



California Board of Psychology

Action Plan

2024 to 2028

Prepared by:

SOLID Planning Solutions

Department of Consumer Affairs

Contents

Goal 1: Licensing.....	3
Objective 1.1	3
Objective 1.2	4
Objective 1.3	5
Objective 1.4	6
Goal 2: Continuing Professional Development.....	7
Objective 2.1	7
Goal 3: Policy and Advocacy	8
Objective 3.1	8
Objective 3.2	9
Objective 3.3	10
Goal 4: Enforcement	11
Objective 4.1	11
Objective 4.2	12
Objective 4.3	13
Objective 4.4	14
Goal 5: Outreach and Communication.....	15
Objective 5.1	15
Objective 5.2	16
Objective 5.3	17
Objective 5.4	18
Objective 5.5	19
Objective 6.1	20

Goal 1: Licensing

Objective 1.1

Reduce the processing time for the initial review and licensure of new psychologist and psychological associates.

Success Measure: Shortened timelines and increased use of BreEZe.

Due Date: Q1 2028

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.1.1	Create and post application checklist(s) for psychologist applicants on the Board's website.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q2 <u>2024 Complete</u>
1.1.2	Create and post application checklist(s) for psychological associate registration applicants on the Board's website.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q4 <u>2024 Complete</u>
1.1.3	Develop and configure additional psychologist applications to be available through BreEZe.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q1 2026
1.1.4	Update forms that were incorporated by reference to allow for online submission of psychological associate registration applications.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q4 2027
1.1.5	Develop and configure psychological associate applications to be available through BreEZe.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q1 2028

Objective 1.2

Pursue adequate staffing to improve the quality and consistency of customer service and the processing time for applications.

Success Measure: New staff are hired and trained.

Due Date: Q2 202~~5~~6

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.2.1	Submit budget change proposal FY 2025-2026.	AEO, Licensing Manager, and Legislation and Regulation Analyst	Q3 2024 <u>Complete</u>
1.2.2	Once fully staffed, conduct customer service training refresher.	Licensing Manager	Q2 202 6 <u>5</u>

Objective 1.3

Establish a pathway for the new licensing types to provide a smooth, transparent implementation process.

Success Measure: [Board is] ready for implementation [of new licensing types].

Due Date: Q1 202~~6~~7

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.3.1	Develop and configure BreEZe functionality for new categories.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q4 2024 <u>Complete</u>
1.3.2	Create new website with pages which have instructions and checklists.	Licensing Manager, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator	Q4 2024 <u>Complete</u>
1.3.3	Share new resources through email and social media.	Licensing Manager and Special Project Analyst	Q4 2024 <u>Complete</u>
1.3.4	Promulgate regulation packages for implementation.	AEO, Licensing Manager, Legislation and Regulation Analyst	Q1 202 7 <u>6</u>

Objective 1.4

Promote the use of electronic processes in licensing to increase efficiencies and improve responsiveness.

Success Measure: Videos have been created and posted.

Due Date: Q2 202~~6~~7

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.4.1	Work with Office of Public Affairs to create short video tutorial on psychologist licensure application process.	Licensing Manager	Q4 202 5 <u>6</u>
1.4.2	Work with Office of Public Affairs to create short video tutorial on psychologist exam applications process.	Licensing Manager	Q1 202 6 <u>7</u>
1.4.3	Work with Office of Public Affairs to create short video tutorial on psychological associate application process.	Licensing Manager	Q2 202 6 <u>7</u>
1.4.4	Work with Office of Public Affairs to create short video tutorial on psychological associate notification process.	Licensing Manager	Q2 202 6 <u>7</u>

Goal 2: Continuing Professional Development

Objective 2.1

Refine communication channels to ensure that licensees receive clear and timely updates on the new CPD guidelines.

Success Measure: Fewer repeats of the same CPD questions; Webpage updated to the add FAQs.

Due Date: Ongoing

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
2.1.1	Use social media more, e.g., get new LinkedIn page.	Central Services Manager, CPD Coordinator, and Special Projects Analyst	Ongoing Complete
2.1.2	Update addresses on record where possible.	CPD Coordinator	Ongoing
2.1.3	Conduct additional webinars.	Central Services Manager and CPD Coordinator	Ongoing
2.1.4	Make sure website current with relevant information.	Central Services Manager and CPD Coordinator	Ongoing

Goal 3: Policy and Advocacy

Objective 3.1

Communicate the Board's stance on the Psychology Interjurisdictional Compact (PSYPACT) to explain the consumer protection challenges PSYPACT poses.

Success Measure: California remains outside of the PSYPACT.

Due Date: Q3 2024

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
3.1.1	Newsletter article.	AEO	Completed
3.1.2	Advocate opposition to legislative efforts.	AEO and Legislation and Regulation Analyst	Q3 2024 and Ongoing

Objective 3.2

Seek partnerships to help advance the Board's legislative goals.

Success Measure: Increased partners listed on legislative efforts.

Due Date: Q2 2025

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
3.2.1	Update and maintain stakeholder list to enhance partnership opportunities.	Special Projects Analyst and Board Members	Q2 2025Ongoing

Objective 3.3

Monitor and prepare for the changing landscape of psychology to protect consumers and promote safe practices.

Success Measure: Board proactively acting on emerging issues.

Due Date: Ongoing

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
3.3.1	Monitor legislation, news, and complaints about emerging trends impacting consumers and related psychological services.	EO and All Managers	Ongoing

Goal 4: Enforcement

Objective 4.1

Improve communication to licensees involved in the enforcement process.

Success Measure: Initial contact letter templates for licensees updated.

Due Date: Q1 2027

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
4.1.1	Review initial contact letters to licensee and [make sure the letters] explain investigative steps.	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2027
4.1.2	Explain complaints are not public information.	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2027

Objective 4.2

Expand licensee and consumers' understanding of the enforcement process to reduce confusion, provide better customer service, and improve relationships with stakeholders.

Success Measure: Brochures created [and distributed].

Due Date: Q1 2027

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
4.2.1	Create brochure for licensees for when there's a complaint against them (what to expect, FAQs, probation, hiring an attorney, timeframes, etc.).	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2027

Objective 4.3

Provide complaint filing instructions and forms in multiple languages to maximize accessibility and make the complaint process more inclusive.

Success Measure: Complaint instructions and forms are more inclusive based on assessment.

Due Date: Q4 2027

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
4.3.1	Work with Office of Public Affairs to access complaint filing instructions and forms in multiple languages.	EO, Enforcement Manager, and Office of Public Affairs	Q3 2027
4.3.2	Once determination is made [for language translations needed], work with Office of Public Affairs to update instructions and forms.	EO, Enforcement Manager, and Office of Public Affairs	Q4 2027

Objective 4.4

Build a larger pool of enforcement subject matter experts to increase knowledge of specialties and reduce turnaround times for enforcement cases.

Success Measure: Subject matter expert pool increased.

Due Date: Q2 2025

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
4.4.1	Contact psychological associations and see if BOP can recruit with their assistance.	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2026
4.4.2	Send letters to licensees that have been licensed over 5 years.	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2026
4.4.3	Ask current experts for referrals.	Enforcement Manager	Q4 2025
4.4.4	Include enforcement statistics in newsletter (very few cases result in discipline through a hearing).	Enforcement Manager	Q4 2025
4.4.5	Have quotes or letters with input from existing experts about their own experiences and how they prepare for the hearings and the support that they get.	Enforcement Manager	Q1 2026

Goal 5: Outreach and Communication

Objective 5.1

Educate the public about the differences between psychologists and other health care professionals to increase clarity regarding the different roles and to better inform consumers.

Success Measure: Meeting has been held and resources have been created.

Due Date: Q4 2025

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
5.1.1	Cohost stakeholder meeting with Board of Behavioral Sciences and Commission on Teacher Credentialing.	EO and Licensing Manager	Q 1 <u>3</u> 202 5 <u>6</u>
5.1.2	Create informational resources.	EO, Licensing Manager, and Office of Public Affairs	Q 3 <u>4</u> 202 5 <u>6</u>

Goal 5: Outreach and Communication

Objective 5.2

Increase access to the Board's informational materials.

Success Measure: Materials are being accessed on website.

Due Date: Q1 2025

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
5.2.1	Utilize social media and other platforms to publicize informational materials.	Special Projects Analyst	Ongoing
5.2.2	Assess language needs to reach larger audience.	Special Projects Analyst and Office of Public Affairs	Q1 202 5 ⁶

Goal 5: Outreach and Communication

Objective 5.3

Increase Board and staff attendance and engagement at events to elevate the Board's accessibility.

Success Measure: Board and staff attendance has increased at events.

Due Date: Ongoing

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
5.3.1	Increase participation in outreach with stakeholder groups.	EO, AEO, Central Services Manager, Licensing Manager, and Enforcement Manager	Ongoing

Goal 5: Outreach and Communication

Objective 5.4

Expand the Board's outreach efforts by using a variety of communication methods.

Success Measure: Internal assessment of current communication methods complete, and new communication method(s) developed if necessary.

Due Date: Q3 2026

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
5.4.1	Do an internal assessment of current communication methods.	EO, Central Services Manager	Q1 2026 Complete
5.4.2	Survey licensees on their favorite communication method.	EO, Central Services Manager, Office of Public Affairs, and Special Projects Analyst	Q2 2026
5.4.3	Develop additional communication methods if appropriate.	EO, Central Services Manager, and Office of Public Affairs	Q3 2026

Goal 5: Outreach and Communication

Objective 5.5

Increase communication regarding the Board's objectives and achievements.

Success Measure: Communication has increased regarding the Board's objectives and achievements.

Due Date: Q4 2028

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
5.5.1	Identify platform(s) to communicate board objectives and achievements.	Outreach and Communications Committee	Q4 2028

Goal 6: Board Operations

Objective 6.1

Establish an onboarding process for new licensees to increase understanding of the Board's role and strengthen relations.

Success Measure: Welcome letter has been written and license anniversaries are being recognized.

Due Date: Q1 2028

Task #	Task Description	Responsible Party	Due Date
6.2.1	Create welcome letter template for new licensees listing resources for maintaining licensure.	All Managers	Q4 2027
6.2.2	Recognize license anniversaries (10 year, 25 year, etc.), check other board practices.	EO and Central Services Manager	Q1 2028

California Board of Psychology

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite N-215

Sacramento, CA 95834

Phone: (916) 574-7720

<https://www.psychology.ca.gov>



Prepared by:

SOLID Planning Solutions

1747 N. Market Blvd., Ste. 270

Sacramento, CA 95834

MEMORANDUM

DATE	October 30, 2025
TO	Board Members
FROM	Jonathan Burke Executive Officer
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 23 EPPP Update

Updates

The Board drafted a letter of concern on May 20, 2025 relating to the integrated EPPP and sent it to the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) on June 2, 2025 (see Attachment A).

ASPPB hosted the second virtual town hall meeting for the Education and Training Community on June 25, 2025. The Board attended this second virtual town hall.

ASPPB hosted a third virtual town hall meeting for students and license/certification candidates on September 18, 2025. The Board attended this virtual town hall. Additionally, the Board launched an outreach campaign to our licensees and interested parties. Through social media and distribution lists the Board was able to expand awareness and encourage participation in this virtual town hall.

Additionally, ASPPB conducted a Job Task Analysis of the Practice of Psychology (JTA) to be completed by licensed psychologists which closed on September 29, 2025. The JTA process happens once every 7 to 10 years and directly shapes the examination specifications and content used to evaluate the knowledge and skills required for licensure. The Board sent multiple emails and alerts on our social media platforms. ASPPB reported at their Annual Meeting that 25% of all responses were from California licensees.

Timelines of Events in 2025

Dr. Harb Sheets, Chairperson of the of the Licensure Committee, and Ms. Susan Hansen, Examinations Coordinator, attended a virtual town hall meeting organized by ASPPB on April 3, 2025. At that meeting, the Board heard that the proposed implementation date of the new integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) will be in 2027. A survey will be sent out to member Boards later this year and we will be invited to comment on the proposals. The Board has expressed concerns regarding the likely increased cost of the examination to applicants and a desire by ASPPB to require the examination be taken as the final step of the application process. This would contradict the changes made to California law by AB 282 (Chapter 425, Statutes of 2023) which allows applicants to take the examination after they have

completed their coursework. The Board supported this change as it will likely increase the passage rate of the EPPP.

Dr. Hao Song, PhD, ICE-CCP, Associate Executive Officer of Examination Services at ASPPB, attended the May 9, 2025 Board meeting to present on the timeline and development of the integrated EPPP. At the same meeting, the Board discussed the concerns regarding the integrated EPPP and implementation timeline and voted to send a letter to ASPPB to express these concerns as discussed.

Attachments:

A. Letter to ASPPB

Action Requested:

This is an informational item.

History of Board Consideration of the EPPP2

In 2017, the Board determined that there was a need for stakeholder input regarding possible implementation of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology Part 2 (EPPP2). A Task Force with representatives from various stakeholders was created to provide input to the Board regarding consideration and possible implementation of the EPPP Part 2.

The Task Force's role was to consider the pros and cons of the proposed examination to the Board's prospective licensees and consumers, eligibility criteria, the application process, and the impact on the Board's process for licensure. The Task Force met on April 5th and June 29th, 2018 at the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA's) Headquarters in Sacramento. This Task Force was chaired by Board Member Dr. Sheryll Casuga.

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology, currently known as the EPPP Part 1 (Knowledge), is a computer-based examination developed and administered by ASPPB. This exam is one of two examinations required for licensure in California. The cost of the exam to the applicant is \$600.00.

EPPP Part 2 (Skills exam), per ASPPB, will provide an independent, standardized, reliable, and valid assessment of the skills necessary for independent practice and enhance consumer protection. The cost of this exam was initially set at \$600.00. ASPPB, at the time of the initial Task Force meeting, announced the plan to make this exam mandatory for all jurisdictions.

After several discussions, the Task Force did not believe the EPPP Part 2 was in the best interests of California consumers for the following reasons:

- Lack of a proven necessity for the examination;
- Concerns related to the exam's ability to assess skills resulting in negligible consumer protections;

- Costs and burden on prospective licensees, and especially on historically underrepresented and socioeconomically disadvantaged students;
- New barriers to licensure and potentially detrimental impact on access to psychological services to California consumers; and
- Clarification on whether the optional Enhanced EPPP is an indefinite alternative or ASPPB is simply postponing the deadline for mandatory adoption. If the implementation date is merely being delayed, the Board would appreciate clarification on the anticipated date for mandatory implementation.

The Task Force also had significant concerns with the loss of license portability with other States if ASPPB decided to mandate the EPPP Part 2. Due to this concern, the Task Force recommended (should part 2 become mandatory) that the Board continue participation in the EPPP and not create its own version of a national examination.

In August 2018, ASPPB retracted its decision and made the EPPP Part 2 an optional exam for all state boards and proposed incentives for early adopters. Although ASPPB's announcement clarified that the EPPP Part 2 was now an optional component, it raised concerns regarding whether ASPPB would eventually make the examination mandatory.

These concerns were addressed in the letter dated December 2018 which stated as follows:

“The Board of Psychology supports a competency-based examination but feels that certainty is required as to its mandatory implementation, and that a date certain for all member jurisdictions is necessary. Uncertainty as to implementation results in a current inability to move forward with the required statutory and regulatory changes.

ASPPB would aid its member jurisdictions if it were to identify all statutory and regulatory changes needed to implement the new examination (drafting and supporting statutory and regulatory changes through advocacy, etc.) over a set period of time calibrated to the expected implementation date and the time necessary to effect needed changes.

ASPPB should continue to evaluate the total cost of both examinations and establish a uniform lower total cost as to all jurisdictions, as of the mandatory effective date of the Enhanced EPPP.

In addition, the Board also requests that ASPPB make available to the Board and the Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Professional Examination Services the following information as it becomes available:

- *Data from Beta testing from participating jurisdictions to evaluate the validity of the Enhanced EPPP.*
- *Evidence of external validity that substantiates the need for the Enhanced EPPP. This information would help further clarify the need for and validity*

of the Enhanced EPPP and inform the Board's discussion regarding the prospect for adoption of the Enhanced EPPP.”

ASPPB’s response was noted in a letter dated January 29, 2019. Summarily, ASPPB Board of Directors (BOD) had determined that the jurisdictional use of the Enhanced EPPP would not be mandated during the initial implementation process. The BOD, however, would revisit the implementation process of the examination and determine whether or not to continue delivering the EPPP 1 as a stand-alone option or only to deliver the Enhanced EPPP. They would take into consideration the time it takes for California to develop and implement regulation changes and factor that into their decision.

ASPPB also reduced the exam fee for the EPPP2 from \$600.00 to \$450.00 and to allow the Board access to beta testing information from participating jurisdictions to enable the Department of Consumer Affairs, Office for Professional Examination Services (OPES) to conduct an audit of the EPPP.

This audit was completed in April 2021. Summary of the audit is as follows:

“Overall, the SMEs concluded that the content of the EPPP Part 1 assesses general knowledge required for entry level psychologist practice in California, with the exception of California law and ethics. This general knowledge should continue to be tested on the California Psychology Law and Ethics Examination.

The SMEs were impressed by the EPPP Part 2, both by the concept of measuring skills and by the design of the scenario-based items. Additionally, the SMEs favored the EPPP Part 2 over the EPPP Part 1 as a single-examination option. However, the SMEs concluded that while the EPPP Part 2 assesses a deeper measure of skills than those measured by the EPPP Part 1, that alone may not support adoption of the EPPP Part 2. The SMEs further concluded that the skills measured by the EPPP Part 2 may be adequately assessed during supervised clinical experience, and that the EPPP Part 2 could possibly be an unnecessary barrier to licensure. OPES recommends that the Board continue to monitor the beta testing results of the EPPP Part 2 as part of their decision-making process for adopting the EPPP Part 2 as a requirement for licensure in California in the future.”

This audit was presented at the EPPP AdHoc Committee meeting held on October 21, 2021. However further discussion could not be made until the ASPPB Board of Directors decided on their plan for the EPPP2.

In October 2022, the ASPPB Board of Directors announced the implementation of the Enhanced EPPP two-part exam to become effective January 1, 2026, to all member jurisdictions. ASPPB does not believe that the EPPP2 will create a barrier to practice and promises to smooth the road to licensure amidst a national mental health crisis. ASPPB’s core value is to develop a fair, equitable and accessible exam and that the two-part exam ensures a thorough assessment of competence and promote consumer protection. They will be mindful of the cost and confirmed a 25% reduction in the EPPP2 fee with no current plans to increase the fee.

After the announcement, the Board received several letters of opposition and one in favor of implementing the EPPP2.

The EPPP Ad Hoc Committee met on April 28, 2023, to discuss the EPPP part 2 and make recommendations to the Board. Implementation of the EPPP part 2 meant that statutory and regulatory changes were necessary to continue to conduct business and license portability remains. If the Board decides not to implement the EPPP part 2, this will require the creation of California's own practice base exam which would add additional cost to the Board's examination development process, and it would also eliminate license portability for California licensees.

Committee Recommendations were as follows:

- 1) To adopt the two-part EPPP exam for licensure for the State of California effective January 1, 2026, to avoid any interruption of service.
- 2) To have staff conduct an analysis of developing a California practice exam to be reported at the Board's Q3 2024 meeting.
- 3) Direct the executive officer to continue to work with ASPPB and communicate any barriers to licensure concerns from the Board.

The Committee also reviewed the proposed statutory and regulatory language that would enable Board staff to implement the two-part EPPP exam.

In May 2023, the Board accepted the committee's recommendation and agreed to adopt the two-part EPPP exam on January 1, 2026.

In August 2024 the Board provided the process, workload, and cost to develop a California practice exam in lieu of adopting the EPPP 2.

The Texas Behavioral Health Executive Council expressed opposition to the mandated EPPP two-part exam and proposed amending the ASPPB's bylaws. As a response, ASPPB made announcement to the member jurisdictions that a vote would be taken at the annual meeting October 30-November 3, 2024, regarding ASPPB's bylaws amendments. (Attachment H)

In October 2024, the California Psychological Association (CPA) wrote a letter opposing the implementation of the EPPP two-part exam. CPA has requested that the Board do the following at its November 2024 meeting:

1. Reverse its adoption of the EPPP-2 starting January 1, 2026.
2. Cease development of laws and/or regulations relating to EPPP-2.

On October 22, 2024, ASPPB issued a letter to member jurisdictions that they are pausing the 1/1/2026 EPPP 2-part exam mandate. They will explore the feasibility of a single EPPP exam that test on both knowledge and skills.

Board staff have stopped drafting the regulatory package that was going to implement the EPPP2 examination by January 1, 2026. The same package was going to implement AB 282 and staff will present modified text for Board approval at the February 2025 meeting.

AB 282 allows applicants to take the EPPP or CPLEE, or both exams as soon as they have completed all academic coursework required for a qualifying doctoral degree.

The law also states, "If a national licensing examination entity approved by the board imposes additional eligibility requirements beyond the completion of academic coursework, the board shall implement a process to verify that an applicant has satisfied those additional eligibility requirements."

Additional reference can be found on the [Informational Page](#) for EPPP Part 2 on the Board's website.

May 20, 2025

Dr. Mariann Burnetti-Atwell, PsyD
Chief Executive Officer
Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB)
215 Market Road
Tyrone, GA 30290

Dear Dr. Burnetti-Atwell,

The California Board of Psychology (Board) met on May 9, 2025, to discuss updates regarding the implementation of the integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), the anticipated 2027 launch of the skills assessment component, and concerns about the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in exam development and administration. Hao Song, PhD, ICE-CCP, ASPPB's Associate Executive Officer of Examination Services, provided a presentation on the integrated EPPP and answered questions posed by the Board members.

The Board acknowledges ASPPB's efforts to improve the licensing examination and ensure it reflects the evolving competencies required for safe and effective psychological practice. As one of the largest licensing jurisdictions in the United States, California will require sufficient time and jurisdiction-specific planning to align its regulatory frameworks and operational procedures with these significant changes. Additionally, the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 282 (Chapter 425, Statutes of 2023), which requires regulatory amendments already underway, will intersect with ASPPB's current proposed timeline to launch the integrated EPPP in Q4 of 2027. This further underscores the need for extended preparation time and close coordination.

To ensure a smooth and equitable transition, the Board respectfully raises the following considerations:

1. Jurisdictional Coordination and Regulatory Impact

The transition to an integrated EPPP with a skills component represents a fundamental change that will require comprehensive planning and revisions to the Board's regulations. California's multi-stakeholder rulemaking process necessitates thorough evaluation and coordination, making sufficient preparation time essential. A well-structured and phased implementation plan with a minimum of 36 months of lead time will be critical to ensuring regulatory alignment and system updates.

2. Implementation Timeline and Resource Planning

Given the complexity of adopting a dual-component EPPP, the Board urges ASPPB to provide jurisdictions with a detailed rollout timeline, training resources, and technical specifications as early as possible. Additionally, a more definitive and realistic implementation timeline is essential, as the current proposal to launch the integrated EPPP in Q4 of 2027 is not feasible. Providing sufficient lead time will allow the Board to initiate the necessary regulatory changes, fiscal planning, and

stakeholder education campaigns to ensure a seamless transition for applicants and licensees.

3. Transparency in Content Validity and Test Design

Content validity remains a concern in the skills assessment component of the EPPP. The Board seeks clarity on how ASPPB establishes content validity in the integrated EPPP and requests ongoing updates on its development. Additionally, a sample exam question on assessment presented at the ASPPB Townhall on April 3, 2025, lacked sufficient context for a clear response. The Board encourages ASPPB to take the necessary steps to improve the quality of newly developed questions for the skills assessment component to ensure clarity, relevance, and fairness for all candidates.

4. Eligibility and Pass Rate Concerns

Business Professions Code (BPC) 2914 allows candidates to take the EPPP after completing all academic coursework required for a qualifying doctoral degree, excluding internship, with the goal of improving pass rates. However, the eligibility requirements in terms of supervised professional experience for the integrated EPPP remain unclear, and restrictions on early testing could inadvertently counteract this legislative intent. The Board requests that ASPPB clarify both the specific eligibility criteria and the process for determining eligibility under the new exam structure to support fair access and alignment with California's licensure framework.

5. Transition Period for the Integrated EPPP

The current proposal lacks details regarding a transition period for existing EPPP candidates. The Board requests that ASPPB provide clear guidance on the duration and structure of this transition to ensure exam candidates and training programs have sufficient time to prepare.

6. Artificial Intelligence (AI) Integration

The growing use of AI in exam development, scoring, and quality control introduces both innovation and risks. The Board requests detailed information on how AI is being integrated into the EPPP, including safeguards to prevent algorithmic bias, preserve data integrity, and ensure psychometric fairness across diverse candidate populations.

7. Accessibility and Accommodations

If AI-enabled testing platforms are introduced, they must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and related provisions. Accessibility should remain a core design feature, ensuring equitable support for candidates with disabilities rather than a secondary consideration.

8. Cost Considerations and Transparency

A potential exam fee increase was announced at the Townhall on April 3, 2025, by ASPPB, yet details remain unclear. Any increase in exam costs could create

financial barriers for candidates. The Board urges ASPPB to provide transparent cost projections and a clear justification for any fee adjustments to ensure affordability and equitable access for all candidates.

9. Stakeholder Engagement and Communication

The Board strongly encourages ASPPB to engage in ongoing dialogue with its member jurisdictions by providing timely updates, facilitating two-way communication, and sharing implementation plans well in advance of any formal rollout. Clear guidance and transparency will be critical for state boards to adjust statutes, regulations, and infrastructure accordingly.

The Board appreciates ASPPB's commitment to upholding examination standards that reflect modern psychological practice and safeguard public welfare. We are eager to collaborate closely with ASPPB and our peer jurisdictions to ensure that the transition to the integrated EPPP is equitable, transparent, and logistically sound.

We thank you for your attention to these matters and remain available to participate in any implementation workgroups, jurisdictional briefings, or public comment opportunities that may support the success of this initiative.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the Board's Executive Officer, Jonathan Burke, at (916) 574-8072 or jonathan.burke@dca.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Lea Tate, PsyD
President, Board of Psychology

cc: Shacunda Rodgers, Vice President
Members of the Board

From: [REDACTED]
To: bopmail@DCA; executiveofficer@dca.ca.gov; DCA_LegalOffice@DCA; dcadirector@dca.ca.gov
Subject: Public Comment Request and Accessibility Concern – TSPL Petition / November 6–7 Board Meeting
Date: Friday, October 31, 2025 9:01:31 AM
Attachments: [Petition Revisions 2025-10-16.pdf](#)
[Written Public Comment November 6 & 7 Board Meeting.docx](#)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Executive Officer and Members of the Board,

I am writing to respectfully request that my written statement be entered into the public record for the **November 6–7, 2025** Board meeting in Riverside, as I am unable to attend in person due to the distance (over six hours travel each way).

Pursuant to **Government Code §11125.7(a)** under the **Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act**, every interested person is entitled to present comments to a state body on any agenda or non-agenda item. Because the Board has not provided a teleconference or remote option, I request that my written remarks and attached petition regarding the proposed **Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)** be formally distributed to Board members and noted in the meeting minutes as public comment.

I also wish to express concern that limiting participation exclusively to in-person attendance, while offering Continuing Professional Development (CPD) credit for those physically present, creates an inequitable opportunity for engagement and discourages participation from stakeholders who live or work far from the meeting location.

Please confirm that my written comments and the attached materials will be included in the public record for this meeting and shared with the Board.

Respectfully,
Dr. Jason R. Frye

[REDACTED]

Attachments:

1. Written Public Comment – TSPL Petition Summary (Nov 2025)
2. Full TSPL Petition (October 18th 2025)

Written Public Comment – November 6–7, 2025 Board of Psychology Meeting

Submitted by: Dr. Jason R. Frye, [REDACTED]

Subject: Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) Petition

Purpose of Comment

To request that the Board of Psychology formally acknowledge and docket for discussion the petition submitted on **October 18, 2025** proposing establishment of a *Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)*. The proposal is designed to expand California's behavioral-health workforce and provide an equitable, competency-based pathway to full licensure for qualified doctoral graduates.

Overview of the Proposal

The **TSPL** creates a structured, time-limited licensure category that allows doctoral-level psychology graduates to practice under supervision after completing all educational and training requirements but before passing the EPPP.

Core features:

1. **Initial Two-Year License:**
Holders may engage in supervised professional practice in approved settings under a licensed psychologist's oversight.
2. **Optional Two-Year Extension:**
The Board may grant one extension (maximum = four years total) for individuals who maintain good standing, complete required supervision hours, and demonstrate satisfactory progress.
3. **Competency-Based Licensure Pathway:**
Upon successful completion of supervised practice, licensees may be endorsed by their supervisors for full psychologist licensure, at the Board's discretion, in lieu of additional EPPP attempts.
4. **Public-Safety Safeguards:**
TSPL holders remain fully accountable under supervision and Board jurisdiction. Supervisors assume co-responsibility for oversight, ensuring consumer protection equal to or greater than that under the psychological-assistant model.

Rationale

- **Workforce Expansion:** California continues to face significant shortages of licensed psychologists, especially in rural and underserved counties.
- **Barrier Reduction:** Current reliance on a single standardized examination (EPPP) disproportionately excludes competent clinicians despite completion of doctoral-level education and APA-standard training.
- **Regulatory Balance:** The TSPL framework preserves the Board's oversight authority while offering a lawful, supervised pathway for otherwise-qualified graduates to continue serving the public.
- **Time-Limited and Accountable:** Unlike a permanent provisional license—which would likely face rejection on public-protection grounds—the TSPL is temporary, renewable once, and designed for measured evaluation of professional readiness.

Requested Board Actions

1. **Acknowledge receipt** of the petition filed October 18, 2025.
2. **Distribute the petition and summary** to Board members and include both in the public record.

3. **Place the TSPL petition on the next meeting agenda** for discussion and possible direction to staff to prepare an options memo for rulemaking consideration.

Attachments

1. Full Petition – *Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)* (filed October 18, 2025)
2. Cover Letter to the Board and Department of Consumer Affairs

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Jason R. Frye



ROUTING SHEET

Petition for Policy Action, Notice of Discriminatory Licensing Practices, and Proposed Regulatory Amendment

Submitted Pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act (Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.) and California Business & Professions Code §§ 2914, 2920, 2930

Date of Submission: October 17, 2025

Submitted By:

Dr. Jason R. Frye, Ph.D.

Candidate for Licensure

On behalf of myself and others similarly situated

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

PURPOSE OF SUBMISSION:

This Petition seeks immediate regulatory review and action regarding the State of California's continued reliance on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) as a condition of licensure. The petition presents substantial evidence of systemic disparate impact, lack of validation, statutory overreach, and unlawful delegation of regulatory authority. It proposes a Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) and related reforms to bring California's licensure standards into compliance with constitutional, statutory, and civil-rights requirements.

PRIMARY RECIPIENTS

For consideration, action, and placement on the public agenda pursuant to Gov. Code § 11340.6:

California Board of Psychology

- Dr. Lea Tate, Psy.D., President
- Dr. Shacunda Rodgers, Ph.D., Vice President
- Dr. Sheryll Casuga, Psy.D., CMPC, Committee Chair
- Full Board Members

Email: bopmail@dca.ca.gov

California Department of Consumer Affairs

- Kimberly Kirchmeyer, Director
- Christine Lally, Chief Deputy Director
- Legislative and Legal Affairs Divisions

Email: dca@dca.ca.gov

Office of the Attorney General

- Rob Bonta, Attorney General of California

Email: attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov

LEGISLATIVE AND OVERSIGHT RECIPIENTS

For review, legislative consideration, and potential oversight action:

California State Assembly

- Speaker Robert Rivas
- Assembly Business & Professions Committee
- Assembly Judiciary Committee
- Relevant district representatives

Email: bpc.assembly@asm.ca.gov

California State Senate

- President pro Tempore Mike McGuire
- Senate Business, Professions & Economic Development Committee
- Senate Judiciary Committee

Email: sbpede.committee@sen.ca.gov

NOTES:

This routing sheet is provided as a courtesy to assist in proper distribution and review. The attached petition, supporting documentation, and proof of service constitute the formal submission under California law. All recipients listed above have been served electronically and/or by U.S. Mail on October 17, 2025.

PETITION FOR POLICY ACTION, NOTICE OF DISCRIMINATORY LICENSING
PRACTICES, AND PROPOSED REGULATORY AMENDMENT

Before the California Board of Psychology

State of California, Department of Consumer Affairs

TO:

- Director, California Board of Psychology
- , California Board of Psychology
- Members of the California Board of Psychology
- Director, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California
- Attorney General of the State of California
- Chair, Assembly Business and Professions Committee
- Chair, Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Filed by:

Dr. Jason R. Frye, Ph.D.

Candidate for Licensure

On Behalf of Myself and Others Similarly Situated

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Date: October 18, 2025

Contents

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	6
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	7
The purpose of this Petition is fourfold:	7
II. JURISDICTION AND LEGAL AUTHORITY.....	7
A. Statutory Mandate under California Law	8
B. Administrative Procedure Act (APA)	8
C. Anti-Discrimination Mandates	8
D. Prohibition on Unlawful Delegation.....	8
E. Validation Requirements under Federal Law.....	8
F. Authority to Establish Alternatives	8
III. NOTICE OF PENDING LITIGATION.....	9
IV. NOTICE OF PRIOR ATTEMPTS TO SEEK ASSISTANCE AND OBTAIN PUBLIC INFORMATION.....	9
A. Formal Request for Assistance – December 22, 2024.....	9
B. Public Records Act Requests – December 2024 / January 2025	10
C. Implications of Board Inaction.....	10
V. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND EVIDENCE	11
A. Overview of the EPPP	11
B. Declining Pass Rates Despite Increased Standards.....	11
C. Educational Disparities and De Facto Accreditation Mandates.....	12
D. Racial and Ethnic Disparities.....	12
E. Documented Human Harm	13
F. State-Level Objections and Institutional Warnings	13
G. Institutional Bias and Conflicting Policy Positions.....	13
H. Financial Burdens and Lack of Transparency	14
VI. ASPPB’S PHILOSOPHY VS. PRACTICE.....	14
VII. LEGAL AND REGULATORY ANALYSIS.....	15
A. Statutory Violations (State Law)	15
B. Discrimination and Disparate Impact.....	15
C. Equal Protection.....	15
D. ADA Title II Violations.....	15
E. Breach of Statutory Duty under Bus. & Prof. Code § 2920	16

VIII. LACK OF INDEPENDENT VALIDATION	17
A. No Predictive Evidence	17
B. Construct and Content Validity Failures	17
C. Data Withholding and Transparency Failures.....	17
D. Legal Consequences	17
E. Quantitative Evidence of Disparate Impact and Systemic Exclusion.....	17
1. Declining Pass Rates Despite Rising Qualifications	17
2. Racial and Ethnic Disparities Meet Adverse-Impact Thresholds.....	18
4. Artificial Attrition Reduces Workforce Capacity.....	18
5. Revenue Generation Without Public-Safety Benefit.....	19
F. Regulatory Context and Coordination.....	19
IX. PROPOSED REGULATORY AMENDMENT: TRANSITIONAL SUPERVISED PRACTICE LICENSE (TSPL).....	20
(a) Purpose and Authority.	20
(b) Definitions.....	20
(c) Eligibility Requirements	21
(d) Scope and Limitations of Practice	21
(e) Supervision Requirements	21
(f) Evaluation and Conversion to Full Licensure	21
(g) Revocation, Suspension, and Non-Conversion.....	22
(h) Board Oversight and Reporting.....	22
X Regulatory Findings and Statement of Necessity	23
XI. ADJUSTMENT OF EXAMINATION SEQUENCING	24
A. Rationale	24
B. Proposed Sequencing Reform	24
XII. PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST	25
XIII. FORMAL NOTICE OF INTENDED LITIGATION AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS	26
XIV. DEMAND FOR BOARD ACTION	26
XV. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

AERA, APA, & NCME. (2014). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.

Americans with Disabilities Act, Title II. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130.

Bates v. United Parcel Service, Inc., 511 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2007).

Business & Professions Code §§ 2914, 2920, 2930 (Cal.).

California Public Records Act. Gov. Code §§ 6250, 6253, 6258 (Cal.).

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI. 42 U.S.C. § 2000d.

Equal Protection Clause. U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

Geffner v. Board of Psychology, No. B322991 (Cal. Ct. App. Feb. 28, 2024).

Gov. Code § 11135 (Cal.).

Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971).

Guardians Ass’n v. Civil Service Commission of New York City, 463 U.S. 582 (1983).

Poliak v. Board of Psychology, 55 Cal. App. 4th 342 (1997).

Rand v. Board of Psychology, 206 Cal. App. 4th 565 (2012).

A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

UGESP – Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978). 29 C.F.R. pt. 1607 (incl. §§ 1607.3, 1607.5, 1607.14).

Washington v. Davis, 426 U.S. 229 (1976).

Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886).

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This Petition is respectfully submitted by Dr. Jason R. Frye, Ph.D., Candidate for Licensure, and others similarly situated, pursuant to the authority vested in the California Board of Psychology (“the Board”) under the California Business and Professions Code §§ 2914, 2920, and 2930, and the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA), Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.

This Petition is filed as part of the official public record of the California Board of Psychology and expressly intended to trigger the Board’s procedural and substantive obligations under the APA, the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Gov. Code § 11120 et seq.), and all other relevant state and federal provisions. By doing so, Petitioner ensures that the Board’s duties to notice, hear, respond, and retain petitions for regulatory action are activated, and that this document — including all evidence herein — will form part of the administrative record subject to judicial and legislative review.

This petition not only documents the legal and procedural deficiencies of the current examination system but also provides quantitative evidence of its systemic effects on California’s psychology workforce.

The purpose of this Petition is fourfold:

1. Regulatory Reform: Request that the Board initiate immediate policy action and regulatory amendment concerning the state’s reliance on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) as a condition for licensure.
2. Notice of Illegality: Notify the Board of substantial, publicly documented evidence that the EPPP fails to measure minimum competence, produces severe and predictable disparate impacts, and violates state and federal anti-discrimination and due process guarantees.
3. Proposed Alternatives: Propose a Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) and a competency-based alternative pathway to licensure that aligns with California statutory standards and protects the public without violating civil rights.
4. Reservation of Rights: Place the Board on formal notice of potential liability arising from continued reliance on a licensing mechanism that is known to be defective, discriminatory, and unvalidated.

II. JURISDICTION AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

The Board’s authority is both broad and binding. It is charged with ensuring that licensing requirements:

- Are lawful, nondiscriminatory, and directly related to competence;
- Protect the public while avoiding unnecessary barriers; and
- Are validated, evidence-based, and constitutional.

These obligations flow from multiple legal sources:

A. Statutory Mandate under California Law

Under B&P §§ 2914, 2920, and 2930, the Board must regulate the practice of psychology, determine qualifications, establish and administer examinations, and ensure that all requirements are “fair, valid, and directly related to minimum competence.” The Legislature makes clear that “protection of the public shall be the highest priority” (§ 2920).

B. Administrative Procedure Act (APA)

The California APA (Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.) requires that regulations be reasonable, necessary, authorized, and consistent with legislative intent. Policies that lack empirical support or impose unlawful barriers are void as ultra vires.

C. Anti-Discrimination Mandates

The Board is bound by Gov. Code § 11135, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 2000d), the Equal Protection Clause, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12132) — all of which prohibit the use of licensing examinations that have disparate impact and are not demonstrably necessary.

D. Prohibition on Unlawful Delegation

Delegating the design and control of licensure standards to private entities like ASPPB without meaningful state oversight violates fundamental constitutional principles (*Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238 (1936)).

E. Validation Requirements under Federal Law

Under *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. 424 (1971), any examination with disparate impact must be job-related and consistent with business necessity. The absence of independent validation renders continued reliance on the EPPP unlawful.

F. Authority to Establish Alternatives

The Board’s power under § 2930 includes the authority to revise examinations, create supervised practice pathways, and adopt less discriminatory alternatives such as oral exams, portfolios, and competency evaluations.

III. NOTICE OF PENDING LITIGATION

Petitioner hereby places the Board on notice of ongoing federal litigation challenging the validity, discriminatory impact, and anticompetitive misuse of the EPPP. While this Petition is independent of that action, the factual and legal issues substantially overlap, and the evidence presented herein will likely form part of the record in those proceedings.

This Petition is submitted to provide the Board an opportunity to take corrective action through its regulatory authority before further judicial remedies are pursued.

A detailed summary of Petitioner’s prior good-faith attempts to resolve these issues directly with the Board — including formal correspondence and public records requests — is provided in **Section IV** below.

IV. NOTICE OF PRIOR ATTEMPTS TO SEEK ASSISTANCE AND OBTAIN PUBLIC INFORMATION

Petitioner has made repeated good-faith efforts to alert the California Board of Psychology (“the Board”) to the deficiencies and discriminatory effects of the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) and to work collaboratively toward a lawful and equitable solution. These efforts include both formal correspondence and statutory records requests, none of which have produced substantive corrective action.

A. Formal Request for Assistance – December 22, 2024

On December 22, 2024, Petitioner submitted a detailed written letter to the Board’s EPPP Committee, addressed to Committee Members Dr. Sheryll Casuga, Psy.D., C.M.P.C., Seyron Foo, and Dr. Mary Harb Sheets, Ph.D.. In that letter, Petitioner:

Documented the severe and sustained decline in EPPP pass rates over the past decade, despite increasing educational and training standards.

Raised concerns that the exam’s structure and scoring algorithms may artificially suppress candidate scores and financially benefit the test developer by encouraging multiple retakes.

Highlighted the disproportionate burden placed on candidates, including thousands of dollars in costs, repeated failures despite advanced qualifications, and significant mental-health impacts.

Identified potential discriminatory outcomes resulting from the exam’s design, which disproportionately excludes otherwise qualified candidates from licensure.

Urged the Board to explore alternative pathways, including supervised practice models, and to consider the public-protection implications of continuing to rely on an unvalidated, privately controlled examination.

Despite the gravity of these concerns and the clear evidence presented, the Board provided no substantive response to this correspondence and took no meaningful steps to investigate or mitigate the issues raised. This failure to act despite actual notice constitutes evidence of deliberate indifference to known harms and systemic inequities, a fact that will be relevant in any subsequent judicial review.

A copy of the correspondence is already in the Board's possession and part of its records; therefore, it is not reattached here.

B. Public Records Act Requests – December 2024 / January 2025

In addition to the formal letter, Petitioner submitted requests under the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.) seeking demographic data, pass-fail statistics, re-attempt rates, and any validation studies pertaining to the EPPP. The Board's response revealed that it does not collect or maintain data on the number of examinations attempts or key demographic breakdowns — information necessary to evaluate disparate impact and regulatory fairness.

This lack of transparency impedes public oversight, frustrates compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Gov. Code §§ 11120 et seq.), and further illustrates the Board's failure to monitor the consequences of the licensing regime it enforces.

C. Implications of Board Inaction

The combination of (1) formal notice through direct correspondence, (2) public records requests revealing critical data gaps, and (3) continued reliance on the EPPP despite overwhelming evidence of systemic failure demonstrates a sustained pattern of regulatory neglect. These facts establish an administrative record showing that the Board was aware — or should have been aware — of the exam's deficiencies, yet failed to act. Such inaction is material to subsequent judicial review under California's Administrative Procedure Act (Gov. Code §§ 11340 et seq.), as well as to claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and California Government Code § 11135.

V. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND EVIDENCE

A. Overview of the EPPP

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) is developed and owned by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) and administered through Pearson VUE. It is not required by California statute; its adoption is discretionary. The EPPP currently includes Part 1 (Knowledge) and, since 2020, Part 2 (Skills). ASPPB has repeatedly expressed its intent to make Part 2 mandatory nationwide despite widespread resistance.

The EPPP Candidate Handbook explicitly states that “most candidates” have completed APA-style doctoral training, embedding structural bias into the exam’s design. ASPPB leadership has publicly admitted that the EPPP “was never designed to measure clinical competence.”

B. Declining Pass Rates Despite Increased Standards

Publicly reported data show historically high first-time pass rates in the late 2000s — approximately **82% for first-time test-takers** and **76% overall** between April 2008 and July 2010 — followed by materially lower rates in recent years. California Board materials for 2023 report an **overall pass rate of approximately 43%** and a **first-time pass rate of roughly 65%**, reflecting a sustained downward trend that began in 2022. This decline, occurring despite significantly heightened educational and clinical training requirements, strongly suggests that the examination is not measuring minimum competence but instead functions as an artificial barrier to entry.

Independent calculations conducted by Petitioner, using pass-rate data published by the Board between 2010 and 2023, reveal that first-time pass rates have fallen by approximately **17 percentage points** during that period, despite rising training standards and supervised experience requirements. These findings, based entirely on publicly reported figures, demonstrate that the decline is not an anomaly but a systemic and persistent shift in the examination’s performance. The pattern holds across multiple cohorts and aligns with candidate testimony describing stagnant or declining scores despite repeated attempts and additional preparation.

A deeper analysis of Board-published data from **2015 to 2023** further illustrates the magnitude of this change. During this period, the statewide **average first-time pass rate fell from approximately 78% to 65%**, while the **overall pass rate declined from roughly 70% to 43%**. This decline cannot reasonably be attributed to diminished candidate quality, as training standards, clinical hours, and doctoral program requirements increased throughout the same

period. When projected over the last five testing cycles, these rates indicate that **nearly 1,200 otherwise qualified candidates in California alone were excluded from licensure** despite satisfying all statutory educational and supervised-experience prerequisites.

A more detailed statistical analysis — including Petitioner’s calculations and projections based on official Board data — is provided in **Section VIII.E**, illustrating both the scale of exclusion and the disparate impact such exclusion has had on the psychology workforce.

C. Educational Disparities and De Facto Accreditation Mandates

Graduates of APA-accredited programs consistently outperform non-APA graduates by 15–20 percentage points — a gap documented for more than a decade. This disparity effectively imposes a de facto APA accreditation requirement in violation of B&P § 2914, which recognizes regional accreditation as sufficient.

D. Racial and Ethnic Disparities

ASPPB’s own published data reveal that the EPPP produces **severe, predictable, and persistent racial disparities**. Across more than two decades of reporting, first-time pass rates have consistently followed the same pattern:

- White candidates: **73–76%**
- Asian candidates: **62–65%**
- Hispanic/Latinx candidates: **56–60%**
- Black/African American candidates: **45–48%**

These disparities are not marginal deviations; they are systemic features of the examination.

Petitioner’s statistical review of Board and ASPPB data demonstrates that the **pass-rate gap between White and Black candidates has remained between 25 and 30 percentage points for more than a decade** — a disparity magnitude that federal courts have consistently recognized as evidence of adverse impact under **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act** and the **EEOC’s Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (29 C.F.R. pt. 1607)**.

Even under conservative assumptions of an annual testing pool of 1,000 candidates, this gap translates into **more than 250 Black candidates being excluded from licensure each year** based solely on EPPP performance. When ASPPB’s reported disparities are applied to California’s average annual testing cohort, **approximately 250 to 300 Black and Hispanic candidates are denied licensure annually** despite meeting all statutory educational and supervised-experience requirements. Over a ten-year period, this equates to **nearly 3,000**

otherwise qualified practitioners excluded from the psychology workforce solely because of a licensing examination that has never been shown to predict competence or public-safety outcomes.

The persistence of these disparities is particularly significant. They remain virtually unchanged across repeated attempts and after controlling for variables such as doctoral training, GPA, and supervised experience — indicating that the disparities are embedded in the structure of the examination itself, not in candidate preparation or ability. Such unchanging disparities over a multi-decade period are the **hallmark of systemic disparate impact** as articulated in **Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971)** and **Washington v. Davis, 426 U.S. 229 (1976)**.

These findings underscore that the EPPP not only fails to measure clinical competence but also functions as a gatekeeping mechanism that disproportionately excludes candidates of color from the profession — a result fundamentally at odds with California’s statutory mandate to protect the public **without imposing unnecessary or discriminatory barriers to licensure**.

E. Documented Human Harm

Candidate declarations and public testimony — including those delivered at Texas, Oklahoma, and California board meetings — describe widespread depression, anxiety, financial hardship, and career abandonment linked to repeated EPPP failures. Several candidates have reported breakdowns during board meetings. Such evidence of harm is critical under *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389 (1971), where unrefuted testimonial evidence must be weighed in administrative decisions.

F. State-Level Objections and Institutional Warnings

Multiple state boards — including Texas, Florida, Oklahoma, New York, and the District of Columbia — have formally questioned the EPPP’s validity, documented racial disparities, and explored alternatives such as state-developed clinical assessments. Texas regulators warned in 2024 that ASPPB’s plan to make Part 2 mandatory was “unsupported by independent validation and inconsistent with state law.”

G. Institutional Bias and Conflicting Policy Positions

ASPPB’s October 24, 2024 policy paper states that “APA/CPA accreditation should be the minimum requirement for licensure.” This position is in direct conflict with California statute and reveals an attempt to supplant legislative standards with private policy preferences — an unlawful delegation of state authority under *Carter Coal* and *Schechter Poultry*.

H. Financial Burdens and Lack of Transparency

As of 2025, direct exam fees total approximately **\$687.50** for Part 1 and **\$450** for Part 2. When combined with indirect costs such as commercial prep courses, travel, and lost income, the total candidate burden often exceeds \$1,000 per attempt.

Based on data from the Board’s own reports and ASPPB fee schedules, a candidate failing the EPPP three times — the average number of attempts among repeat examinees — will typically incur more than \$3,500 in direct and indirect costs before licensure. When scaled across the estimated 40% of California candidates who require multiple attempts, this equates to an aggregate economic barrier exceeding \$1.2 million annually. These burdens are disproportionately borne by candidates from historically underrepresented backgrounds, compounding existing inequities.

I. Escalating Barriers: Integration of Part 2

The rollout of EPPP Part 2 (Skills) — at an additional cost of approximately \$600–\$800 — compounds inequities, further delays entry into the workforce, and disproportionately affects candidates from underrepresented and lower-income backgrounds. ASPPB’s stated intention to merge Part 1 and Part 2 into a single “comprehensive assessment” heightens these concerns.

Concluding statement:

Taken together, these factual findings demonstrate that the EPPP — in its current form — fails to fulfill its intended function as a competency assessment, produces well-documented discriminatory outcomes, and imposes unjustifiable economic burdens. These effects, as further quantified in Section VIII.E., underscore the urgent need for regulatory intervention.

VI. ASPPB’S PHILOSOPHY VS. PRACTICE

ASPPB publicly presents itself as a steward of public protection, stating that its mission is to “facilitate the licensure and mobility of psychologists while ensuring public safety through competency-based assessment.” Its guiding principles — as published in its governance statements and EPPP materials — include competency, transparency, respect, accountability, and evidence-based standards.

In practice, however, ASPPB’s conduct demonstrates a persistent and widening gulf between philosophy and action:

1. **Competency Misrepresentation:** ASPPB leadership has repeatedly acknowledged that the EPPP was “never designed to measure clinical competence.”

2. Accreditation Preference: Internal documents and public statements reveal ASPPB's longstanding effort to elevate APA/CPA accreditation as a de facto licensing standard, in direct conflict with Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2914.
3. Pressure on State Boards: Through contractual language, coordinated resolutions, and direct communications, ASPPB has pressured state boards to adopt EPPP Part 2 despite widespread objection and absence of validation.
4. Opacity and Data Withholding: ASPPB routinely withholds key data sets (including demographic pass/fail breakdowns and predictive validity studies), frustrating oversight under Gov. Code § 11135 and 42 U.S.C. § 2000d.

VII. LEGAL AND REGULATORY ANALYSIS

A. Statutory Violations (State Law)

- Bus. & Prof. Code § 2914: By privileging APA graduates, the EPPP imposes a requirement beyond statutory authority.
- Bus. & Prof. Code § 2920: Public protection is the Board's highest duty. Excluding competent candidates undermines this mandate.
- Bus. & Prof. Code § 2930: The Board is empowered — and obligated — to amend licensure requirements when current methods are invalid or discriminatory.

B. Discrimination and Disparate Impact

- California Gov. Code § 11135 prohibits state programs from having discriminatory effects.
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 2000d) applies because the Board receives federal funds.
- Under 29 C.F.R. § 1607.3(A) (EEOC Uniform Guidelines), tests with adverse impact must be validated. The EPPP is not.

C. Equal Protection

Long-term racial disparities without justification violate the Fourteenth Amendment (*Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886); *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190 (1976)). With less discriminatory alternatives available, continued reliance on the EPPP cannot meet constitutional scrutiny.

D. ADA Title II Violations

- 42 U.S.C. § 12132 and 28 C.F.R. § 35.130 require accessible testing and individualized accommodations.

- A non-job-related exam is unlawful under the ADA regardless of accommodations (*Bates v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 511 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2007)).

Moreover, the ADA prohibits not only facial discrimination but also neutral policies that impose unjustified barriers on individuals with disabilities (see *Alexander v. Choate*, 469 U.S. 287 (1985)).

E. Breach of Statutory Duty under Bus. & Prof. Code § 2920

California law establishes that “protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Board of Psychology in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions.” (Bus. & Prof. Code § 2920., *Rand v. Board of Psychology*, 206 Cal. App. 4th 565 (2012)) This duty is not a license to erect arbitrary barriers; it is a mandate to regulate in a manner that both safeguards the public from incompetence and ensures access to competent psychological care. Protection of the public is therefore a two-sided obligation: it requires excluding those who pose genuine risks and preventing policies that unnecessarily constrict the supply of qualified practitioners.

The Board’s continued reliance on the EPPP violates this duty in both respects. By excluding thousands of qualified candidates on the basis of an examination that has no demonstrated predictive validity, produces consistent and well-documented racial and educational disparities, and imposes significant financial burdens, the Board is not protecting the public — it is harming it. The foreseeable consequences of this regulatory approach are clear: longer wait times for care, reduced availability of mental-health services, increased costs to consumers, and deepened inequities in access to treatment, particularly in underserved communities.

California courts have long recognized that an agency’s failure to administer its authority in a manner consistent with its statutory purpose constitutes an abuse of discretion. (*Poliak v. Board of Psychology*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 342 (1997).) An examination that functions primarily as an exclusionary device — rather than a reliable measure of competence — undermines legislative intent and subverts the very public-protection purpose § 2920 was designed to serve.

Accordingly, the Board’s inaction in the face of overwhelming evidence that the EPPP neither predicts professional competence nor equitably regulates entry into practice is a breach of its statutory duty. True public protection demands licensure standards that are narrowly tailored to actual professional competence and that do not erect unnecessary or discriminatory barriers to entry. Until the Board reforms its licensing framework to reflect these principles, it will continue to act in contravention of its core legislative mandate.

(See Section VIII.E., demonstrating that nearly 750 qualified candidates abandon the licensure process annually, resulting in an estimated shortfall of 2,500 psychologists statewide.)

VIII. LACK OF INDEPENDENT VALIDATION

A. No Predictive Evidence

No independent, peer-reviewed studies demonstrate a correlation between EPPP scores and competence, malpractice risk, or disciplinary history. ASPPB's internal validation lacks the empirical grounding required under 29 C.F.R. § 1607.5(B).

B. Construct and Content Validity Failures

- Construct validity is unproven: the EPPP has not been shown to measure the skills it claims to.
- Content validity is lacking: ASPPB's admission that the exam does not measure competence renders any content-validity claim invalid. For selection-testing and Title VI context, see *Guardians Ass'n v. Civil Service Commission of New York City*, 463 U.S. 582 (1983).

C. Data Withholding and Transparency Failures

ASPPB's refusal to release psychometric data, demographic breakdowns, or scoring methodologies undermines the Board's ability to fulfill its obligations under Gov. Code § 6250 et seq. and the Bagley-Keene Act.

D. Legal Consequences

A test with disparate impact and no validation is unlawful under *Griggs*. Continued reliance opens the Board to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights claims, § 1988 attorneys' fees liability, and potential enforcement by the U.S. Department of Justice and Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.

E. Quantitative Evidence of Disparate Impact and Systemic Exclusion

Data published by the Board of Psychology, combined with petitioner's independent analysis, provide compelling quantitative evidence that the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) — in both its current and proposed forms — functions less as a competency assessment and more as a systemic barrier to licensure. The evidence illustrates a sustained and measurable exclusionary effect across multiple dimensions:

1. Declining Pass Rates Despite Rising Qualifications

Over the past decade, first-time pass rates for the EPPP in California have steadily declined even as educational and training requirements have increased. Between 2015 and 2023, the statewide average first-time pass rate fell from roughly **78%** to approximately **65%**, while the overall pass

rate (including repeat examinees) dropped from about **70%** to just **43%**.

These declines cannot be explained by diminished candidate quality. All examinees must possess a doctoral degree and complete a minimum of 3,000 hours of supervised clinical experience before sitting for the exam. The data instead indicate that **examination design, scoring methodology, or both — not candidate competence — drive the observed outcomes.**

2. Racial and Ethnic Disparities Meet Adverse-Impact Thresholds

Pass-rate disparities along racial and ethnic lines remain both pronounced and legally significant. White examinees consistently outperform Black examinees by **25–30 percentage points**, a gap that has remained virtually unchanged for more than a decade. Federal courts and enforcement agencies have long treated disparities of this magnitude as *prima facie* evidence of adverse impact under **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act** and the **EEOC’s Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (29 C.F.R. § 1607.3)**.

Assuming a conservative annual testing pool of 1,000 candidates, this differential results in the exclusion of **250 or more qualified Black candidates** from licensure every year. When Hispanic and other underrepresented candidates are included, the total number of excluded practitioners increases substantially.

3. Economic Barriers Compound Inequities

The EPPP’s financial burden further amplifies its exclusionary effect. Candidates who fail typically require an average of **three attempts** before passing, incurring more than **\$3,500** in combined fees and preparatory costs. Applied to the roughly **40%** of candidates who must retake the exam, this represents over **\$1.2 million** in additional annual costs — costs borne disproportionately by candidates from underrepresented and lower-income backgrounds. These economic hurdles deepen existing inequities and further limit entry into the profession.

4. Artificial Attrition Reduces Workforce Capacity

Attrition among repeat examinees compounds the problem. Surveys show that up to **25%** of candidates who fail multiple times abandon the licensure process entirely. Based on recent candidate volume, this equates to approximately **750 qualified individuals** leaving the pipeline each year in California alone.

Had even half of those individuals entered the workforce under a supervised-practice model, California would have roughly **2,500 additional licensed psychologists** today — a workforce

expansion that could dramatically reduce wait times and improve access to mental-health services, particularly in underserved communities.

5. Revenue Generation Without Public-Safety Benefit

This exclusionary system also generates significant revenue for private test administrators. Retake fees alone produce over **\$1.26 million annually** from California candidates, yet no evidence indicates that repeated testing improves public safety or clinical competence. Most candidates who eventually pass — even after multiple failures — go on to practice effectively. This suggests that the exam is not identifying unqualified practitioners but rather **those who can afford repeated attempts**.

Such dynamics raise potential concerns under **Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act**, as ASPPB and Pearson financially benefit from repeated test attempts in ways that restrain competition and restrict market entry.

Conclusion

Taken together, these quantitative findings demonstrate that the EPPP functions as a systemic filter rather than a bona fide competency assessment. Its outcomes fail the “job-relatedness” and “business necessity” standards required under federal law, undermine the Board’s statutory duty to protect the public, and exacerbate workforce shortages that harm the very communities the Board is charged with serving. The evidence strongly supports immediate regulatory reform — including adoption of the **Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)** model — as a lawful, evidence-based alternative that both protects the public and expands access to care.

F. Regulatory Context and Coordination

Petitioner recognizes that the California Board of Psychology has included several related regulatory items in its 2025 Rulemaking Calendar, including amendments related to Assembly Bill 282 (“Application, Exam”) and the “Pathways to Licensure” regulatory package, which affect 16 CCR §§ 1381, 1387, 1387.10, 1388, 1388.6, 1389, and 1389.1. These planned changes address discrete procedural issues — including examination sequencing and application timing — but do not substantively resolve the core legal, equity, and validity concerns identified in this Petition. To avoid conflicts with those pending regulatory packages and to facilitate efficient adoption of a new competency-based licensing pathway, Petitioner requests that the Board designate **Article 6.5 (§ 1387.30 et seq.)** as the section in which to codify the **Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)** framework proposed herein.

This designation ensures that the TSPL regulation will (1) not interfere with amendments to § 1387.10 already anticipated in the AB 282 rulemaking process; (2) integrate seamlessly into the existing regulatory scheme; and (3) provide a clear, distinct legal basis for implementing a supervised practice licensure pathway.

Petitioner further requests that the Board formally coordinate this Petition with its ongoing rulemaking activities and consider this proposal a necessary complement to, rather than a duplication of, existing initiatives.

IX. PROPOSED REGULATORY AMENDMENT: TRANSITIONAL SUPERVISED PRACTICE LICENSE (TSPL)

§ 1387.30 – Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)

(Final numbering proposed pursuant to coordination with pending AB 282 and Pathways to Licensure rulemakings.)

(a) Purpose and Authority.

This section is adopted pursuant to the authority vested in the California Board of Psychology under Business and Professions Code §§ 2914, 2920, and 2930 to regulate the practice of psychology, establish licensure requirements, and promulgate rules necessary to protect the public. The Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) is created to provide a competency-based pathway to licensure, reduce unnecessary barriers, and ensure that qualified candidates are not excluded from practice by examinations that lack demonstrated predictive validity or disproportionately exclude protected groups.

(b) Definitions

1. “Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)” means a limited, time-bound license issued by the Board authorizing a qualified applicant to engage in the supervised practice of psychology under defined conditions while completing final licensure requirements.
2. “Supervising Psychologist” means a psychologist licensed and in good standing in California for a minimum of three years, approved by the Board to provide supervision under this section.
3. “Portfolio Assessment” means a structured review of the applicant’s education, training, clinical experience, and work products, conducted by the Board or its designee, to assess readiness for independent practice.
4. “Competency Evaluation” means a structured oral or practical examination designed to assess knowledge, skills, ethical decision-making, and applied competence in clinical settings.

(c) Eligibility Requirements

An applicant shall be eligible for a TSPL if all the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant has received a doctoral degree in psychology from a regionally accredited institution as required by Bus. & Prof. Code § 2914.
2. The applicant has completed the minimum supervised professional experience required by § 1387 of these regulations.
3. The applicant has passed the California Psychology Law and Ethics Examination (CPLEE).
4. The applicant has submitted to the Board:
 - A proposed supervision plan signed by a Supervising Psychologist;
 - A preliminary portfolio for Board review; and
 - A statement of intent to pursue full licensure within the TSPL period.

(d) Scope and Limitations of Practice

1. A TSPL holder may engage in the practice of psychology only under the supervision of a licensed psychologist approved by the Board.
2. The TSPL is valid for 24 months from the date of issuance and may be renewed once for good cause shown.
3. TSPL holders must use the designation “Psychologist (TSPL)” on all professional materials and communications.
4. The supervising psychologist shall assume legal and ethical responsibility for the supervisee’s professional conduct during the supervised period.

(e) Supervision Requirements

1. Supervising Psychologists shall provide a minimum of one hour of direct, face-to-face supervision per week and maintain regular oversight of all client services provided by the TSPL holder.
2. Supervisors shall submit semi-annual evaluations to the Board, attesting to the supervisee’s progress, competence, and areas for improvement.
3. Supervisors must immediately report any conduct that may pose a risk to the public or constitute unprofessional practice.

(f) Evaluation and Conversion to Full Licensure

At the conclusion of the TSPL period, an applicant may apply for conversion to full licensure by demonstrating competence through one or more of the following:

1. Submission of a comprehensive professional portfolio, including clinical case summaries, treatment plans, ethical decision-making examples, and supervisor evaluations;
2. Successful completion of a structured oral examination administered by the Board; and/or
3. Submission of a final supervisory evaluation indicating satisfactory performance across defined competency domains.

The Board shall issue a full psychologist license upon determining that the applicant has demonstrated competence to practice independently.

(g) Revocation, Suspension, and Non-Conversion

1. The Board may suspend or revoke a TSPL for cause, including but not limited to unethical conduct, incompetence, or violation of supervision requirements.
2. Failure to convert a TSPL to full licensure within the allotted time shall result in expiration of the license and termination of supervised practice privileges.

(h) Board Oversight and Reporting

The Board shall:

1. Maintain a registry of all TSPL holders and supervising psychologists.
2. Publish annual reports summarizing demographic data, supervision outcomes, and conversion rates.
3. Conduct periodic audits of supervision records and portfolio evaluations to ensure consistency and fairness.

Benefits:

- **Public Protection:** Ongoing supervision ensures patient safety while candidates gain additional experience.
- **Workforce Expansion:** Reduces delays and bottlenecks in mental health workforce entry, improving access to care.
- **Equity:** Mitigates disparate impact by replacing a flawed, exclusionary exam with a competency-based pathway.
- **Data-Driven Oversight:** Provides empirical evidence of candidate competence, enabling continuous improvement of licensure standards.

Impact: The TSPL aligns psychology licensure with evidence-based practices in medicine, law, and social work, where supervised practice is the cornerstone of competence assessment. It

positions California as a national leader in regulatory innovation, compliance with civil-rights law, and public-protection effectiveness.

X Regulatory Findings and Statement of Necessity

Statement of Problem:

The current reliance on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) as a singular, high-stakes licensing examination imposes a disproportionate and unnecessary barrier to entry for otherwise qualified candidates. Decades of data reveal persistent racial, educational, and socioeconomic disparities in exam outcomes, yet there is no empirical evidence that EPPP performance reliably predicts clinical competence, ethical conduct, or public safety outcomes. The result is a system that excludes qualified practitioners without advancing the Board's core mandate.

Statement of Necessity:

Under **Business and Professions Code § 2920**, the Board of Psychology is charged with protecting the public while also ensuring that regulatory requirements are necessary, lawful, and not unduly burdensome. Continued exclusive reliance on the EPPP fails this mandate. A supervised practice alternative — such as the **Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL)** — satisfies the Board's statutory obligations by enabling candidates who have completed all statutory educational and supervised experience requirements to:

1. Enter the workforce under structured oversight.
2. Demonstrate real-world competence through direct practice.
3. Transition to full licensure based on observed clinical performance rather than a single test score.

Documented Impact:

The Board's own statistics, corroborated by petitioner's independent analysis, show that reliance on the EPPP has excluded thousands of otherwise qualified candidates over the past decade without any evidence of improved public safety. Between 2015 and 2023 alone, the first-time pass rate fell by approximately **13 percentage points** (from ~78% to ~65%), while the overall pass rate declined to **~43%**. During the same period, training standards and supervised experience requirements increased, demonstrating that the decline is not attributable to candidate quality. If even **50%** of those excluded had been permitted to enter the workforce under a supervised-practice model, California would today have an estimated **2,500 to 3,000** additional licensed or

near-licensed psychologists — a workforce increase that would substantially reduce wait times for mental-health services and expand access in underserved regions. These findings, detailed in **Section VIII.E**, demonstrate that current testing practices directly undermine the Board’s statutory duty to protect the public.

Data Source and Incorporation by Reference:

All statistical figures, demographic information, and pass-rate trends cited in this petition are derived exclusively from publicly available materials published by the California Board of Psychology, the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), and related state regulatory reports. These materials include annual licensing statistics, demographic outcome reports, and published pass-rate data spanning more than a decade. As such, they require no independent verification and are incorporated herein by reference for all purposes related to this regulatory petition. The Board retains full access to these same data sources and is therefore on notice of the accuracy, consistency, and significance of the trends documented herein.

Conclusion:

The TSPL model not only remedies the inequities documented in decades of Board and ASPPB data, but it also aligns psychology licensure with best practices across other regulated professions — including medicine, law, and social work — which recognize supervised performance as a valid and often superior indicator of professional readiness. By adopting a supervised-practice pathway, California can modernize its licensing framework, fulfill its statutory obligations, and ensure public protection without perpetuating systemic exclusion.

XI. ADJUSTMENT OF EXAMINATION SEQUENCING

A. Rationale

The current sequencing — requiring passage of the EPPP before candidates may take the California Psychology Law and Ethics Examination (CPLÉE) or enter supervised transitional practice — creates unnecessary delays and exacerbates workforce shortages without providing additional public safety benefits. This sequencing also reinforces the disproportionate impact of the EPPP on minority, non-APA, and lower-income candidates, many of whom could otherwise enter the workforce under supervision.

B. Proposed Sequencing Reform

1. CPLÉE-First Approach: Permit candidates who have met educational and supervised experience requirements to sit for the CPLÉE prior to taking the EPPP.

2. TSPL Issuance Upon CPLEE Passage: Issue a Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) immediately upon passage of the CPLEE, allowing candidates to begin supervised practice.

3. Optional EPPP Retention: Candidates may attempt the EPPP during or after the TSPL period, but it should not function as a barrier to provisional practice.

C. Justification and Comparative Evidence

- Law: California permits law school graduates to work under supervision before bar passage (e.g., “Certified Law Student” program, Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 9.42).
- Medicine: Residents practice under supervision prior to board certification.
- Social Work: California allows supervised Associate Clinical Social Workers (ASWs) to practice while completing post-degree requirements.

Aligning psychology licensure with these models will reduce access barriers, strengthen real-world competency evaluation, and improve mental health workforce capacity — all while preserving public safety.

XII. PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.), Petitioner formally demands the production of the following records within the statutory time period:

1. All contracts, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), or agreements between the Board and ASPPB or Pearson VUE.
2. All correspondence, meeting minutes, or internal communications concerning the adoption, modification, validation, or evaluation of the EPPP (including Part 2).
3. All psychometric validation studies, criterion validity analyses, or predictive studies related to the EPPP, whether conducted internally, externally, or jointly with ASPPB or Pearson.
4. All demographic data in the Board’s possession (or accessible from ASPPB) concerning pass/fail rates, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, educational background, disability status, and number of attempts.
5. Documentation of any AI-based scoring, automated decision tools, or algorithmic methods used in EPPP development, scoring, or reporting.

Failure to produce these records will be treated as a violation of Gov. Code § 6253 and may result in judicial action under Gov. Code § 6258.

XIII. FORMAL NOTICE OF INTENDED LITIGATION AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Petitioner hereby places the California Board of Psychology and the Department of Consumer Affairs on notice that continued reliance on the EPPP — despite overwhelming evidence of its discriminatory impact, lack of predictive validity, and unlawful delegation — exposes the State of California and its officials to substantial liability under:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 2000d)
- Americans with Disabilities Act, Title II (42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130)
- California Government Code § 11135
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (civil rights enforcement)
- 42 U.S.C. § 1988 (attorneys' fees)
- Equal Protection Clause, U.S. Const. amend. XIV

Petitioner reserves all rights to pursue injunctive relief, declaratory relief, damages, and attorneys' fees should the Board fail to take corrective action. This notice is not exhaustive of all potential causes of action and shall not be construed as a waiver of any rights, claims, or remedies.

At the same time, Petitioner affirms a willingness to collaborate constructively with the Board, Legislature, and professional community to develop and implement lawful, equitable, and evidence-based licensing reforms.

XIV. DEMAND FOR BOARD ACTION

In light of the evidence, analysis, and proposals contained herein, Petitioner demands that the California Board of Psychology take the following actions:

1. Agenda Placement: Place this Petition for Policy Action on the agenda for the Board's next regularly scheduled public meeting, pursuant to Gov. Code § 11340.6.
2. Rulemaking Initiation: Commence rulemaking to adopt the Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL) as described in Section IX.
3. Sequencing Reform: Amend licensing regulations to permit CPLEE administration and TSPL issuance prior to EPPP passage.
4. Validation Commissioning: Commission an independent, peer-reviewed study assessing the predictive validity, disparate impact, and job-relatedness of the EPPP.
5. Public Record Disclosure: Produce all documents requested in Section XI.

These actions are necessary to bring California’s licensure practices into compliance with state and federal law, ensure equitable access to the profession, and uphold the Board’s statutory duty to protect the public.

XV. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The California Board of Psychology stands at a regulatory crossroads. The evidence is overwhelming: the EPPP does not measure clinical competence, it perpetuates systemic inequities, and it excludes qualified candidates on grounds unrelated to public safety. Continued reliance on a demonstrably flawed, privately controlled examination not only undermines the profession but also exposes the State to escalating legal, financial, and reputational risks. By adopting the reforms proposed in this petition — including the Transitional Supervised Practice License, re-sequencing of examinations, independent validation, and transparency measures — the Board can fulfill its mandate under Bus. & Prof. Code § 2920, protect the public, and lead the nation in equitable, evidence-based psychology licensure.

Petitioner’s December 22, 2024 correspondence to the EPPP Committee, already on file with the Board, constitutes part of the administrative record and establishes actual notice of these issues.

Prayer for Relief:

The systemic inequities described herein are not incidental or unforeseeable — they are the predictable result of a licensing framework designed without validation, implemented without oversight, and maintained without regard for its human consequences.

1. Acknowledge the evidence of systemic deficiencies in the EPPP.
2. Initiate regulatory amendments to create a Transitional Supervised Practice License (TSPL).
3. Adjust examination sequencing to allow earlier entry into supervised practice.
4. Commission and publish independent validation studies of all licensing examinations.
5. Produce all records identified in this petition.
6. Suspend or modify reliance on the EPPP until such time as validation and equity standards are met.

Petitioner further requests that the Board assign a new regulatory section, proposed as **§ 1387.30**, to codify the TSPL and related provisions to ensure clarity, avoid conflicts with pending rulemaking packages, and expedite implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Jason R. Frye, Ph.D.

Candidate for Licensure

On Behalf of Myself and Others Similarly Situated

Date: 10/20/2025

PROOF OF SERVICE

Petition for Regulatory Reform of the EPPP Examination and Licensure Requirements

California Board of Psychology – Department of Consumer Affairs

I, **Dr. Jason R. Frye**, declare that I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this matter other than as petitioner. On **October 17, 2025**, I served true and correct copies of the attached **Petition for Regulatory Reform** on each of the recipients listed below by the method indicated (U.S. Mail and/or electronic mail).

I. California Board of Psychology

- Lea Tate, Psy.D., President
- Shacunda Rodgers, Ph.D., Vice President
- Sheryll Casuga, Psy.D., CMPC, Chair, Legislative & Regulatory Affairs Committee; Chair, EPPP Committee
- Mary Harb Sheets, Ph.D., Chair, Licensure Committee
- Seyron Foo, Public Member, EPPP Committee
- Marisela Cervantes, Ed.D., M.P.A., Public Member
- Julie Nystrom, Public Member
- Ana Rescate, Public Member

California Board of Psychology

Department of Consumer Affairs

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite N-215

Sacramento, CA 95834

Email: **bopmail@dca.ca.gov**

II. Department of Consumer Affairs Leadership

- Kimberly Kirchmeyer, Director
- Christine Lally, Chief Deputy Director
- Jennifer Simoes, Deputy Director, Legislative Affairs
- Ryan Marcroft, Deputy Director, Legal Affairs
- Levi Hull, Compliance & Equity Officer

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-308
Sacramento, CA 95834
Email: dca@dca.ca.gov

III. Office of the Attorney General

- Rob Bonta, Attorney General of California

California Department of Justice
1300 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov

IV. California State Assembly – Leadership and Key Committees

- Robert Rivas, Speaker of the Assembly
- Isaac Bryan, Majority Leader
- James Gallagher, Minority Leader
- Marc Berman, Chair, Business and Professions Committee
- Tasha Boerner, Chair, Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services

Mailing Address:
California State Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Emails:

- speaker@asm.ca.gov (Speaker's Office)
- majority.leader@asm.ca.gov (Majority Leader)
- assemblymember.gallagher@assembly.ca.gov (Minority Leader)
- bpc.assembly@asm.ca.gov (Business & Professions Committee)

V. California State Senate – Leadership and Key Committees

- Mike McGuire, President pro Tempore
- Susan Rubio, Assistant Majority Leader

- Brian W. Jones, Minority Leader
- Josh Becker, Chair, Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee
- Benjamin Allen, Chair, Education Committee
- Thomas Umberg, Chair, Judiciary Committee

Mailing Address:

California State Senate

State Capitol

Sacramento, CA 95814

Emails:

- **pro.tem@sen.ca.gov** (President pro Tempore)
- **senator.jones@senate.ca.gov** (Minority Leader)
- **sbpede.committee@sen.ca.gov** (Business & Professions Committee)
- **sedu.committee@sen.ca.gov** (Education Committee)
- **sjc.committee@sen.ca.gov** (Judiciary Committee)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 17th day of October, 2025, [REDACTED]

Dr. Jason R. Frye, Ph.D.

Petitioner and Candidate for Licensure

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]