

**GEORGIA STATE BOARD OF PHYSICAL THERAPY**  
**Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Professional Licensing Boards**  
**237 Coliseum Drive, Macon, GA**  
**September 22, 2015 - 9:00AM**

The Georgia State Board of Physical Therapy met on Tuesday, September 22, 2015. The following members were present:

**Board Members Present**

Stefanie Palma, PT - President  
Reid Lawson, PT  
Charles Bass, PT  
Chad Whitefield, PTA  
Jesse Crews, Consumer Member

**Administrative Staff Present**

Adrienne Price, Executive Director  
Tamara Elliott, Board Support Specialist  
Kathy Osier, Licensing Supervisor

**Attorney General's Office**

D. Williams-McNeely, Senior Assistant Attorney General  
(via teleconference)

**Visitors Present**

Katherine Sylvester, Physical Therapy Association of Georgia (PTAG)  
Joe Donnelly, Physical Therapy Association of Georgia (PTAG)  
Lauri Wallace, Physio  
Robert Koester, Emory University  
Sandra Eskew Capps, Integra Rehab/PTAG  
Irene Alday  
Clanisse Enceler  
John Schulte  
David Taylor

**Call to Order** Dr. Palma established that a quorum of the Board was present and called the meeting to order at 9:08a.m.

**OPEN SESSION**

**Agenda** The Board accepts the agenda as presented.

**Open Session Minutes**

**1) July 21, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the July 21, 2015 open session minutes.

**2) September 1, 2015 Teleconference Minutes**

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the September 1, 2015 open session minutes as amended. Mr. Crews abstained from voting.

**Licenses to Ratify July 15, 2015 – September 15, 2015**

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to ratify the list of licenses issued in accordance with Board rules and policies from July 15, 2015 – September 15, 2015.

**Correspondence – Robert Ross – Supervision of the PTA**

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Whitefield seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to send a no legal advice letter and refer Mr. Ross to Board Rule 490-5-.01 regarding Supervision of a PTA.

**Correspondence – Sandra Eskew Capps – Clarification regarding Board Policies and Procedures**

Dr. Palma addressed the following questions posed to the Board by Ms. Capps:

- 1) **Question:** Will the Board please clarify reference to Committee “recommendations” and what processes follow a Committee’s recommendations? For example, it is my understanding that for any Committee recommendations to revise a Rule, these recommendations will be presented to the full Board at the next full Board meeting, to be considered for vote and post for public hearing. Is this correct?

**Answer:** YES, the recommendations are presented for a vote; however, proposed amendments to the rules are only posted for public comment and hearing:

1. if the Board votes to accept the recommendation(s); and,
2. if and when it has been determined by the Attorney General’s Office that the Board has the statutory authority to make said recommendations.

- 2) **Question:** For other recommendations that do not involve a Rule change, is the process the same, or is it possible that recommendations from a Committee might result in a policy or procedural change? For example, the June 2

Rules Committee Meeting Minutes note that the Committee recommends adding language to the FAQ relating to Waiver requests. Can (or *did*) this change occur as a result of the Committee's recommendation, or must this also be considered by the full Board prior to implementation.

**Answer:** The recommended change(s) do still require a Board vote; however, posting for public hearing or comment is not required. When the Board votes to accept the recommendation(s) for a policy or procedural changes, the change is typically made and updated on the website within 10-15 business days after the meeting date.

- 3) **Question:** On the topic of Board responses to waiver petitions, per PLB policy, the Board has up to 60 days to render decisions for waivers; what is the *typical* length of time for these requests?

**Answer:** The timeframes for review of Petitions for Waiver of Rules are not established by the Professional Licensing Boards Division (PLB) but rather is a statutory requirement. Petitions may be submitted anytime; however, the petition must be posted on the registry for a minimum of 15 days and no more than 60 days before the Board can render a decision. There is no "typical" timeframe. A decision will be made within the 15 to 60 days of the posting of the petition on the registry.

- 4) **Question:** At its meeting on June 9, the Special Projects Committee recommended that the Board proceed with adding the Jurisprudence Assessment Module of FSBPT as a "test option" for new graduates. Can the Board please provide additional information on this option: Would this option replace the GA Jurisprudence exam available through FSBPT (at a cost for the exam and the testing center)?

**Answer:** The JAM option could potentially replace the current examination; however, this option still in early stages of development and as a result the Board cannot state this with absolute certainty at this time.

- a) **Question:** Will there be other changes in policies related to this requirement, such as time frames that candidates for initial licensure by exam may be eligible to test?

**Answer:** Whenever there is a procedural change, there is typically a policy change. Exam eligibility procedures could potentially change; however, this option is still in early stages of development and as a result the Board cannot state this with absolute certainty at this time.

- b) **Question:** Is this option currently available?

**Answer:** No.

- c) **Question:** If not, does the GA Board develop the module, and what would the expected date of availability be?

**Answer:** As with the current jurisprudence examination, the Board has input on its development and hope to have it available as early as next calendar year.

- d) **Question:** Will this option also be offered to other applicants, such as endorsement and foreign-educated applicants?

**Answer:** Potentially, however, this option is still in early stages of development and as a result the Board cannot state this with absolute certainty at this time.

- 5) **Question:** When is the last date that the Candidate Information Bulletin has been reviewed/updated? This online reference does not have a date indicated, and some of the information seems to be related to the earliest implementation of the exam, when it was given onsite at the Examining Boards Division office.

**Answer:** Thank you for bringing this to our attention as it has not been updated for quite some time. Based on a discussion between the Board Chair and the Executive Director, it was determined that all of the information one would find in the bulletin is located via a link from the Board website to FSBPT site as well as in the Board's FAQs. As a result, the Candidate Information Bulletin has been removed from the website.

- 6) **Question:** Is there any consideration of reviewing the Board Traineeship Reporting Form to ensure that these areas are appropriate to capture clinical performance of trainees, and that each area reflects something that is reasonably measurable by time frames, according to the instructions on the form? Specifically, is it possible to capture one's competence with "minimum competence" (per the form's instructions) in *Cultural Competency* by the "Hours Completed" in this area, or would a more appropriate measure be related to the Trainee's *level of competence* with this skill/competency? I recommend that the Board (or designated Committee) review this and the associated Information Sheets to ensure currency and accuracy of information and required outcomes measures.

**Answer:** There has not been any consideration of altering the measurement of competency at this point. During the meeting it was recommended that this matter be referred to the Special Projects committee for review and discussion. Board Member Mr. Jesse Crews entered a motion, Board Member Mr. William Reid entered a second and the motion carried unanimously to refer this matter to the Special Projects committee for review and discussion.

- 7) **Question:** I'd also like to request that the Board provide reasonable access to prior versions of Policies. Specifically, when a Policy is revised or amended, the date of revision is published on the online Policy document, but there is no way to efficiently determine what the actual change was. For some Policy changes, this information would be extremely helpful for reference and to provide clarity, such as the change to Policy #7 – Continuing Competency – during the 7/21/15 meeting. Could changes be indicated via underline or bold text, such as seen on Policy #3?

**Answer:** Similar to rule revisions, policy revisions can always be found within the minutes and that is how one

can determine exactly what was amended. What is underlined and bolded in policy #3 was for the purpose of emphasis and not specific to a change/revision as is done in the minutes or public rule hearings.

- 8) **Question:** Policy #5 refers to an “alternate supervisor”; is this a recent policy change? If the Board now allows for an alternate supervisor, what is the process of including this information for Board approval during the Traineeship application process?

**Answer:** As referenced within Policy #5, the Board directs you to refer to Board Rule 490-2.04 as it stipulates the requirements of the primary and/or alternate supervisor.

- 9) **Question:** Several of the current Policies (#2, 3, 5) refer to an appointed Board member who is appointed to review applications for approval. I am assuming – based on my experience with the Board and past discussions – that the designated member(s) will be available between meetings to keep the applications processes moving forward and as consistent as possible for all licensure applicants. Is there more than one Board member who is designated for this purpose at any given time, and are there expectations for how this member will support applications processing?

**Answer:** The Board Members wish to remind you that they are appointed by the Governor and do not hold paid position. Board Members are volunteers and with the exception of the consumer member, are required to be gainfully employed within the profession in some capacity. The Board or its members is under no obligation to appoint or serve as Cognizant(s) and the Board may in its discretion reserve all matters until a scheduled board meeting. However, this Board has opted to designate Cognizant Board Members in order to attempt to review files/matters between meetings and hopefully expedite the review process. Cognizant(s) review matters as soon as possible as their schedules permit. There are several members who serve as Cognizant(s); however, they do not all review the same matters. There is a Cognizant for Disciplinary/Complaint Matters and a Cognizant for matters involving Applications. The Cognizant(s) do not serve on either the Rules or Special Project committees. The votes relevant to the designations of Cognizant(s) and/or Committee Members are reflected in the minutes when the vote is made.

- 10) **Question:** Would the Board consider allowing for 10 hours (or some other appropriate assignment) of continuing competency credit for the peer review role of a Trainee Supervisor? The competency assessment conducted by a Traineeship Supervisor requires that they are verifying practice according to the current prevailing practice standards, which seem to qualify as either peer review or serving as a clinical “instructor” or “mentor,” activities which are acceptable toward satisfying continuing competency requirements for license renewal.

**Answer:** Peer review is the evaluation of scientific, academic, or professional work by others working in the same field. Provided that the activity of being a Traineeship Supervisor or a Peer Review is an adjunct responsibility and not the primary employment of the Traineeship Supervisor as stated in Board Rule 490-4-.02(1)(g), licensees could potentially receive CE credit for the Traineeship Supervisor role as it does meet the definition of Peer Review. In other words, if that Traineeship Supervisor’s primary job responsibilities do not include training others, it may work. A Traineeship Supervisor may also receive CE credit for mentorship, referenced in in 490-4-.02 (1)(o), provided that the individual can prove to the Board’s satisfaction that what is being provided is a formal, nonacademic mentorship.

- 11) **Question:** What is the current time frame for meeting minutes to be posted online?

**Answer:** Minutes cannot be posted until they have first been reviewed and voted upon by the Board during a meeting. In example, the meeting minutes from today’s meeting will not be available for the Board to vote upon and accept until the November 17, 2015 meeting. Once the Board reviews, edits and votes to accept the minutes during the November meeting, the minutes will be posted on the website typically within 7-10 business days after the meeting.

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer traineeship competencies discussion to the Special Projects Committee.

#### **Discussion – 2015 FARB Regulatory Law Seminar**

The Regulatory Law Seminar will be held in Denver, CO October 1-4, 2015. The Board accepts the correspondence as information.

#### **Discussion – Application – PT Approval to Perform Dry Needling**

A discussion regarding an application to perform dry needling was held as the discussion had been tabled by the Board at a previous meeting based on the new statutory changes that became effective on July 1, 2015. Ms. Price and Dr. Palma informed the visitors of the application instructions and what it would require. Members of the Board and members of the general public questioned whether or not the application continues to be necessary and feasible. Mr. Joe Donnelly, President of PTAG, explained it was his understanding that the development of this application was two-fold. On the one hand it would allow individuals who had completed 50% of their education in dry needling to perform the techniques on patients as a means to improve their competence and from a regulatory perspective it would notify the Board of which individuals are performing the technique and when their training was completed. Mr. Donnelly remarked that based on the current discussion, the Board would be requiring a 100% of licensees to complete an application that if they are performing dry needling in the state of Georgia and he did not think that was the original

intent of the proposal to develop an application process. He stated that for example, he has been performing dry needling since 2002 and developed competency standards for performance of the technique which is outlined in the current rules and the law and FSBPT has identified the minimum level of competencies for the technique that would be post entry level DPT Education. Mr. Donnelly is wondering if the Board should review the rule to identify the competencies that need to be addressed in Dry Needling courses as he thinks the Board would be going down a slippery slope about an intervention that PTs perform as a part of their practice, that's already in the law and the rules which he feels are very clear with regard to dry needling. Mr. Donnelly requested that the Board revisit this topic before making a decision about the application. Visitor spoke and said that he would be in support of an application from an applicant that has completed 50% of the training for dry needling and the requirement that they will have to complete their training within 6 months or not be allowed to perform dry needling. He thinks the application is a good idea for those who are in training so that the Board can keep track of their training process but he is not in support of requiring all PTs who happen to be performing dry needling as a part of their practice to report since they are already bound by the law and rules. The Board and visitors also discussed the potential for requiring those who practice dry needling to take some continuing education courses in that specialty area.

Ms. Price remarked that although roughly 85% of the educational requirements for dry needling is obtained within a PT's standard curriculum, the Board will want to consider the steps that they take carefully as it relates to their role in protecting the public health, safety and welfare as the acupuncturists has expressed concerns about whether or not the Board is properly identifying those PTs who are performing dry needling and ensuring that those individuals are competent to do so.

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer the Application for Approval to Perform Dry Needling as well as the current dry needling rule to the Rules Committee for further review and discussion and submit proposals to the Board at the next meeting.

#### **Board Rule 490-9-.05 Dry Needling (Proposed Revision)**

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer Board Rule 490-9-.05 to the Rules Committee to review and draft proposed amendments for review by the Board at the next meeting.

#### **Discussion – FSBPT Dry Needling Competencies Final Report**

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer FSBPT Dry Needling Competencies to the Rules Committee to consider while drafting proposed amendments to relevant rules and policies.

#### **Discussion – CAPTE Actions Decisions on Accreditation-July 2015**

The Board accepts the correspondence in reference to CAPTE Actions as information.

#### **Discussion – FSBPT Computer Based Testing Satisfaction Survey Report**

The Board accepts the correspondence in reference to FSBPT computer based testing survey as information.

#### **Discussion – FSBPT Update on PEAT Copyright Violations**

Dr. Palma recommended that those in Education speak to students as it relates to the PEAT Copyright Violations. The Board accepts the correspondence in reference to PEAT Copyright Violations as information.

#### **Discussion – House Bill Addresses State Licensure Barriers to Telemedicine**

The Board accepts the correspondence in reference to the House Bill 3081 and Senate Bill 1778 addressing barriers to Telemedicine as information.

#### **Discussion – International Education Research Foundation (IERF) EvalDirect Option**

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Whitefield seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to allow staff to accept the IERF report in an electronic format.

#### **Discussion – PTA Scope of Practice – Can a PTA perform any treatment during the 8 visits or 21 days prior to discharge or referral to a MD?**

A discussion regarding whether or not a PTA can perform any treatment during the period of 8 visits or 21 days prior to discharge or referral to a MD. Mr. Donnelly expressed to the Board that this topic as it relates to patient self-referral was a part of the discussions and negotiations on the recent legislative changes which took place between PTAG, MAG and GOS, particularly since the PTA has a scope of work that is identified by the PT scope of practice. He remarked that the new statute indicates what areas of practice that they wanted the PTA to be involved in and that the PT is always 100% responsible because of the improved patient management expectations that we currently have in the laws which is relative to the knowledge, skills, and abilities a PT has to assess of the PTA to provide care for the patients. He reported that those involved in the negotiations initially had that PTAs couldn't be involved but now because of the patient-client management expectations that are in the law they have stepped away from that and said, yes, the PT should be able to make that decision regarding what part of the interventions would be provided by the PTA for their patients even in light of the 21 day restriction.

Ms. Capps noted to the Board that Policy 17 refers to PTAs and care communication.

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer the correspondence regarding whether or not a PTA can perform any treatment during the 8 visits or 21 days prior to discharge or referral to a MD along with Policy #17 to the Special Projects Committee for further discussion and to determine if any clarifying statements should be entered into the rules or policies on this subject.

#### **Petition for Rule Variance –Galloway, Kristen Richards**

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to table the review of the petition for rule variance of Board Rule 409-2-.09 (2)(b) for review of the application in Executive Session.

#### **Petition for Rule Waiver Request – Desai, Mausami**

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to grant the petition for rule waiver 490-2-.03 (1)(g)

#### **Rules Committee Discussion**

No committee meeting took place since the date of the last board meeting. No report was presented.

#### **Special Projects Committee Discussion**

No committee meeting took place since the date of the last board meeting. No report was presented.

#### **Executive Director Report – A. Price**

Ms. Price presented the Board with statistical data relevant to the processing of applications, renewals and complaints/compliance. Ms. Price provided the Board with an update on the current number of Georgia licensees who have registered in the aPTitude CE tracking system. She also presented the Board with possible ways the Board can improve its overall ratings in the Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy (FSBPT). One of the ways would be to provide FSBPT with the licensure data file to be inputted into the Exam, Licensure and Discipline Database (ELDD) and to notify them of new discipline going forward. Ms. Price informed the Board of the FSBPT NPTE Eligibility Appeals Process Webinar the staff attended on August 25, 2015. She also provided the Board with an update on the number of states that allow direct access for PT and indicated that of the states that responded, there was no mention of insurance companies that did not cover the services. Ms. Price also shared that National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) is currently conducting a compliance audit on the Board, that a response to the audit has been submitted on behalf of the Board and that she is presently awaiting response from NPDB regarding the outcome of the audit.

Mr. Donnelly asked should the licensees continue to upload all of their C.E. in aPTitude or should they stop the uploading process at the point of notification that they have reached the required hours? Ms. Price answered by stating that the licensee may upload all of their C.E. into aPTitude to house as many as they please; however, the staff will only audit that which is required by this Board. Dr. Palma stated that it would be very helpful to use it as a repository for all of their C.E. documents in order to keep track of them. Mr. Donnelly asked if it would be helpful for PTAG to send out a correspondence to all the licensees regarding the new laws and the aPTitude process. Dr. Palma answered that it would be very helpful if PTAG sent out correspondences in addition to what the Staff sends out and welcomes any help in notifying the public of any actions made; however, it is still the public/licensee's responsibility to stay updated with the current laws and rules. The Board accepted the Executive Director's Report as presented.

#### **Board's Chairperson Report – S. Palma**

Dr. Palma indicated that she has no report to present at this time.

#### **Miscellaneous Discussions**

##### **1) 2016 Board Meeting Dates**

Mr. Lawson motioned, Mr. Whitefield seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to post the 2016 Board Meeting Dates.

##### **2) David H. Erickson - [www.keepingyouinformed.com](http://www.keepingyouinformed.com)**

The Board and visitors entered into a discussion about various CE companies that falsely advertise that their courses will meet the Georgia requirements. It was the consensus of the Board that CE companies do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Board; however, if it is brought to their attention that a particularly company is misleading licensees, the Board will consider the information and respond accordingly.

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to send a letter of concern regarding misleading advertisement, as it relates to Georgia CE requirements, to [www.keepingyouinformed.com](http://www.keepingyouinformed.com).

##### **3) Ms. Capps remarked that she is one who has taken the FSBPT Jurisprudence Examination and could potentially use it to receive CE credit and requested clarification as to how that will work with aPTitude. Ms. Price responded that initially, the licensee was required to contact FSBPT and obtain a copy of their score report to load into aPTitude after first ensuring that the test was not**

the one they used to gain licensure but an additional test. She informed those present that now, FSBPT is going to enter a notation into aPTitude which reflects that the individual has taken the examination for CE credit and the hours will be tallied accordingly. Dr. Palma remarked that it may be helpful to clarify or add more specific language to the rules or policies as it relates to the jurisprudence requirement.

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer Policy #13 to the Special Projects Committee to review the language relating to the Georgia Law and Ethics Examination.

**4) New Board Rule 490-9-.06 – Animal Rehabilitation**  
490-9-.06 Animal Rehabilitation

(1) A physical therapist practicing under this subsection shall be held to the standard of care for physical therapists and veterinarians as set forth in Georgia Rules and Regulations Chapter 490 and Chapter 700.

(2) A physical therapist licensed in the state of Georgia may accept a referral for physical therapy services from a veterinarian who holds a valid license in the state of Georgia under the following conditions:

(A) The referral must be received in writing from a veterinarian licensed in the state of Georgia who has established a valid veterinary-client-patient relationship (VCPR) in accordance with the law and rules of the Georgia State Board of Veterinary Medicine; and,

(B) The patient record must include documented evidence of consultation with the referring veterinarian and specify the treatment or therapy to be provided by the physical therapist.

(3) At the time of license renewal, each licensed physical therapist shall certify to the Board that he/she has completed the continuing competence hours required for license renewal and whether he/she has practiced animal rehabilitation within the biennium.

(4) Physical therapists practicing animal rehabilitation in this state must obtain a minimum of seven (7) clock hours of continuing competence relevant to the practice of animal rehabilitation. Such hours may be used toward satisfying the thirty (30) hours of continuing competence required per biennium.

(5) A failure to disclose the practice of animal rehabilitation or meet the continuing competence hours required is grounds for disciplinary action as determined by the Board.

**Authority: O.C.G.A. §§ 43-1-19, 43-33-3, 43-33-10, 43-33-18, 43-50-3.**

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to refer the proposed amendment to Board Rule 490-9-.06 to the Attorney General's Office for a memorandum of authority and if no objections noted, vote to post.

The Board discussed the economic impact of Board Rule 490-9-.06 upon the licensee. Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion that the formulation and adoption of this rule does not impose excessive regulatory cost on any licensee and any cost to comply with the proposed rule cannot be reduced by a less expensive alternative.

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion that it is not legal or feasible to meet the objectives of O.C.G.A. §§ 43-1-25, 43-24A-19(2), and 43-24A-3(4) to adopt or implement differing actions for businesses as listed in O.C.G.A. § 50-13-4(3)(A), (B), (C), and (D). The formulation and adoption of these rules will impact every licensee in the same manner and each licensee is independently licensed in the field of Physical Therapy.

**FSBPT Leadership Issues Forum Update**

Ms. Price shared with the Board that Dorothy Gaskin had recently attended the FSBPT Leadership Issues Forum and due to her absence, Ms. Gaskin forwarded a summary of the topics which were discussed:

- a) Licensure Compact – FSBPT is ready to start rollout in various states during the 2016 legislative session. States must have 4 things to participate – continuing competence requirements, criminal background checks, full participation in ELDD, & use NPTE. It was suggested that state PT Chapters & the Boards may need to work together if they are in favor of compact participation and that the first ten (10) states that pass the legislation will like get to write the rules for the compact.
- b) NPTE Eligibility Limits for the NPTE - As was discussed in the Executive Director's Report
- c) Minimum Data Set (MDS)
- d) Course Tool (CWT) 6 – FSBPT is rolling out this CWT soon and it will include an increase of clinical hours from 800 to 1200; however, they are still gathering data on how the CWT is being used within different organizations.

- e) Dry Needling Competencies – Based on a job analysis conducted by an outside agency, it was determined that 86% of the knowledge and skills necessary to perform dry needling is completed within an entry level PT program and remaining 14% occurs within specialized training.
- f) Supreme Court vs. NC Dental Board Aftermath – It was suggested that the Boards begin to look at the type of oversight it has and if there is a system in place that will allow for modifications to or vetoing of some decisions.
- g) Exam, Licensure, Disciplinary Database (ELDD) – As was discussed in the Executive Director’s Report
- h) Continuing Competence – There is an ongoing discussion about new and improved tools, practice tools and assessment modules and how it should be measured.
- i) Public Awareness – There was a discussion about how well or how poorly information is disseminated to the public as to how to identify a good or bad PT/PTA and if the public has enough knowledge to report any problems.

The Board accepts the summary of Ms. Gaskin’s participation in the FSBPT Leadership Issues Forum as read by Ms. Price.

**Mr. Whitefield made the motion, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted to enter into Executive Session in accordance with O.C.G.A. §43-1-19(h)(2) and §43-1-2(k) to deliberate and to receive information on applications, investigative reports and the Assistant Attorney General’s report. Voting in favor of the motion were Stefanie Palma, Chad Whitefield, Charles Bass, Jesse Crews, and Reid Lawson.**

**At the conclusion of Executive Session on Tuesday, September 22, 2015 Dr. Palma declared the meeting to be “open” pursuant to the Open and Public Meeting Act O.C.G.A. § 50-14-1 et seq. No votes were obtained during Executive Session.**

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### Executive Session Minutes

#### 1) **July 21, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Crews motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the July 21, 2015 open session minutes.

#### 2) **September 1, 2015 Teleconference Minutes**

Mr. Whitefield motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the September 1, 2015 open session minutes as amended. Mr. Crews abstained from voting.

### Attorney General’s Report- D. Williams-McNeely

Mr. Lawson motioned, Mr. Bass seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to accept the Attorney General’s report as presented.

### Cognizant’s Report – C. Whitefield

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to accept the following recommendations made in Executive Session:

- PT150005 Schedule for Investigative Interview
- PT150006 Close the case with a referral to the Department of Health and Human Services to follow up on allegations of Medicaid Fraudulent Billing practice and release of complaint information if requested.
- PT150016 Close case, no action
- PT150019 Place a hold on the respondent license to prevent future renewals for failure to disclose information and flag for CE audit.
- PT160004 Send a letter of concern to the corporate office addressing the concerns regarding advertising.

### Executive Discussions

#### 1) **L.A.R. Request for Extension**

Mr. Lawson motioned, Mr. Bass seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to deny the extension request.

#### 2) **C.S.B. Violation of Board Order**

Mr. Lawson motioned, Mr. Bass seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to close the case with a letter of concern regarding compliance.

### Applications

Mr. Bass motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to accept the following recommendations made in Executive Session:

- 1) K.R.G. Issue the license by examination.
- 2) P.D.M. Issue the license.
- 3) D.L.C. Issue the license with a letter of concern regarding criminal history. Dr. Palma abstained from voting.
- 4) A.R.D. Issue the license.
- 5) B.T.D. Issue the license with a letter of concern regarding criminal history and failure to disclose

- information regarding criminal history.
- 6) K.R.H. Renew the license with a letter of concern regarding alcohol history.
  - 7) R.D.K. Refer to the Attorney General's office for a Private Consent Agreement for Licensure to include 1 year probation, random drug screenings, and to report any arrests within 10 business days of the incident. Issue the license.
  - 8) J.C.M. Issue the license.
  - 9) B.L.S. Issue the license with a letter of concern regarding criminal history.
  - 10) A.J.M. Issue the license.
  - 11) P.C.L. Issue the license upon completion of 480 hour traineeship
  - 12) D.F.N-W Deny the request to sit for the NPTE and recommend the applicant return to school to complete a physical therapy educational program approved by CAPTE.
  - 13) D.A.P. Approved the remediation plan and suggests the applicant consider requesting special accommodations for testing based on the medical diagnosis.
  - 14) J.L.R. Approve the remediation plan.
  - 15) J.A.S. Approve for reinstatement.
  - 16) I.J.A. Approve the traineeship.
  - 17) C.H.E. Approve the traineeship.
  - 18) L.H.K. Issue the license.

**Petition for Rule Variance –Galloway, Kristen Richards**

Mr. Lawson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to deny the petition for rule variance of Board Rule 409-2-.09 (2)(b) due to insufficient evidence to substantiate a hardship.

**Miscellaneous**

Mr. Lawson motioned, Mr. Crews seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to grant permission to the Board Chair and Executive Director to generate a formal letter to the Page Law Firm regarding their concerns about the applicants they represent and the application process.

Dr. Palma mentioned to everyone that she will be attending the PTAG Meeting from October 9, 2015 to October 11, 2015 as well as the FSBPT Annual Meeting from October 13, 2015 to October 18, 2015 and will report back to the Board at the next meeting.

**Adjournment**- With no additional business to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

<b>Minutes recorded by:</b>	Tamara Elliott, Board Support Specialist
<b>Minutes reviewed and edited by:</b>	Kathy Osier, Licensing Supervisor and Adrienne Price, Executive Director
<b>Minutes approved on:</b>	November 17, 2015

**STEFANIE PALMA**  
**BOARD PRESIDENT**

**ADRIENNE PRICE**  
**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**