

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL LICENSING  
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY  
DISCIPLINARY SUBCOMMITTEE

In the Matter of

THERESA JOAN ANDERSON-VARNEY, PH.D.  
License Number: 63-01-007309

File Number: 63-15-138075

ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLAINT

The Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (Complainant) by Kim Gaedeke, Director, Bureau of Professional Licensing, files this Complaint against Theresa Joan Anderson-Varney, Ph.D. (Respondent) as follows:

1. The Michigan Board of Psychology (Board) is an administrative agency established by the Public Health Code, MCL 333.1101 et seq. Pursuant to section 16226 of the Public Health Code, supra, the Board's Disciplinary Subcommittee is empowered to discipline licensees for violations of the Public Health Code.
2. Respondent is licensed to practice as a psychologist in the state of Michigan.
3. "Good moral character" is defined at Section 1 of 1974 PA 381, as amended; MCL 338.41 et seq., as the propensity on the part of the person to serve the public in the licensed area in a fair, honest and open manner.

4. At all relevant times, Respondent was engaged in private practice as the owner of Theresa J. Anderson-Varney, Ph.D. (facility) in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

5. From August 22, 2007, to July 1, 2011, Respondent provided psychotherapy services to client S.M. (initials are used throughout to protect the patient's identity) for the diagnoses of "Generalized Anxiety Disorder" and "Depression." Throughout the duration of Respondent's treatment of client S.M. the following events occurred:

- a) Respondent failed to document client S.M.'s diagnoses in the progress notes;
- b) Respondent failed to obtain a complete psychological/social history that would justify client S.M.'s diagnoses;
- c) Respondent failed to provide a treatment plan individualized and specific for client S.M. signed by Respondent and client S.M.;
- d) Respondent's excessive use of therapy built a dependency upon therapy, rather than building toward the necessary independence of client S.M.;
- e) Respondent's progress notes did not justify the frequency of services provided to client S.M.; and
- f) The frequency and duration of Respondent's psychotherapy sessions were unusual, unnecessary, and unproductive. For example:
  - i. From December 2, 2010, to December 27, 2010, Respondent saw client S.M. 16 times almost consecutively and the sessions ranged from 50 to 120 minutes; and

- ii. From January 3, 2011, to January 27, 2011, Respondent saw client S.M. 12 times almost consecutively and the sessions ranged from 50 to 120 minutes.

Client S.M. saw another psychologist, who after several sessions, determined that client S.M. did not need counseling/therapy and there was no need for further therapy. Consequently, client S.M. ended her treatment with Respondent.

6. On January 14, 2016, during an interview with Complainant's investigator, Respondent admitted that she does not normally write or type out any of her client treatment plans and have a copy placed in the clients' file.

#### COUNT I

Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, evidences a violation of general duty, consisting of negligence or failure to exercise due care, including negligent delegation to or supervision of employees or other individuals, whether or not injury results, in violation of section 16221(a) of the Public Health Code, supra.

#### COUNT II

Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, evidences a departure from, or failure to conform to, minimal standards of acceptable and prevailing practice for the health profession, whether or not actual injury to an individual occurs, in violation of section 16221(b)(i) of the Public Health Code, supra.

### COUNT III

Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, evidences a lack of good moral character, in violation of section 16221(b)(vi) of the Public Health Code, supra.


Complainant requests that this Complaint be served upon Respondent and that Respondent be offered an opportunity to show compliance with all lawful requirements for retention of the license. If compliance is not shown, Complainant further requests that formal proceedings be commenced pursuant to the Public Health Code, rules promulgated thereunder, and the Administrative Procedures Act of 1969, MCL 24.201 et seq.

Pursuant to section 16231(8) of the Public Health Code, supra, Respondent has 30 days from the date of receipt of this Complaint to submit a written response to the allegations contained herein. The written response shall be submitted to Complainant, Kim Gaedeke, Director, Bureau of Professional Licensing, Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, P.O. Box 30670, Lansing, MI 48909.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Pursuant to section 16231(9) of the Public Health Code, supra, Respondent's failure to submit a written response within 30 days, as noted above, shall be treated as an admission of the allegations contained herein and shall result in transmittal of this Complaint directly to the Board's Disciplinary Subcommittee for imposition of an appropriate sanction.

Dated: 08/19/2016

  
Kim Gaedeke, Director  
Bureau of Professional Licensing

This is the final page of an Administrative Complaint in the matter of Theresa Joan Anderson-Varney, Ph.D., File Number 63-15-138075 before the Disciplinary Subcommittee of the Michigan Board of Psychology, consisting of five pages, this page included.

LFM