated with instituting a training program for Board members whereby time on certain meeting agendas is dedicated to presenting one or more topics of interest for Board review and discussion. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen commented that the anticipated outcome of such a training program would be to promote a shared understanding of topics and issues to improve the effectiveness of the Board. Ms. Herbst Paakkonen presented to the Board for purposes of review and discussion the "Board Disciplinary Options and Considerations" document she drafted – with input and feedback from Ms. Hiller – for purposes of providing the Board with information relative to the Board's options for adjudicating complaints and cases, and guidance on when to utilize the various options. The Board reviewed and discussed the options and discussed with legal counsel some questions and distinctions relative to the options.

b. Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy (FSBPT) Members Only Web Site

Ms. Herbst Paakkonen reviewed with the Board the "Members Only" intranet site of the FSBPT and its various features including the news, calendar, documents, resources, directory and message board features. She demonstrated how to log into the site and how to navigate the information that the Federation has included for purposes of providing the members of its member boards with support and resources in their public protection efforts.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Prepared by,

Heidi Herbst Paakkonen
Executive Director

Regular Session Meeting
May 22, 2007

Approved by,

Randy Robbins,
Secretary