

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY – Administration

1625 N. Market Blvd., Suite N-215, Sacramento, CA 95834 P 916.574.7720 F 916.574.8672 www.psychology.ca.gov



5 **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

6 7 8 9

California State Capitol 1315 10th Street Room 112 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 324-0333

12 13 14

11

Thursday, February 26, 2015

15 16

Michael Erickson, PhD, Board President called the open session meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.

17 18 19

Members Present:

20 Michael Erickson, PhD, President 21 Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President 22 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member 23 Johanna Arias-Bhatia, Public Member 24 Miguel Gallardo, PsyD 25 Andrew Harlem, PhD 26 Jacqueline Horn, PhD Stephen Phillips, PsyD 27

Linda Starr, Public Member

28 29

30

48

Others Present:

31 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer 32 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager 33 Karen Johnson, Licensing Coordinator 34 Jonathan Burke, Administrative Coordinator 35 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel 36 Kurt Heppler, DCA Legal Counsel 37 Julie Hayden, PsyD, Southern California Seminary 38 39 Raymond J. Trybus, PhD, Walden University, San Diego Psychological 40 Association Penelope McAlmond-Ross, PsyD, Sacramento Valley Psychological Association 41 Talia Cortese, Center for Public Interest Law 42 Shawn McCall, PsyD, San Francisco Psychological Association, Santa Clara 43 44 County 45 Jorge Wong, PhD, California Psychological Association, San Francisco Psychological Association 46 Pamela McCrory, PhD, Los Angeles County Psychological Association 47

Jo Linder-Crow, PhD, California Psychological Association

19	LeOndra Clark Harvey, PhD, Assembly Business and Professions Committee
50	Melodie Schaefer, PsyD, California Psychological Association Division I, II,
51	California Psychology Internship Council
52	Rachel Later, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
53	Marilyn Immoos, PhD, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
54	Corey Scheidegger, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
55	Dana Nussbaum, PhD
56	Beth Cooper Tabakin, PhD
57	Leslie Lessenger, PhD, Napa-Solano Psychological Association
58	Bruce M. Gale, PhD, Los Angeles County Psychological Association
59	Bruce W. Ebert, PhD, JD, Center of MH Law and Ethics
50	Tom Tobin, PhD, Pacific Forensic Psychological Association

Agenda Item #2: President's Welcome

Dr. Erickson welcomed the public, Board members, and Board staff to the California State Capitol and thanked everyone for their attendance.

Agenda Item #3: Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

No public comments were received.

Agenda Item #4: Approval of Minutes: November 20-21, 2014, Board Meeting

It was M(Erickson)/S(Starr)/C to approve the minutes.

Vote: 7 aye (Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay. (2 Members not present).

Agenda Item #5: Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2015, Board Meeting

Dr. Horn pointed out a statement on page 7, lines 15-16 regarding the Executive Officer's duty statement and asked that it be removed.

It was M(Horn)/S(Arias-Bhatia)/C to approve the minutes as amended.

Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.

Agenda Item #6: Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) Task Force Report

Ms. Arias Bhatia referred to the items that were provided in the Board packets and summarized the three motions that were passed during the meeting on January 26th, 2015. The motions passed were: 1) that any licensure bill will contain an exemption for psychologists and their supervisees, 2) that any licensure bill exclude diagnosis in the ABA practitioner scope of practice, and 3) that it be communicated that ABA is within the scope of practice for licensed psychologists. In addition, a fourth motion was passed

- for the staff to make a report on the potential impact to the Board of housing ABA. Ms. 96
- 97 Arias-Bhatia referred to the hand carry fiscal analysis that elaborated on the impact.
- 98 Dr. Horn asked about the fiscal IT impact and if the expenditure and revenue would
- 99 even out. Mr. Burke explained that the IT cost would be a one-time fee and that the
- expenditure and revenue would even out as time progresses. 100
- 101 Ms. Sorrick stated that the fiscal analysis was to be included in the legislative analysis
- 102 when the bill was proposed.
- 103 Ms. Jones asked if there was any update from Senator Bates's office regarding
- 104 legislation. Ms. Sorrick stated that the Board heard from Senator Bates' office that this
- 105 will be a bill and asked Dr. Linder-Crow for more information.
- 106 Dr. Linder-Crow stated there is no bill yet, but CPA's Director of Government Affairs has
- 107 provided language that was agreed upon at the meeting. She stated that the language
- 108 will not be seen until after the deadline which is Friday, February 27, 2015.

109 Agenda Item #7: CLOSED SESSION

- 110 The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to
- discuss and vote on disciplinary matters including stipulations and proposed decisions, 111
- 112 and pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(e)(1) to discuss pending litigation
- 113 (Weiss v. Board of Psychology, Case No. CPF-14-514011)

114

Return to Open Session

115 116

- Dr. Erickson called the meeting back to order and invited Dr. Horn to present the 117 Licensing Committee report.
- 118

119

Agenda Item #8: Presentation of Licensing Committee Report and Consideration 120 121 of Committee Recommendations - Horn

122

Dr. Horn provided a summary of the Licensing Committee's meeting.

123 124

a) Application Report

125 126 127

Dr. Horn referred the Board to the application report provided in the Board packets.

128

129 b) Examination Report

130

131 Dr. Horn referred the Board to the examination report and statistics for the examinations 132 provided in the Board packets.

133

134 c) Renewal Report

135

136 Dr. Horn referred the Board to the renewal report provided in the Board packet.

138	a) Continuing Education Report
140 141	Dr. Horn referred to the Continuing Education (CE) report regarding audits and compliance provided in the Board packets.
142 143 144	e) Discussion and Consideration of Comments to Association of State and Provincial Psychology Board (ASPPB) Draft Supervision Guidelines
145 146 147	Dr. Horn referred to the guidelines provided in the Board packets and stated that ASPPB is looking for comments from the Board.
148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155	Dr. Harlem discussed issues surrounding the guidelines of supervisors personally observing a videotaped or live session in supervision settings and the mechanics of how videotaping sessions takes place. In addition, he addressed patient dignity and the intrusiveness of a video recording device during a session. Dr. Harlem also stated that almost all facilities do not have the necessary means to protect patient dignity during a videotaped session. He also stated that the Board should not assume that videotaping would facilitate better services.
156 157 158 159 160	Dr. Harlem stated that the guidelines for allowing payment of supervision at the postdoctoral level may be a good idea from a consumer protection standpoint. He added that he believes quality supervision is vital for quality consumer protection and services.
161 162	Dr. Horn said that the Committee will be reviewing the Draft Guidelines at its next meeting.
163 164 165 166	f) Licensing Action Plan – Proposed Improvements to the Licensing Process – Update
167	Dr. Horn referred to the Licensing Action Plan provided in the Board packets.
168 169 170	g) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda
170 171 172	No public comment was received.
173 174 175	It was M(Horn)/S(Phillips)/C that the Board approve the Licensing Committee's recommendations on items A through G.
176 177 178	Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.
178 179 180	h) Licensing Committee Report on Closed Session Items

181 (1) Request from N.P. for an extension of the 30-consecutive month requirement to accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional experience pursuant 182 183 to section 1387(a) of the California Code of Regulations. 184 Dr. Horn summarized NP's request for an extension of the 30-consecutive month 185 186 requirement to accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional 187 experience. She stated that the Licensing Committee recommends that the Board 188 approve N.P.'s request for the extension. 189 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to approve N.P.'s request for an extension of the 30-consecutive month requirement. 190 Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, 191 192 Acquave-Baddoo) – 0 nav. (2) Request from A.M. for an extension of the 30-consecutive month requirement to 193 194 accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional experience pursuant 195 to section 1387(a) of the California Code of Regulations. 196 Dr. Horn summarized A.M.'s request for an extension of the 30-consecutive month 197 198 requirement to accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional 199 experience. She stated that the Licensing Committee recommends that the Board 200 approve A.M.'s request for the extension. 201 It was M(Horn)/S(Phillips)/C to approve A.M.'s request for an extension of the 30-202 consecutive month requirement. 203 Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, 204 Acquaye-Baddoo) - 0 nay. (3) Request from J.M. for an extension of the 30-consecutive month requirement to 205 accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional experience pursuant 206 to section 1387(a) of the California Code of Regulations. 207 208 209 Dr. Horn summarized J.M.'s request for an extension of the 30-consecutive month 210 requirement to accrue 1500 hours of post-doctoral supervised professional 211 experience. She stated the Licensing Committee recommends that the Board 212 approve J.M.'s request for the extension. 213 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to approve the extension of the 30-214 consecutive month requirement. 215 Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, 216 Acquave-Baddoo) - 0 nay.

218 219	(4) Request from S.M. for an exception from the Continuing Education requirements pursuant to section 1397.62(b) of the California Code of Regulations.
220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227	Dr. Horn summarized S.M.'s request for an exception from the CE requirements. She indicated that in order to qualify for an exception, the licensee must not be engaged in the direct delivery of mental health services, there must be an absence of available CE courses relevant to the specific area of practice, and the coursework submitted to fulfill the CE requirements must be acceptable. She stated that S.M. received the required CE hours in other ways, mostly pedagogical, and reported that the Licensing Committee recommends approving the exception.
228	It was M(Horn)/S(Phillips) to approve the exemption from the CE requirements.
229 230 231 232 233	Dr. Harlem questioned the evidence behind the claim that CE courses are unavailable regarding teaching neuroscience and psychology. Dr. Horn stated that she appreciates Dr. Harlem's concerns, but stated that S.M. is teaching neuroscience rather than neuropsychology, therefore, the CE courses in neuroscience appear sufficient.
234 235	Dr. Gallardo stated that this person's CE hours appear to relate more to being a professor rather than a licensee of the Board.
236 237 238	Dr. Phillips stated that the scope of a license does not have to relate only to mental health practices, but also neuroscience and other areas of the practice of psychology.
239 240	Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that this person does not appear to be practicing psychology as it applies to her understanding of the scope of practice.
241 242 243	Dr. Gallardo pointed out that although S.M. does not provide therapy, he or she could start practicing psychology at any moment. He stated that this is problematic when he or she has not taken proper CE courses related to that kind of practice.
244 245	Dr. Harlem also pointed out that by granting this person the license exception, the Board is assuming that he or she is up to date with laws and regulations.
246 247	Dr. Horn amended her motion to state that the Board will contact S.M to receive more information regarding this person's profession.
248 249 250 251	It was M(Horn)/S(Phillips)/C to contact this person to get more information about two specific areas: 1) clarification regarding the nature of S.M.'s profession; and 2) the unavailability of CE courses in S.M.'s specific area of practice, and to bring back issue to the full Board.
252253	Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.

254255 Agenda Item #9: Introduction of Licensing Staff

Ms. Johnson introduced the following Licensing staff including Annette Parino, Audrey Watkins, Liezel Isadore, Julie Brown, Molly Olson, Kelli Okuma, and Tammey Bailey.

Dr. Erickson thanked all of the Licensing staff for their work and commended them on their turnaround of the licensing timeframes.

<u>Agenda Item #10: Overview of Sunset Review Process – Le Ondra Clark, PhD, Chief Consultant, Assembly Committee on Business and Professions)</u>

Dr. Erickson invited Dr. Clark to speak about the sunset review process.

Dr. Clark stated that about every four (4) years, the Committee reviews all entities under DCA. She added that hearings for each board are scheduled in March. During the hearing, four or five issues are addressed with the Board President and/or Executive Officer. After the hearing, the Board has 30 days to address issues addressed in the background paper before reporting to either the Senate or Assembly. In addition, she stated that statutory changes are also addressed in the sunset legislation.

Ms. Jones asked how it is decided to which branch of the legislature the report after 30 days is sent. Dr. Clark stated that there is no formula, but consultants on the Committee and the House chairpersons provide input.

Dr. Erickson thanked Dr. Clark for her overview and presentation.

<u>Agenda Item #11: Overview of the Legislative and Regulatory Process – Justin Paddock, Assistant Deputy Director, Legislative and Policy Review Division, Department of Consumer Affairs</u>

Dr. Erickson invited Mr. Paddock to speak. Mr. Paddock provided an overview of a board's role in the legislative and regulatory process. He stated that statutory changes are a lot of work and require Board approved language the autumn before the session where it is planned to be introduced. Technical changes to a Practice Act are most easily made during the Sunset Review process. The Board may also adopt formal positions on proposed legislation and lobby legislators, provide technical guidance, and Committee testimony. Regulatory changes are simpler, but require compliance with

- 293 Office of Administrative Law (OAL) standards.
- 294 Mr. Paddock asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board Members.
- 295 Dr. Erickson thanked Mr. Paddock for his presentation.
- 296 Agenda Item #12: Presentation of Policy and Advocacy Committee Report;
- 297 <u>Consideration of Committee Recommendations Jones</u>

Ms. Jones provided a summary of the Policy and Advocacy Committee's meeting.

a) Legislation Update and Review; Recommendations to Full Board

1) Exempt Settings Legislative Proposal (Business and Professions Code Sections 2909, 2909.5, 2910)

Mr. Jones summarized the bill and reported that the language in the bill was approved by the Board in August. She indicated that it has since been submitted to Legislative Counsel and is being authored by Assemblymember Susan Eggman. She stated that the bill was introduced on February 25th as AB 705.

Ms. Jones stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is recommending that the Board adopt a Support position for this bill.

2) Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Proposal Regarding Submission of Supervised Professional Experience (Business and Professions Code Section 2914(g))

Ms. Jones summarized the bill and reported that this item concerns the Board's Omnibus bill proposal for the Senate B&P Committee. She stated that it was accepted by the Senate B&P Committee.

Ms. Jones stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is recommending that the Board adopt a Support position for this bill.

 Submission of Supervised Professional Experience Legislative Proposal (Business and Professions Code Section 2914(c))

Ms. Jones summarized the proposal and stated that it was deemed too substantial for the Omnibus legislation by the Senate B&P Committee. Therefore, the Board turned it into a legislative proposal that was submitted to Legislative Counsel before the deadline by Assemblymember Catherine Baker.

Ms. Jones stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is recommending that the Board adopt a Support position for this bill once it is introduced contingent upon it being introduced as it was approved by the Board and submitted to the author.

4) Discussion and Consideration of Business and Professions Code Section 2903 - Licensure Requirement; Practice of Psychology; Psychotherapy; Fee

Ms. Jones stated that Legal Counsel expressed concern with the language that was approved by the Board at the January meeting. She referred to the new proposed language provided in the meeting packets.

Ms. Jones stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is recommending that the Board approve the proposed language as written and to give staff the authority to seek a legislative change.

5) Expiration of License/Birth Date Renewal Legislative Proposal (Business and Professions Code Section 2982)

Ms. Jones summarized the proposal and stated that it had been introduced by Assemblymember Catherine Baker as AB 773.

Ms. Jones stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is recommending that the Board adopt a Support position for this bill once it is introduced contingent upon it being introduced as it was approved by the Board and submitted to the author.

6) SB 128 (Wolk) - End of Life

Ms. Jones reported that the Board staff began watching this bill because it is based on the Death with Dignity Law that is in place in the state of Oregon that allows a licensed psychologist to counsel a person wishing to end his or her life and determine if he or she is competent to make the decision. She indicated that no position is required because the legislation does not directly impact psychologists. Board staff will continue to Watch this bill.

7) AB 2198 (Levine) - Suicide Prevention - Update

Ms. Jones summarized the history of AB 2198 from the previous legislative session. She stated that some of the surveys the Board distributed were returned and collected. She indicated that Dr. Linder-Crow offered CPA's assistance in distributing the surveys and collecting additional responses. Dr. Gallardo asked what kind of action the Board needs to take to meet the issues raised in the Governor's veto letter. Ms. Jones responded that the Committee is going to work with the other stakeholders and interested parties in formulating a response to the Governor's veto message. Mr. Burke stated that the Board is collecting data to show whether suicide prevention is already being taught and will be continually providing this information to the Board. Public comment was then requested.

Mr. Gordon Dowdy thanked and applauded the Board for taking action, as well as the Board of Behavioral Sciences. He stated that the responses to the survey appeared to show gaps and inconsistency. He pointed out that those advocates of suicide awareness and supporters of AB 2198 (Levine) were left out of the discussion.

Victor Ojakian asked how many questions the Board asks on examinations for licensure regarding suicide prevention. He also asked about the progress on the work group/task force and what the Board will do with the list of coursework that has been collected. He pointed out that the suicide rates have been increasing and it is a huge public health problem. In addition, he pointed out that he refers people who are at risk for committing suicide to psychologists and that these psychologists should be highly competent.

Craig Lomax thanked the Board for their work and following through with a survey. In his own experience, he has come across numerous mental health practitioners, some of whom were competent and others not. He asked if the Board knows whether the psychologists are competent at the point of licensing. Dr. Tabackin suggested programs that start suicide awareness and prevention in schools from the beginning.

b) Update regarding the California Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) and Mandated Reporting – Penal Code Sections 261.5, 288, and 11165.1

Ms. Jones provided a summary of the Policy and Advocacy Committee CANRA report. The item was informational and no action was requested.

c) Regulation Update, and Review; Recommendations to Full Board

1) Title 16, CCR, Section 1397.12 – Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abuse and Disciplinary Guidelines

Ms. Jones provided a summary of the Policy and Advocacy Committee Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abuse and Disciplinary Guidelines report. The item was informational and no action was requested.

2) Title 16, CCR, Sections 1388, 1388.6, 1389, 1392 – Examinations, License Requirements and Waiver of Exemption, Reconsideration of Examinations, Psychologists Fees

Ms. Jones provided a summary of the Policy and Advocacy Committee Examinations regulation. The item was informational and no action was requested.

3) Title 16, CCR, Sections 1397.60, 1397.61, 1397.62, 1397.67 – Definitions, Continuing Education Requirements, Continuing Education Exemptions and Exceptions, Renewal after Inactive or Delinquent Status

- Dr. Erickson invited public comment and testimony regarding the continuing education regulatory changes.
- 431 Mr. Heppler gave a brief overview of the modification of regulations process and how
- the public comments have been and will be handled. He stated that the Board would
- need a motion to reconsider the proposal if the Board wishes to do so.
- Dr. Horn argued in favor of the motion of reconsideration due to public comment and
- concern. She welcomed public comment and expressed appreciation for it.

- 436 Dr. Gallardo expressed concern for public comment that is being provided now rather
- 437 than having it being provided along the way. He pointed out that the Board has been
- 438 transparent in the process and some of the comments have demonstrated a lack of
- knowledge as to what the proposed regulation actually does.
- Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that people should have been aware of the proposal. She
- stated that reconsidering would be wise because the process has led to this.
- It was M(Phillips)/S(Harlem)/C for reconsideration of the vote in the November meeting
- to move forward with the regulations.
- Dr. Harlem expressed agreement with Dr. Gallardo. He stated that this project is very
- ambitious and that it is a major culture change.
- 446 Ms. Jones expressed agreement with Dr. Gallardo. She pointed out that not everyone
- 447 will agree with monumental change, and the Board should respect comments while also
- 448 respecting the Board's work.
- Ms. Arias-Bhatia stated that she views this situation as a part of the process.
- Dr. Phillips stated that some of the reaction has made it appear as if the Board has
- attempted subterfuge against the public and its licensee population. He added that he
- 452 thinks that some legitimate concerns were raised, as well as many others that are
- 453 unrelated.
- 454 Ms. Starr and Dr. Erickson expressed agreement with the other Board members.
- 455 Dr. Linder-Crow urged the Board to reconsider and allow public comment on the
- 456 quidelines.
- Dr. Immoos thanked the Committee for their work, but supports reconsideration.
- Dr. Schaefer thanked the Board for their work and supports the reconsideration.
- Dr. Heibert strongly supports the Board voting yes on this motion.
- Dr. McCall stated that he supports the motion for reconsideration.
- Dr. Wong stated that he supports the motion for reconsideration.
- Dr. Trybus stated that he supports the motion to reconsider.
- Dr. McCrory stated that she supports the motion to reconsider.
- Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr,
- 465 Acquaye-Baddoo) 0 nay.
- Discussion ensued. Members of the public commented on the proposed regulations.

- Dr. Linder-Crow stated that she wanted to let the Board know that many positive
- 468 messages were provided to CPA. Many individuals thanked the Board for allowing
- comments and for paying attention to concerns that have been raised. She stated that
- 470 there is confusion about what people are reading. She stated that there needs to be a
- lot of education after any regulatory change. There is lack of clarity in some aspects of
- 472 the proposal and she suggested clarifying these aspects during discussion and through
- 473 outreach.
- Dr. Erickson summarized the chronology and timeline concerning what the Board has
- 475 done with regard to this project.
- 476 Ms. Jones expressed concern with the level of the Board's communication with the
- 477 public.
- Dr. Erickson stated that the options are to either continue the process, allowing the
- 479 proposal move forward, or stop the process and completely reconsider. He added that a
- 480 15-day notice could be done if there are changes that need to be made which would
- allow the proposal to be completed within the one-year window.
- Dr. Harlem stated that the original intent is reflected in this proposal. He stated that the
- part where the original intent was lost is with the cap of 18 hours. The 18-hour cap has
- detracted from the original intent. He stated that he thinks if the Board removed the cap,
- the Board would achieve its aims. He proposed raising the cap from 18 hours to 36
- 486 hours. In addition, he remained concerned about a lack of clarity in some areas.
- Dr. Phillips thanked Dr. Harlem. He acknowledged that licensees did not have enough
- notice, but he stated it is their own responsibility to keep up with the processes of the
- Board. He stated that change is difficult, but in order to teach the public about the new
- 490 system, the regulation needs to be in place first. He added that there needs to be an
- incentive to be involved and that he is not sympathetic to licensees that are not
- interested in maintaining competency. He pointed out that it is not all about the
- licensees, but it is also more about the protection of the consumers in California. He
- 494 suggested maintaining a cap of traditional CE hours.
- 495 Dr. Gallardo expressed strong agreement with Dr. Phillips. To add to his comments, he
- stated that given the comments, he thinks that the Board should pull back and do more
- work on the proposal. He stated that there still needs to be a cap on the amount of
- 498 traditional CE units that are allowed. He stated that traditional education process is not
- serving the consumers in the best way and that he will not personally support leaving it
- at 36 hours. He stated that the Board also advocates for psychologists as consumers.
- as well as the public. He agreed with Harlem's point regarding the beginning intent of
- the proposal.

- 503 Dr. Horn stated that she strongly agrees with both Dr. Gallardo and Dr. Phillips. She
- stated that she is the one who brought the ASPPB guidelines to the Board. She directed
- the audience to the website which addresses the guidelines and the intent behind them.
- 506 She stated that this change will help improve and evolve competency, but recognizes
- that the proposal is a major change in the established way of doing things. She stated
- that she doesn't believe the cap should be removed completely.
- Ms. Starr stated that she agrees with Dr. Phillips and acknowledged that change is
- 510 difficult.
- Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that she agrees with Dr. Harlem. She expressed desire to
- gain the approval of the psychologists and keep everyone informed.
- 513 Ms. Jones stated that she agrees with Dr. Gallardo, Dr. Horn, and Dr. Phillips. She
- stated that they should maintain what the changes are and extend the public comment
- 515 period. She suggested educating the public, perhaps with a synopsis. She expressed
- 516 concern regarding whether or not the Board is communicating effectively with its
- 517 stakeholders and the public.
- 518 Dr. Gallardo stated that he is okay with shifting the capped hour amount a little bit, but
- 519 not leaving it at 36 hours.
- 520 Dr. Harlem stated that he does not believe the Board has to impose requirements down
- for licensees to do the right thing. He added that he is seeking to get people to work
- together rather than providing something for them to create resistance around.
- 523 Dr. Phillips stated that there is a group of people who would only choose to do the 36
- hours. He added that that group is the one that concerns him.
- Mr. Thomas pointed out that the regulations would not take complete effect until two
- 526 years after they have been adopted.
- 527 It was M(Phillips)/S(Gallardo)/C to modify the text to increase the cap of Sponsored
- 528 Continuing Education from 18 hours to 27 hours.
- Ms. Marks stated that a 15-day notice would be sufficient with this motion.
- 530 Dr. Harlem stated that he believes that the proposal conveys flexibility.
- Dr. Philips expressed concerns with becoming more specific in regulations in fear of
- 532 psychologists feeling like the Board is micromanaging their activities.
- Ms. Jones asked if the Board could have a 15-day period, hold a committee meeting,
- and then come back to the Board. She pointed out that it is the Board's responsibility to
- take all of the comments into account.

- Dr. Phillips stated that the Board is addressing the primary concern. He suggested the
- formation of a committee to determine if additional changes are necessary and for
- ongoing evaluation of their impact. He pointed out that changes can be made later,
- especially after people start working with the regulation as it is newly implemented.
- Mr. Heppler stated the Board can offer interpretive guidance, but specificity is provided
- in regulations.
- Dr. Linder-Crow offered a caution about drawing a conclusion about CE and how it
- affects practice. She stated that there is evidence that didactic CE is the least effective
- way. She also stated that she does not think that the majority of comments raised by
- 545 CPA's members were concerns about convenience. She stated that most psychologists
- will not be inconvenienced. She stated that it is a false assumption that changing to 27
- hours rather than 36 hours will solve the problem, but it is an issue of trust between
- 548 Board and licensees.
- 549 Vote: 7 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Arias-Bhatia, Starr) 2 nay
- 550 (Harlem, Acquaye-Baddoo)
- It was M(Harlem)/S(Starr)/C to delegate the authority to the executive officer to adopt
- the text in the absence of any negative comments after the public comment period.
- Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr,
- 554 Acquaye-Baddoo) 0 nay.
- It was M(Jones)/S(Acquave-Baddoo)/C to direct staff to compile the feedback that was
- 556 provided at this Board meeting and others regarding information that could possibly be
- forwarded to the Licensing Committee to consider for future changes.
- 558 Dr. Gale suggested enabling two-way comments via his website.
- Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr,
- 560 Acquaye-Baddoo) 0 nay.

561562563

4) Title 16, CCR, Section 1380.5 – Filing of Addresses

564565

566

567

568

569

Ms. Jones summarized the discussion that was held during the Policy and Advocacy Committee's meeting regarding the proposed language for filing of addresses. She indicated that many concerns were raised, including safety concerns about accessibility of home addresses of licensees to the public. She recommended that revised language be brought back to the Board at its May Board meeting.

570571572

It was M(Starr)/S(Arias-Bhatia)/C to adopt the recommendations of the Committee.

573574575	Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.
576 577 578	The Board adjourned at 5:54 p.m.
579 580	Agenda Item #13: Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum
581 582 583	Michael Erickson, PhD, Board President called the open session meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.
584 585	Friday, February 27, 2015
586 587 588	Michael Erickson, PhD, Board President called the open session meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.
589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599	Members Present: Michael Erickson, PhD, President Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member Johanna Arias-Bhatia, Public Member Miguel Gallardo, PsyD Andrew Harlem, PhD Jacqueline Horn, PhD Stephen Phillips, PsyD Linda Starr, Public Member
600 601 602 603 604 605 606	Others Present: Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager Karen Johnson, Licensing Coordinator Jonathan Burke, Administrative Coordinator Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel
607 608 609 610 611 612 613	Kurt Heppler, DCA Legal Counsel Jo Linder-Crow, PhD, California Psychological Association Pamela McCrory, PhD, Los Angeles County Psychological Association Melodie Schaefer, PsyD, California Psychological Association Division I, II, California Psychology Internship Council Talia Cortese, Center for Public Interest Law Raymond J. Trybus, PhD, Walden University, San Diego Psychological
614 615	Association Christina Versari, PhD, San Diego University for Integrative Studies

Agenda Item #14: Budget Report

- Mark Ito and Robert De los Reyes referred to the simplified fund condition and the fund
- 620 condition in which the 2013 fiscal year data is shown.
- Dr. Horn asked what a healthy reserve is.
- Mr. Ito stated that it is three (3) months. Mr. De los Reyes stated that a program can
- stay twenty-four (24) months in reserve, but three (3) months in reserve is traditional in
- the program.
- Dr. Erickson said some money is put into the general fund and asked what the Board
- does when they get the money back.
- Mr. Ito stated that an annual assessment is conducted on the funds to find out if a loan
- repayment needs to be paid at that point.
- Mr. De los Reyes stated that nothing is scheduled in the conceivable future based on
- the status of the fund currently.
- Ms. Sorrick stated that the Governor said they would repay loans, but there is no
- concrete schedule in place. In addition, the Governor has made a statement that doing
- so was his goal.
- Mr. Ito referred to a third attachment with information regarding staff and operating fees.
- Ms. Jones stated that more money should be spent on postage and communication
- 636 generally.

639

642

645 646

647

652

- 637 Mr. Ito stated that they could reallocate the extra dollars to address that issue.
- 638 Agenda Item #15: Introduction of Administrative Staff

Mr. Burke introduced the following Administrative staff Diana Crosby, Chris Siepert (Not present), and Taylor Hattersley.

Dr. Erickson thanked Mr. Burke and the Administrative staff for their hard work and the materials they provide for the meeting.

Agenda Item #16: Enforcement Report

Dr. Erickson invited Ms. Monterrubio to begin the Enforcement Report. 649

650 Ms. Monterrubio referred the Board to the informational items provided in the Board 651 packets.

Dr. Harlem asked if, in the last two years and based on the provided data, more
 complaints are resulting in open investigations.

Ms. Monterrubio stated that the data is based off of BreEZe and that the number of complaints is still the same.

Agenda Item #17: Introduction of Enforcement Staff

Ms. Monterrubio introduced the following Enforcement staff: Joana Castillo, Ashley Castleberry, Deborah Morales, Rob Loyola, Corey Brasier, Denise Russell, and Barbara Tanner.

Dr. Erickson thanked Ms. Monterrubio and the Enforcement staff for their work.

<u>Agenda Item #18: Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education -- Update on Requirement for Accreditation of Degree-granting Institutions -- Joanne Wenzel, Chief, Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education</u>

Dr. Erickson invited Ms. Wenzel to begin her presentation.

Ms. Wenzel reported that new legislation went into effect that changed the minimum operating standards of private postsecondary institutions in California. She stated that BPPE had a mandate to adopt emergency regulations that went into effect on February 1st of 2015.

She summarized the timelines and mandates of the Bureau that were provided in the Board packets. Dr. Harlem asked if it was true that degree-granting institutions need BPPE approval. Ms. Wenzel replied that they do, unless they are exempt. Dr. Harlem asked what the conditions are for an exemption. Ms. Wenzel stated that an exemption can be approved for about eight (8) or nine (9) reasons. The requirements for the ability to claim an exemption has been counterbalance due to federal regulations that require state authorization. Dr. Harlem asked for clarification regarding whether or not these changes are affecting the exemption process. Ms. Wenzel replied that these changes do not affect the exemption process or requirements. Public comment was then invited.

Steve Arthur requested that the Board take a more passive stance on what the BPPE is doing. He stated the Bureau has not protected institutions in the past, such as his own. He added that the proposed August legislation was not fact-based and institutions were provided little time for hearing. He expressed concern that institutions, such as his own, would be discontinued within a three (3) month period, similar to a previous situation involving the Board that he cited from 2007 or 2008. Mr. Arthur provided letters to the Board members concerning the issue.

Dr. Horn clarified that the Bureau, as it existed at the time, had come under scrutiny because they were not actually requiring the approved schools to do what they needed to do in statute. She stated the Board had concerns about the approved schools and the BPPVE was going through the sunset process. The Board voted to allow students who were in the approved programs to have five or six years from the date of the closure to finish out their programs. At that time, the Board had decided to not allow the schools to admit any new students due to the fact that those schools would have no oversight once the BPPVE was sunsetted.

Mr. Arthur claimed that Dr. Horn is incorrect and that they had to rush their previously current students through their coursework before the given deadline. He stated that he would direct the Board to the minutes where this discussion was captured.

Agenda Item #19: Outreach and Education Committee

The Outreach and Education Committee met to discuss and formulate its recommendations to the Board.

Agenda Item #20: Sunset Review Committee Report

Dr. Erickson presented the Sunset Review Committee Report and referred to informational items provided in the Board packets.

Agenda Item #21: President's Report

a) Ad Hoc Committee Update

1) Telepsychology Committee

Dr. Erickson referred the Board to the update provided in the Board packets. He stated that the Committee will meet again on March 23rd, 2015, at 10:00 a.m.

2) Sunset Review Committee

Dr. Erickson referred the Board to the update provided in the Board packets. He stated that the Committee met on January 20th, 2015, to consider the questions from the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee.

3) ABA Task Force

Dr. Erickson referred the Board to the update provided in the Board packets. He stated that the next Task Force meeting is scheduled for April 27th, 2015, from 1:00 - 5:00 p.m.

4) Enforcement Committee

Dr. Erickson referred the Board to the update provided in the Board packets. He stated that the new ad hoc Enforcement Committee will consist of Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo as Chairperson as well as Dr. Phillips.

b) Draft Executive Officer Duty Statement

Dr. Erickson invited Human Resources to present about the Executive Officer Duty Statement. Betty Saeteun referred the Board to the draft of the Executive Officer Duty Statement included in the Board packets. Ms. Marks pointed out that "classification title"

was used in the duty statement and wanted to make sure that Executive Officer is recognized as not a civil position. Ms. Saeteun stated that "Executive Officer" is a type of classification, but it is not a civil service position. Ms. Marks noted that "lobbyist" is used to describe the Executive Officer when it is requires registration, and instead suggests using different language. Board members and Ms. Sorrick agreed on the term "advocate" rather than "lobbyist."

It was M(Starr)/S(Jones)/C to adopt the amended Executive Officer Duty Statement.

Vote: 7 aye (Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay. (2 Members not present).

c) 2015 Meeting Calendar and Locations

Dr. Erickson referred the Board to the informational meeting calendar provided in the Board packets and summarized the scheduled dates and locations of future Board meetings.

d) Other Informational Items

Dr. Erickson presented Ms. Marks with a certificate of appreciation on behalf of the Board.

Agenda Item #22: Presentation of Outreach and Education Committee Report; Consideration of Committee Recommendations) - M. Gallardo

Dr. Gallardo provided a summary of the Outreach and Education Committee's meeting.

a) Strategic Plan Update

Dr. Gallardo referred to the Strategic Plan Update provided in the Board packets.

b) Communications Plan Update

Dr. Gallardo referred to the Communications Plan provided in the Board packets.

c) Social Media Update

 Dr. Gallardo referred the Board to the Social Media Update document that was provided in the Board packets. Ms. Jones asked that regulations be included with the Top 5 Page Hits on the Website Update memo.

d) Website Update

Dr. Gallardo referred the Board to the Website Update document that was provided in the Board packets.

e) Newsletter

Dr. Gallardo referred the Board to the newsletter that was included in the Board packets.

f) Outreach Activities Update

Dr. Gallardo referred the Board to the Outreach Activities Update document that was included in the Board packets.

It was M(Gallardo)/S(Starr)/C that that the Board accept the Agenda Items A through F of the Outreach and Education Committee report with the minor modification to the Communications Plan.

Vote: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, Acquaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.

g) California Psychological Association Ethics Training Program

Dr. Linder-Crow informed the Committee that she is inviting the Board to partner with CPA to host a workshop on the topic of diverse perspectives on everyday ethics. She stated that this type of workshop has been done in several states. She explained that the intent of these workshops is to have a joint program between the psychological association and the licensing board. She summarized the topics and learning objectives that the workshop would address.

Mr. Heppler expressed concern about Board members providing ethical advice and stated that sponsorship might not be an option for the Board. Ms. Sorrick stated that she will work with Legal Counsel to examine the possibility of the Board's participation in the workshop. Dr. Linder-Crow committed to submitting a proposal to the Board to be shared with legal counsel and then presented to the Board at the next meeting.

Dr. McAlmond-Ross asked what advantage there is to CPA and the Board to engage in the partnership, as well as the disadvantages. Dr. Horn replied that it is not the advantage to the Board or CPA, but it is to help the consumers and licensees.

Dr. Erickson stated that he is in favor of the workshop happening.

h) Review and Consideration of Draft Annual Outreach Campaign Proposal

Dr. Gallardo referred the Committee to the draft Outreach Campaign Plan provided as a hand-carry item. He indicated that this was drafted to be two-year plan rather than an annual plan. Dr. Horn expressed appreciation for the intent behind the Campaign Proposal and commended the Board staff for addressing different ways to reach out to the public. Ms. Sorrick asked that an amendment be made to the Campaign Proposal that changes the dates to "2015-2017."

slig	vas M(Gallardo)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the Outreach Campaign Plan as all the properties of the 2015-2017 implementation dates for approval and deptance to move forward.
	te: 9 aye (Gallardo, Horn, Phillips, Erickson, Jones, Harlem, Arias-Bhatia, Starr, quaye-Baddoo) – 0 nay.
i)	Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda
	public comment was offered. enda Item #23: Executive Officer's Report
Dr.	Erickson invited Ms. Sorrick to begin the Executive Officer Report.
a)	Organization Update
	. Sorrick referred the Board to the informational update items provided in the Board ckets.
b)	CPS Program Analysis Update
	. Sorrick referred the Board to the informational update items provided in the Board ckets.
c)	Other Informational Items
No	ne.
<u>Ag</u>	enda Item #24: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings
	. Jones asked if the Board would be inviting OPES back to a future Board meeting more data and an opportunity for the public to comment.
sta	. Sorrick stated that, at the last meeting, Dr. Harlem raised an issue with the tistical significance of the passing rates. A letter was then drafted to OPES, which s responded to by OPES, and distributed to Board members.
<u>Ag</u>	enda Item #25: Adjournment
The	e Board adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
- Pre	esident Date