

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

**State Capitol, Room 112
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-0333**

Thursday, February 9, 2017

Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.

Members Present:

Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President
Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President
Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member
Alita Bernal, Public Member
Michael Erickson, PhD
Jacqueline Horn, PhD

Others Present:

Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer
Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager
Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager
Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator
Jacquelin Everhart, Continuing Education/Renewals Coordinator
Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel

Agenda Item #2: President's Welcome

Dr. Phillips welcomed the attendees to the Board's quarterly meeting and read the Board's mission statement. He thanked Senator Steven Glazer of the 7th district for sponsoring the Board Meeting at the State Capitol.

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

Dr. Phillips explained that public comment is the opportunity for members of the public to make comments on items not on the agenda, however, he stated that the Board cannot discuss or take action on any of the comments received.

Kathleen Russell, Executive Director of the Center for Judicial Excellence addressed the Board regarding the oversight of psychologists who are appointed by the court system to work in custody and visitation proceedings in family courts. She requested that the Board consider removing the child custody checklist since it is a roadblock to public protection as it shows a severe lack of understanding about the crisis in the

48 family court system in California. She requested that the Board perform a thorough
49 review of the Board's ability to investigate psychologists that are involved in family court
50 matters. She stated that children are routinely being taken from safe, nurturing parents
51 and are forced into contact with physically, sexually, and emotionally abusive parents.
52 She stated that psychologists are there to heal, but that there are a number of corrupt
53 psychologists who are using junk science and putting kids in harm's way. She provided
54 an article from the Sacramento News and Review regarding what is happening in
55 California's family courts for the Board to consider.

56
57 Tilahien Yilma also addressed the Board regarding the family court system in
58 California.

59
60 Arianna Riley stated that she was one of the children affected by the family court
61 system and shared her experience with the Board.

62
63 Darryl Riley, Ms. Riley's father addressed the Board and indicated they flew in from
64 Seattle to address the Board on this issue. He stated that he has another daughter that
65 is still in the program and has not been in contact for almost a year. He urged the Board
66 to act on this issue.

67
68 Catherine Campbell addressed the Board regarding the family court system and
69 described how it has personally affected her.

70
71 Mark Mulholland shared his experience with the family court system with the Board. He
72 stated that there needs to be a better system in place for child custody evaluations and
73 that the Board needs to be held accountable for this.

74
75 Dr. Phillips requested individuals providing comment to the Board refrain from providing
76 specific names of psychologists that they have submitted a complaint against as the
77 Board is the final adjudicator in these matters and can only receive evidence through
78 proper channels.

79
80 **NO NAME GIVEN** addressed the Board on the importance of mothers having the right
81 to protect their kids and the improper mislabeling of child abuse cases as parental
82 alienation cases.

83
84 Dr. Erickson stated that while the Board is touched by the testimony being given, Board
85 Members are unable to respond to the comments being made since this item is not on
86 the agenda. However, he clarified that if the item is placed on a future agenda, he would
87 hope that the same individuals would return to talk about this issue.

88
89 Rebeca Tripp addressed the Board regarding the family court system and her personal
90 experience in this regard.

91
92 Dr. Horn stated that it would be helpful to know what these issues are specifically
93 addressing and why they are being brought up now. Dr. Phillips responded by indicating

94 that this is the public comment period and any individual wishing to address the Board
95 can make public comment.

96
97 Jaclyn Qirreh thanked the Board for providing the opportunity to make public comments
98 and addressed the Board on her experience with parental alienation. She requested the
99 Board ban the use of parental alienation in California as it takes the focus off of the
100 children and places it instead on the parent.

101
102 Britt Brown addressed the Board regarding the methods used to evaluate children in
103 child custody cases.

104
105 Connie Valentine from the California Protective Parents Association discussed the
106 abusive practices by certain psychologists in California. She urged the Board to look
107 into this issue.

108
109 Jeffrey Perry shared his experience with the family court system.

110
111 Jaimie Gay addressed the Board regarding child custody and parental alienation. She
112 asked the Board for oversight in these issues in hopes that her experience does not
113 happen to other families.

114
115 Christy Ashley addressed the Board and shared her experience with the family court
116 system.

117
118 **NO NAME GIVEN** addressed the Board and shared her experience with the family court
119 system as well as with the Board.

120
121 Kathleen Russell addressed the Board once again and explained that she has been in
122 open dialogue with the Board's Enforcement Manager and that these are current issues
123 related to the Board's child custody checklist and the procedures the Board uses in
124 investigating and disciplining psychologists working in family courts.

125
126 Ms. Marks indicated that based on the comments heard by the Board today, staff can
127 present the complaint and investigation procedures for child custody evaluators at a
128 future meeting, so the Board has a better understanding of this process.

129
130 **Agenda Item #4: Approval of Minutes: November 17-18, 2016**

131
132 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo) to approve the minutes as modified.

133
134 Vote: 6 aye (Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal, Erickson, Acquaye-Baddoo)

135
136
137 **Agenda Item #5: Budget Report**

138

139 Ms. Burns provided an update to the Board's budget and explained the budget process.
140 She explained that the Board's budget for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 started as \$5,013,000;
141 however, revisions and adjustments have been made, and the Board's budget now
142 stands at \$4,764,000.

143
144 Mark Ito, DCA Budget Analyst, presented to the Board. He explained the budget reports
145 that were provided in the Board meeting packets. He explained that DCA uses
146 incremental budgeting which means that we use the prior year's budget act as the
147 starting point to determine the next year's budget.

148
149 Mr. Ito referred to the Analysis of Fund Condition report and noted that the Board's
150 months in reserve is on a downward trend which is because the Board is currently
151 spending more than it brought in. However, he pointed out that the Board currently has
152 \$7,500,000 in outstanding General Fund loan repayments and that \$6,300,000 is
153 projected to be repaid in Fiscal Year 2018/2019 which leaves an additional \$1,200,000
154 to be repaid later. Dr. Horn asked how many months in reserve is considered healthy.
155 Mr. Ito indicated that typically three to six months is what would trigger a General Fund
156 loan repayment.

157
158 Mr. Ito reported on the Board's expenditure projections. He noted that as of month six of
159 the current fiscal year, it is projected that the Board will overspend its budget by
160 \$15,000. However, he noted that there is budget bill language that allows health care
161 boards to pursue a current year augmentation for the Office of the Attorney General and
162 Office of Administrative Hearings and that staff is currently in the process of pursuing
163 this augmentation.

164
165 Mr. Ito explained the Psychology Fund Balance Comparison (Budgeted and Actuals),
166 Psychology Expenditure Comparison (Budgeted vs. Actual), and Psychology Revenue
167 Comparison (Projected vs. Actual) reports that were provided in the Board meeting
168 packets. He also explained the difference between the discretionary and non-
169 discretionary budget items.

170
171 Dr. Erickson asked Mr. Ito if the Board is doing well with its budget or if he had any
172 recommendations. Mr. Ito stated that the Board is doing a great job with its budget and
173 that he worked with Board staff last year to realign budget items to more accurately
174 reflect where the Board's budget is being spent.

175
176 Dr. Phillips thanked Mr. Ito for his presentation.

177
178 **Agenda Item #6: Enforcement Report**

179
180 Ms. Monterrubio provided the Enforcement Report to the Board. She indicated that
181 Curtis Gardner was recently hired as the Board's Probation Coordinator and that there
182 are currently no vacancies in the Enforcement Unit. Since reported that since July 1,
183 2016, the Board received 657 complaints, issued 19 enforcement citations, and referred
184 27 cases over to Office of the Attorney General for formal discipline. She also reported

185 that enforcement staff is currently monitoring 45 probationers of which seven are out of
186 compliance. Dr. Erickson asked what staff does with probationers that are not in
187 compliance. Ms. Monterrubio responded by explaining that it depends on the type of
188 violation. For minor violations such as missing a cost recovery payment or quarterly
189 report, those can be addressed by the issuance of a citation; but more serious violations
190 are referred to the Office of the Attorney General.

191
192 Ms. Monterrubio referred to the Enforcement Performance Measures Report which was
193 provided as a hand-carry item. She indicated that the Board opens complaints within
194 seven days on average which is lower than the target of nine days. She indicated that
195 the average number of days for formal discipline is 624 days with the target being 540
196 days. She explained that this is the hardest target to meet since it involves outside
197 factors, including the investigation unit and the Office of the Attorney General. Ms.
198 Monterrubio indicated that she is proud of the Enforcement Unit for their efforts to meet
199 the established target dates.

200

201 **Agenda Item #7: Press Releases on Board Enforcement Actions**

202

203 Ms. Monterrubio stated that at the November Board Meeting, the Board received public
204 comments regarding concerns about the Board's use of press releases. She indicated
205 that the Board is a consumer protection agency and is committed to protecting
206 consumers of California from harmful licensees and practices. She stated that in
207 keeping with its statutory mandate to protect consumers of psychological services, the
208 Board may issue press releases including, but not limited to, unlicensed activity, sexual
209 misconduct, revocations, fraud and criminal arrests and convictions.

210

211 Ms. Monterrubio indicated that the Board works with the DCA Office of Public Affairs
212 and its Legal Affairs Division as well as the Office of the Attorney General to ensure that
213 the information being published is accurate and informative. She stated that most press
214 releases are issued once a case has been adjudicated; however, there are instances
215 where a press release is issued immediately due to the egregiousness of the case, such
216 as cases involving child molestation, child abuse, elder abuse, unlicensed activity, or
217 fraud.

218

219 Ms. Monterrubio referred to the letter from Senator Jerry Hill to Ms. Sorricks dated
220 February 1, 2017 that was provided as a hand-carry item. She indicated that the letter
221 thanked the Board for its efforts in consumer protection and endorsing the posting of
222 arrests in press releases and social media following the filing of an accusation. Dr.
223 Phillips noted that it is fairly infrequent for the Board to issue a press release. Ms.
224 Monterrubio stated that all press releases issued by the Board since 2014 can be
225 viewed on the Board's website under Publications.

226

227 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo thanked Ms. Monterrubio for her report.

228

229 **Agenda Item #8: Enforcement Mail Ballot Procedures – Discussion and Possible**
230 **Change to Policy**

231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276

Ms. Monterrubio indicated that there was a discussion on this issue at the November Board Meeting and therefore, she has provided the Board with an overview of the mail ballot process as well as the Board's hold policy. She stated that for Stipulated Settlements, the Deputy Attorney General will draft a memo explaining the rationale behind the recommendation to adopt the Decision. For Proposed Decisions drafted by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the ALJ will explain the rationale for the Decision within the document itself.

Ms. Monterrubio stated that, as a courtesy to the Board, staff sends a spreadsheet to each member once a week listing the names of every case that is expected to go out for vote that week. Board members are given ten days to vote to either Adopt, Hold for Discussion, or to Recuse Oneself. She explained that a minimum of five votes to adopt must be received to adopt the Decision, while a minimum of two votes to hold for discussion must be received to move the matter to the next Board meeting. She noted that a vote to reject or not adopt the proposed action or hold a decision for discussion means that the Board member either disagrees with one or more portions of the proposed action and do not want it adopted as the Board's decision or the Board Member has a question or concern about the decision and would like to discuss the matter with fellow Board members.

Ms. Monterrubio noted that if a Decision were to be non-adopted, the transcript will be ordered, and the case is referred back to Board to write its own decision. She stated that failure to obtain a quorum will also cause the matter to be non-adopted and moved to next Board meeting.

Dr. Horn thanked Ms. Monterrubio for her report. She indicated that there have been a few times that she wanted to discuss something about a Decision due to concerns; however, since she was the only one that felt it warranted a discussion, there was no way to discuss it. She indicated that she feels that a requirement for two votes to hold for discussion does not allow the Board Members to do their job and raise concerns. Although she understands that it will cause delays, she proposed changing the number of votes required to hold a matter for discussion to one.

Dr. Phillips added that he has found inaccuracies in Decisions and voted to hold the matter for discussion which did not happen since he was the only one who voted to hold it. He stated that changing it to require only one vote to hold would ensure that the Board is being mindful as to what they are signing off on, but that he also sees the advantage for the process to move quickly for consumer protection.

Ms. Marks clarified an earlier statement made by Ms. Monterrubio. Ms. Monterrubio had stated that a minimum of five votes to adopt must be received to adopt the Decision. Ms. Marks clarified that a minimum of five votes are required to act since five constitutes a quorum of the Board. Therefore, she indicated that if five votes were received, four of which were to adopt and one were to non-adopt, the Decision would still be adopted.

277 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked what would the Board need to do if it wanted to change the
278 requirement for holding a Decision for discussion to one vote. Ms. Monterrubio stated
279 that this is an internal policy; therefore, the Board would need to make a motion and
280 vote on it.

281
282 Ms. Sorrick stated that if the Board votes to change the requirement to one vote to hold
283 for discussion, it might want to consider changing it back to two votes once all nine
284 members have been appointed to the Board. Discussion ensued.

285
286 It was M(Horn)/S(Jones)/C to change the Board policy that if one Board member votes
287 to hold a Decision for discussion, then the Decision would be brought back to the next
288 Board meeting for discussion.

289
290 Vote: 6 aye (Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal, Erickson, Acquaye-Baddoo) 0 no

291
292 **Agenda Item #9: Overview of the Legislative Process Presentation**

293
294 Ms. Burns presented an overview of the legislative process as well as the Board's and
295 Staff's roles and responsibilities during the process. She thanked staff from the DCA
296 Office of Legislative and Regulatory Review for their assistance in preparing the
297 presentation.

298
299 **Agenda Item #10: Executive Officer's Report**

300
301 a) Organization Update

302
303 Ms. Sorrick announced that a new Probation Coordinator has been hired in the
304 Enforcement Unit as well as a Limited Term Licensing Analyst in the Licensing Unit.
305 She stated that as of today, the only vacancy is the Licensing/BreEZe Coordinator
306 position in the Licensing Unit.

307
308 b) DCA Update

309
310 Ms. Sorrick referred to the information provided in the Board meeting packets.

311
312
313
314
315

316 **Agenda Item #11: Strategic Plan Update**

317
318 Ms. Bernal provided the Board with a Strategic Plan update. Ms. Sorrick indicated that
319 the timeframe for four of the items listed under goal 2.1 had to be moved out since the
320 Licensing Committee is still reviewing language to bring to the Board.

321
322 **Agenda Item #12: Communications Plan Update**

323
324 Ms. Sorrick reported that a draft stakeholders list was sent to the Board members by Mr.
325 Leitzell and that it will be discussed at the next Outreach and Education Committee
326 meeting.

327
328 **Agenda Item #13: Social Media Update**

329
330 Ms. Bernal said the Board is experiencing trolls on its Twitter page. Ms. Burns explained
331 that trolls are those who are tagging the Board in inappropriate posts that keep getting
332 re-Tweeted. Ms. Burns stated that we have asked DCA's Office of Public Affairs to
333 come talk to the Board about the use of social media and whether or not certain social
334 media platforms are efficacious.

335
336 Ms. Bernal indicated that this will be continued to be reviewed at the next Outreach and
337 Education Committee meeting and further information will be reported back to the
338 Board.

339
340 **Agenda Item #14: Website Update**

341
342 Ms. Burns provided the top five website pages that get the most views and asked if staff
343 should provide other pages as well. She asked if it would be more beneficial for the staff
344 to track the pages the Board finds most important. Dr. Phillips stated that feedback from
345 Board members and staff should be solicited as to which pages are the most important.
346 Ms. Burns indicated that staff will gather this information and add it to the agenda for the
347 next Outreach and Education Committee meeting.

348
349 **Agenda Item #15: Update on Newsletter**

350
351 Ms. Bernal presented the 2016 *Fall Journal*.

352
353 **Agenda Item #16: Outreach Activities Update**

354
355 Ms. Bernal reported that Dr. Erickson and senior staff went to lunch with CPA on
356 February 8, 2017 to discuss outreach, legislation, and regulation for 2017. Dr. Erickson
357 indicated that due to circumstances, there was not much time for discussion, but that a
358 conversation has been started.

359
360 Ms. Sorrick stated that following the lunch with CPA, she, Dr. Erickson, Dr. Phillips, and
361 staff made some legislative visits. She indicated that they were able to meet with
362 Assembly Member Salas and Assembly Member Brough, as well as with staff from
363 Senator Bate's office and Senator Hill's office. She stated that the goal of the visits was
364 to talk about what is going to be introduced in the 2017-18 legislative session as well as
365 to provide a recap of 2016 legislation. She noted that the recap of 2016 focused on the
366 concerns the Board had with Applied Behavior Analysis, continued concerns regarding
367 Workers' Compensation, telehealth, and college mental health provision funding. She
368 stated that there seemed to be a lot of interest in telehealth and access to care in rural

369 areas and with veterans. Dr. Phillips also noted that they discussed the Board-
370 sponsored legislation regarding continuing education on suicide assessment and
371 intervention. Dr. Erickson stated that the visits were very helpful and productive.
372

373 Dr. Phillips thanked staff for their hard work.
374

375
376 **Agenda Item #17: Access to Mental Healthcare in the State of California**
377 **Campaign Update**
378

379 Ms. Bernal said this campaign has been completed and the Outreach and Education
380 Committee will consider other campaigns at its next meeting,
381

382 Ms. Burns added that there will also be telehealth article in the upcoming newsletter that
383 will be part of a multi-part series.
384

385
386 **Agenda Item #18: Petition for Early Termination of Probation – Gary Schummer,**
387 **PhD**
388

389 Administrative Law Judge Marilyn Woollard presided. Deputy Attorney General John
390 Gatschet was present and represented the People of the State of California. Gary
391 Schummer, PhD was present and represented himself.
392

393 **Agenda Item #19: Closed Session**
394

395 The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to
396 discuss disciplinary matters including the above petition, petitions for reconsideration,
397 stipulations, and proposed decisions.
398

399
400
401
402
403
404

405 **Thursday, February 10, 2017**
406

407 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session meeting to order
408 at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested
409 parties.
410

411 **Members Present:**

412 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President
413 Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President
414 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member

415 Alita Bernal, Public Member
416 Michael Erickson, PhD
417 Jacqueline Horn, PhD

418

419 **Others Present:**

420 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer
421 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
422 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
423 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager
424 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager
425 Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator
426 Jacquelin Everhart, Continuing Education/Renewals Coordinator
427 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel

428

429 **Agenda Item #20: Legislative Update**

430

431 Ms. Jones referred to the Legislative Matrix provided in the meeting packets. She
432 indicated that everything is currently a “Watch” since the Policy and Advocacy
433 Committee has not had a chance meet and review any of the bills. Ms. Burns stated that
434 the legislative session has just started; therefore, bills are still being introduced. She
435 indicated that some of the bills are considered intent language and do not reference any
436 code sections at this time; however, the bills will develop over time.

437

438 **a) Legislative Proposals for the 2017 Legislative Session**

439

440

441 **1) Omnibus Proposal – Amendments to Business and Professions Code**
442 **Sections 2290.5 (Telehealth; Patient Consent; Hospital Privileges and Approval**
443 **of Credentials for Providers of Telehealth Services) and 2987 (Fee Schedule)**

444

445 Ms. Jones explained that omnibus proposals are ways to clean up statutory
446 language and make non-controversial changes. Ms. Burns explained that each
447 year, the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee
448 (Senate BP&ED) reaches out to the boards and bureaus within DCA for any
449 clean-up language or non-controversial changes to the Business and Professions
450 Code which get combined into one large omnibus bill.

451

452 Ms. Burns indicated that the Board approved omnibus language at its November
453 2016 Board meeting to allow psychological assistants to pay their own
454 registration fees. She indicated that the proposed changes will bring section 2987
455 into conformity with the changes made by SB 1193 (Chapter 484, Statutes of
456 2016) which was the Board’s Sunset Bill. Ms. Burns stated that the proposed
457 language has already been submitted to the Senate BP&ED and that the
458 language will be put into a bill that will be submitted by the Committee. She
459 indicated that a bill number has not yet been assigned, but that the Committee is
460 working with other boards and bureaus to incorporate their changes into the bill.

461

462 2) AB 89 (Levine) Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention Coursework
463 Requirements – Addition of Section to the BPC (Coursework in Suicide Risk
464 Assessment and Intervention)
465

466 Ms. Jones introduced the discussion on Suicide Risk Assessment and
467 Intervention coursework requirements and indicated that there were some hand-
468 carry materials that have been provided. She reminded the Board that this
469 process has been ongoing for quite some time now, and that there has been a lot
470 of activity on this issue within the last year. She indicated that at the May 2016
471 Board meeting in Los Angeles, the Licensing Committee made two proposals to
472 the Board, neither of which were carried. She stated that the Licensing
473 Committee was asked to take the issue back to the Committee level and take a
474 thorough look at the issue. Ms. Jones indicated that the Licensing Committee
475 received public input and brought the issue back to the Board at its November
476 2016 meeting. At that time, the Board adopted a motion to move forward with this
477 legislation and directed staff to work with Assembly Member Levine’s office to
478 develop language for a bill. Ms. Jones stated that AB 89 has been introduced by
479 Assembly Member Levine. She indicated that there has been a lot of discussion
480 on this issue and that transparency has been a key value throughout the
481 process. She stated that at this time, the Board needs to take a look at the
482 language and determine what position it wants to take.
483

484 Dr. Phillips acknowledged the hard work and research that former Board Member
485 Dr. Harlem put into this issue.
486

487 Ms. Burns provided a brief history of the Board’s efforts on this issue which was
488 explained in more detail in the Board meeting materials. She stated that, at the
489 November 2016 Board meeting, Board members expressed a desire to have the
490 statutory language reflect the Board’s intentions with proposing this legislation.
491 The Board approved the Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention coursework
492 requirement legislative proposal and instructed staff to move forward with the
493 language and work with Assembly Member Levine’s office. Levine had previously
494 informed staff of his desire to author the bill if the proposal was approved.
495

496 Ms. Burns stated that since the November 2016 Board meeting, staff has
497 developed legislative intent language for the Board’s consideration which was
498 included in the Board meeting materials, and has submitted the amendments
499 made at the November 2016 Board meeting to Assembly Member Levine’s staff
500 for inclusion in the bill text. Ms. Burns indicated that Assembly Member Levine
501 introduced AB 89 on January 9, 2017, which includes the Suicide Assessment
502 and Intervention coursework requirement text as approved by the Board.
503

504 Ms. Burns stated that if approved, the legislative intent language would be
505 submitted to Assembly Member Levine’s office for inclusion in AB 89. She stated
506 that the bill will not be moved to any committee until the Board is ready for it to
507 be. She indicated that intent language is pretty common and provides context as

508 to why the Board is taking action. She explained that intent language does not
509 wind up in the statutory language, but is kept as a part of the record.

510
511 Discussion ensued. Dr. Horn and Ms. Jones made comments regarding the
512 Request for Approval of Proposed Legislation document that was provided for
513 the Board's review at its November 2016 Board meeting.

514
515 Dr. Horn raised her concern about the Board addressing other boards in its intent
516 language. Dr. Phillips reminded the Board that in his veto message of AB 2198,
517 the Governor asked licensing boards to look at their own requirements with
518 regard to training in suicide assessment and to take whatever actions are
519 needed. Dr. Phillips stated that it is not within the Board's purview to encourage
520 other licensing boards to address this issue.

521
522 Ms. Jones suggested that the Board first review the bill itself and then return to
523 its discussion regarding the intent language. Ms. Burns summarized the changes
524 that the Board requested that have been made to the bill language. Ms. Sorrick
525 suggested that, if the Board is okay with the language, that it be on record to be
526 the sponsor of this bill.

527
528 Ms. Burns presented the draft intent language and explained the structure of the
529 document. She noted that the Board of Behavioral Sciences indicated that they
530 performed an assessment on this issue and determined that they did not need to
531 add any additional requirements and requested to be removed from the intent
532 language.

533
534 Ms. Jones indicated that she appreciates staff citing the sources in the draft
535 language and once again thanked Dr. Harlem for his work on this issue.

536
537 Dr. Horn requested that the year that the Centers for Disease Control came up
538 with their statistics be added in section (a)(1). Ms. Jones also requested that the
539 year be added for each citation made in the document. Ms. Sorrick also
540 requested that "California" be changed to "the Department of Health Care
541 Services Suicide Prevention Program" in section (a)(3).

542
543 Dr. Horn requested that the statistics in section (a)(2) on the percentage of
544 people who die by suicide that have seen a mental health professional prior to
545 their death by highlighted as she feels that information is extremely important. Dr.
546 Phillips questioned the relevancy of the information provided in section (a)(2) and
547 asked if it needs to be included. Discussion ensued. Ms. Bernal recommended
548 adding California data along with the national data provided in section (a)(1). Dr.
549 Horn stated that the issue may be with the relevance of this data and how the
550 data is collected. Dr. Erickson asked if the Board needed to approve the intent
551 language in order to move forward with the bill. Ms. Burns replied that the bill can
552 be moved forward without the intent language and that it is more important for
553 the Board to decide if it wants to be the sponsor on the bill. Dr. Phillips suggested
554 that the Board solely look at the issue of AB 89 and that the intent language be

555 deferred to the Policy and Advocacy Committee for further review and
556 consideration.

557
558 Ms. Jones stated that the Board received written comments on this issue for
559 consideration.

560
561 Craig Lomax commented before the Board in support of AB 89 and indicated that
562 he appreciates the Board's objectivity and transparency throughout the process.
563 He stated that the coursework requirement is not burdensome or inappropriate
564 and that the Board's efforts would not be in vain and that it will save lives. He
565 commented that the Board Members are leaders, not in just psychology, but in
566 other mental health professions, and that this effort is an important statement for
567 other professionals to look at and say that all mental health professionals need
568 some foundation in suicide prevention. Mr. Lomax stated that he is hopeful that
569 the Board will move forward today and not risk any further delays. He stated that
570 he appreciates that the Board kept the requirement for students intact as well as
571 for current licensees.

572
573 Dr. Jo Linder-Crow, Chief Executive Officer of the California Psychological
574 Association, stated that she recognizes the Board's intention in considering
575 sponsoring this bill as suicide is a crippling issue in this society. She stated that
576 when the Governor vetoed AB 2198 two years ago, that bill would have required
577 all mental health professionals, including psychologists, to complete a continuing
578 education course in suicide assessment and treatment management. In the veto
579 message, the Governor stated that California has an extensive regulatory
580 scheme that aims to ensure that California physicians, psychologists and
581 counselors are skilled in the healing arts to which they have committed their lives
582 and that rather than further regulating this field, he asked licensing boards to
583 evaluate the issues which this bill raises and take whatever actions are needed.
584 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that this Board did an admirable job in fulfilling his request
585 by conducting surveys and received a healthy response. She indicated that the
586 Board's survey demonstrated that psychology students and trainees receive this
587 training as required by their training programs and that 97% said suicide risk
588 assessment is required as part of their training; 92% said it is a required part of a
589 trainee's supervised experience. Additionally, she stated that the qualitative
590 portion of the Board's survey showed that it is not one course that is offered, but
591 a continuum of training woven throughout the training program.

592
593 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that taking a single course will not suffice, but what will
594 save lives is greater access to mental health care in our communities and on our
595 campuses and access to a vast array of helpful, high-quality resources
596 developed by organizations that have a sole focus on this issue. She stated that
597 she agrees with Mr. Lomax in that that this Board has an opportunity to provide
598 real, meaningful leadership on this issue. She suggested making this issue an
599 area to focus on in the Board's outreach efforts and partner with CPA to make
600 available resources even more available to clinicians and consumers. She stated
601 that she urges the Board to redirect its resources and energy into a different

602 effort that might actually save lives. She indicated that CPA cannot support this
603 bill, but CPA is willing and eager to shed a light on this issue and do some work
604 that can hopefully reduce the level of suicide.
605

606 Dr. Erickson thanked Dr. Linder-Crow for her comments and noted that the
607 research the Board did focused on students who will be completing training
608 programs and becoming psychologists. He indicated that, in practical terms, this
609 is a very low number in terms of whether the field of psychologists has adequate
610 suicide training and the Board has not spent much time surveying its
611 approximately 20,000 licensees to see what their level of training is, which he
612 thinks is also very important. He stated that this bill invites licensees to take an
613 inventory of what they know about suicide prevention and whether they are up to
614 date, and he does not see this bill as requiring one six-hour course because
615 people can obtain this requirement in other ways. Therefore, he indicated that
616 taking a six-hour course is not the major thrust of this legislation. He stated that
617 he thinks that moving forward on this bill shows that it is a very important issue.
618

619 Dr. Phillips stated that although psychologists may be the some of the best-
620 trained clinicians in suicidality issues, he thinks the Board should aspire to
621 ensure that all psychologists are properly trained in this area. He indicated that
622 he has spoken to a substantial number of psychology students many of whom
623 who have felt that they have received inadequate training in their graduate
624 programs and training sites. He stated that he thinks that there are vast
625 inconsistencies and that there is enough inconsistency that the Board needs to
626 make certain that the training is being obtained and thinks that this bill is a great
627 compromise. He also indicated that he does not think that the Legislature is in
628 the best position to determine what type of specialized training needs to be done
629 by trainees and licensees, and that it is better left to the Board's discretion. He
630 stated that the Board is exercising its discretion after reviewing the information
631 gathered and has determined that this is the best approach to take. He stated
632 that his thinking on this issue has evolved over time after hearing and reading a
633 lot of data, and he feels that this is one way to ensure that people are aware of
634 this training. He stated that he does not think that sponsoring this bill prevents
635 the Board from engaging in outreach efforts in this area with CPA.
636

637 Dr. Horn stated that she agreed with virtually everything Dr. Linder-Crow said,
638 but she does not see things as mutually exclusive. She thinks it would be a great
639 idea for the Board to partner with CPA in an outreach campaign. She stated that
640 her thinking on this issue has evolved as well. She indicated that she was initially
641 opposed and her thinking changed based upon the information received over the
642 course of the discussions of this issue. She indicated that she thinks this will
643 always be an area where people feel they need more training because it is a
644 complex issue; but she also recognizes that people are getting this training along
645 the way and this has been addressed in the language. She indicated that a six-
646 hour course is not required; therefore, this bill is much different from the bill that
647 was vetoed in 2014. She acknowledged that psychologists are well trained but

648 she wants to ensure that everyone is assessing if they have the skills and the
649 knowledge in this area.

650
651 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that the Board has evolved in its thinking given the
652 additional information that has been provided over time. She stated that the
653 Board is willing to take all information that it has been given and drill down to
654 ensure that this bill will benefit everyone.

655
656 Ms. Bernal stated that the Outreach and Education Committee would be more
657 than thrilled to work with CPA on an outreach campaign.

658
659 Ms. Jones said she appreciates the historical perspective of this issue. She
660 stated that although the Board did oppose the original bill for various reasons,
661 throughout the process, the Board has evolved in its way of looking at this. She
662 thanked Dr. Linder-Crow for her input and Mr. Leitzell for his hard work on the
663 intent language.

664
665 It was M(Phillips)/S(Erickson)/C to approve the proposed language of AB 89, for
666 staff to continue working with Assembly Member Levine's office, and for the
667 Board to be listed as the official sponsor of the bill.

668
669 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no
670

671 The Board further discussed the draft intent language. Ms. Jones requested
672 additional input and stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee will be
673 reviewing the intent language and recommended changes in March and it will be
674 brought back to the April 2017 Board meeting.

675
676 Dr. Erickson stated that section (a)(4) needs to be clearer about whether the
677 training being discussed is only for psychologists versus other mental health
678 professionals. Dr. Horn commented that she agrees with Dr. Erickson but also is
679 not sure if the section needs to be there at all. She also addressed section (b)
680 and noted that it is not stated strongly enough. She also recommended that when
681 training is being discussed, to put it in the order that it happens - from graduate
682 school, to internship, and to post-doctoral training.

683
684 Dr. Linder-Crow commented that section (b) makes sweeping statements that
685 leave the impression that perhaps psychologists are not trained very well. She
686 stated that she is also concerned about section (c) which states that it is the
687 intent of the Legislature which is stating that this document is speaking for the
688 author of the bill. It states that this bill will ensure that all psychologists receive a
689 minimum level of education or training in suicide risk assessment and
690 intervention. To imply that this bill will establish a baseline for training for
691 psychologists is not accurate since the baseline for training for psychologists is
692 established in their training programs, and this language is misleading to the
693 Legislature. Dr. Linder-Crow stated that, based on Board Members' earlier

694 comments, the intention of the bill is to create an environment where
695 psychologists could do an assessment of their own training in this area.
696
697 Dr. Erickson expressed his concern with section (d) and whether the Board
698 wants to encourage other boards. He asked if this language is helpful or if it
699 overreaching. Ms. Jones said the Board would be revisiting this issue.
700
701 Dr. Horn noted that if section (c) was read alone, it sounds like psychologists are
702 currently deficient in this training.
703
704 Ms. Bernal recommended using the terminology “all health care professionals” in
705 section (d) rather than naming specific boards.
706
707 Ms. Jones stated that the Board will not going to be taking any action on this item
708 because there are changes that need to be made by the Policy and Advocacy
709 Committee and that the revised document will be reviewed again by the full
710 Board at its April 2017 Board meeting.

711
712 **b) Legislative Items for Future Meeting**

713
714 Ms. Jones said the Board does not have any items at this time.

715
716 **c) Update Regarding the California Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA)**
717 **and Mandated Reporting – Penal Code Sections 261.5, 288, and 11165.1**

718
719 Ms. Burns stated that the Board previously requested an opinion from the Attorney
720 General but due to litigation on this issue, the request was withdrawn. On January 9, a
721 decision was rendered by the Court of Appeals of the State of California, Second
722 Appellate District which affirmed the judgment of the Los Angeles County Superior
723 Court trial. Board staff is now working with the Opinions Unit of the Office of the
724 Attorney General to determine whether the Board will need to submit a new request for
725 a legal opinion.

726 Dr. Phillips commented that the court’s decision seems to indicate that sexting among
727 people under the age of 18 may constitute a reportable offense under CANRA.

728
729 **Agenda Item #21: Regulatory Update and Review: Possible Action**

730
731 **a) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10,**
732 **1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants**

733
734 Mr. Glasspiegel referred the Board Members to an updated memorandum dated
735 February 3, 2017 that was provided as a hand-carry item. He stated that staff is
736 currently working to create the Initial Statement of Reasons and Notice of Proposed
737 Regulations with Informative Digest. He indicated that additional changes have been
738 made to the proposed language, which are indicated in red font. Mr. Glasspiegel
739 explained that the changes that were made were to address the Office of Administrative
740 Law’s requirements that we include form numbers in the regulatory language and

741 explain the necessity and statutory authority for collecting the information requested on
742 the form.

743
744 Dr. Phillips asked if the Board was going to be requiring the form by referencing it in
745 language to be in compliance with OAL. Mr. Glasspiegel explained that form names can
746 be referenced in the language, or the specific information to be collected must be
747 itemized out in the language. He further explained that minor changes could be made
748 through a section 100 change which is much easier than a full regulatory change. Ms.
749 Marks clarified that the minor changes that could be made through a section 100
750 change would include non-substantive issues such as changing the name of the
751 Governor or the Board's address; but if the Board decided to include a new data point
752 for applicants or to make more substantive changes, then it would need to go through
753 the regulatory process.

754
755 Mr. Glasspiegel stated that staff is requesting the Board to approve the changes in the
756 proposed language.

757
758 Ms. Marks asked if the Board wanted this matter set for hearing. Ms. Jones inquired
759 regarding the necessity of a hearing. Ms. Marks clarified that either way, there must be
760 a 45-day public comment period, and that the Board would have to adopt the language
761 at the end of the public comment period. She noted that this Board usually does
762 conduct a hearing.

763
764 Discussion ensued. Mr. Glasspiegel explained that previously the Business, Consumer
765 Services, and Housing Agency provided a waiver to DCA boards that allowed boards to
766 notice proposed language before it went through a review from DCA, Agency and the
767 Department of Finance, but the rulemaking file would have to reviewed and submitted to
768 the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) within one year. He stated that the waivers no
769 longer exist and that now the review process must be completed before the proposed
770 regulatory language is noticed. He also noted that, with the new process, the review
771 period no longer counts toward the one-year deadline to submit rulemaking files to OAL.

772
773 Dr. Linder-Crow clarified that the proposed language will no longer reference an
774 employer/employee relationship for psychological assistants. She stated that the
775 guidance that CPA has been giving for years is that the psychological assistant
776 relationship must be a W-2 relationship rather than a contractor relationship. She asked
777 what impact this change would have on this guidance.

778
779 Ms. Marks indicated that she does not see the change in 2913 which used to refer to a
780 person who may be employed, which has since changed, as dispositive of the
781 relationship between the supervisor and the trainee. She clarified that, when
782 determining if someone is an employee, many factors have to be considered such as
783 who has control over the workplace and the work to be done, who sets the schedule,
784 and which clients are going to be seen by the person in question. She stated that the
785 same factors would have to be considered for psychological assistants.

786

787 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that she understands the relationship between supervisor and
788 supervisee, but asked if this is going to create a separate relationship of
789 employer/employee that will change the guidance that CPA gives to psychologists who
790 are going to be hiring psychological assistants. Ms. Marks indicated that it is her
791 understanding that the changes to the statute and regulations changes the nature of
792 who files the registration, and changes the fact that the statute no longer refers to a
793 person who may be employed, however, she indicated that it would not necessarily
794 change the basic relationship that existed before, or the nature of the analysis of who
795 controls the aspects of the work to be done, and that supervisors are responsible for
796 seeking their own counsel.

797
798 Discussion ensued. Dr. Erickson stated that it seems to him that the Board made a
799 realization that identifying the employer/employee relationship in statute was not
800 necessary since the Internal Revenue Service is clear that it must be an
801 employer/employee relationship since there are guidelines that state that, if the person
802 doing the work doesn't have full control, which a psychological assistant does not, they
803 must be considered an employee. Dr. Horn commented that section 1391.8 states that
804 the supervisor or employer shall supply all provisions necessary to function as a
805 psychological assistant; that independent contractors provide all their own provisions,
806 but supervisors of psychological assistants must provide the provisions necessary to
807 function as a psychological assistant. Dr. Phillips added that he thinks that the real
808 distinction is the extent of control that the person who is paying for work being done
809 has. He stated that, if someone has control over how the work is done, which the
810 supervisor of a psychological assistant has, that, as he understands it, it would
811 constitute an employer/employee relationship regardless of what the Board calls it;
812 therefore, the guidance that CPA has been giving would not change.

813
814 It was M(Phillips)/S(Horn)/C to approve the changes in the proposed language and give
815 the Executive Officer the authority to proceed with the rulemaking file and set the matter
816 for hearing.

817
818 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

819
820 b) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1387(b)(10)(11) and 1387.1 – Verification of Experience
821 and Supervision Agreement Forms

822
823 Mr. Glasspiegel reported that the Rulemaking File was noticed for the initial 45-day
824 comment period on April 1, 2016 and that the hearing took place at the May 2016 Board
825 meeting. He indicated that the final regulatory package was approved by DCA and the
826 Department of Finance, and it was delivered to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL)
827 on December 22, 2016. He indicated that OAL advised staff on February 1, 2017 of the
828 need for a 15-day notice of modified text to make non-substantive changes to the
829 original language, and that staff noticed the text on February 7, 2017. He indicated that
830 the comment period will end February 22, 2017. Ms. Jones inquired if the notice had
831 been posted on social media. Mr. Glasspiegel stated that it had not yet been posted on
832 social media, but that he would get it posted. Ms. Sorrick clarified that this is a follow-up
833 to a bill by Assembly Member Levine from 2014 which allowed the Board to receive

834 verification of experience forms directly from trainees along with their applications for
835 licensure, provided specific procedures are followed.

836
837 Mr. Glasspiegel noted that the word “may” has been changed to “shall” as suggested by
838 OAL. Dr. Horn indicated that section 1387.1(c) indicates that primary supervisors shall
839 be in compliance at all times with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law and
840 the Medical Practice Act, whichever is applicable, and inquired if it needs to be changed
841 to read “or” the Medical Practice Act, whichever is applicable. Ms. Marks commented
842 that if a supervisor is a psychiatrist, they would have to comply with the Psychology
843 Licensing Law in addition to the Medical Practice Act. Dr. Horn stated that if that is the
844 case, then the phrase “whichever if applicable” needs to be removed. Discussion
845 ensued. Ms. Sorrick stated that the Board could address this change in the “pathways”
846 language so it would not jeopardize or hold up this package. Dr. Horn stated that she
847 does not believe people are currently confused as to which Practice Act they need to
848 follow but thinks the language is still unclear. Dr. Phillips stated that there seems to be a
849 consensus among Board members to address this issue under “pathways” rather than
850 making any further modifications to the text of the current package.

851
852 It was M(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to approve the modified language as written and
853 to give the authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the language at the end of the
854 public comment period if no negative comments are received.

855
856 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

857
858
859 **Agenda Item #22: Telepsychology Committee Report and Consideration and**
860 **Possible Action on Committee Recommendations**

861
862 **a) Consideration and Possible Approval of Proposed Additions to California Code of**
863 **Regulations, Title 16, to Address Standards of Practice for Telehealth**

864
865 Dr. Erickson reported that the Telepsychology Committee met on February 3, 2017 to
866 discuss and refine the proposed additions to the Board’s regulations regarding the
867 practice of telehealth services. He stated that the Committee considered a written letter
868 from the Federal Trade Commission regarding the use of telehealth services for speech
869 pathology and audiology services. Dr. Erickson noted that, after consideration of the
870 letter, the Committee did not feel that the proposed language limited access to
871 telehealth services and, therefore, did not run afoul of the intent of the FTC.

872
873 Dr. Erickson referred to draft language that was provided as a hand-carry item that aims
874 to accomplish guidelines for licensed California psychologists to provide telehealth to
875 clients and patients.

876
877 Dr. Horn noted that the language makes it clear that we are talking about health care.
878 Dr. Erickson agreed. Ms. Jones asked if there has been any additional feedback
879 regarding the proposal since the November Board meeting. Ms. Sorrick indicated that

880 the public comment received at the November Board meeting was taken into
881 consideration during the February 3, 2017 Committee meeting.

882
883 Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman, CPA, thanked the Board for allowing her to provide comment.
884 She indicated that the language is complicated because it bases the rules on residency
885 rather than based on the location of the patient and the provider. She indicated that
886 there are two issues that are unclear and potentially restrictive. She stated that the
887 language states that a licensee may also provide psychological health care services to
888 a patient or client who initiates psychological health care services while in this state, but
889 who may not be a resident of this state. She indicated that it sounds like it would
890 exclude subsequent telehealth services since it omits the phrase "via telehealth." She
891 indicated that this seems to be implying that a non-resident cannot initiate services via
892 telehealth from out of state.

893
894 Dr. Phillips said that it would be clearer to add the phrase "via telehealth" to the
895 proposed amendments in subsection (a) so that it reads "A licensee may also provide
896 psychological health care services via telehealth to a patient or client who initiates
897 psychological health care services while in this State, but who may not be a resident of
898 this State." Dr. Phillips also commented that in terms of out of state people calling into
899 the State to speak to a provider here, he stated that is something that should be up to
900 the jurisdiction in which the person is located, rather than the Board giving its licensees
901 permission to do it.

902
903 Dr. Phillips also indicated that the first sentence of subsection (a) should be amended to
904 read "A licensee is permitted to provide psychological health care services via telehealth
905 to an originating site in this State, as defined in section 2290.5 of the Code, and to
906 provide psychological health care services via telehealth to a patient or client who is a
907 resident of California who is temporarily located outside of this State, subject to the laws
908 and regulations of the other state where either the licensee or the patient is located."

909
910 Ms. Jones thanked former Board member Dr. Andrew Harlem for his work on this issue.

911
912 It was M(Jones)/S(Bernal)/C to accept the language with amendments and proceed with
913 the rulemaking file.

914
915 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

916
917 Ms. Marks suggested adding this proposed new section to article 8: Rules of
918 Professional Conduct and numbering it as section 1396.8. The Board agreed to allow
919 staff to select the appropriate section.

920
921 Dr. Phillips expressed his thanks to Dr. Winkelman and Dr. Melodie Schaffer for
922 providing their contributions to the language.

923
924 **Agenda Item #23: Licensing Report**

925

926 Ms. Cheung referred to the Licensing Report that was provided in the Board Meeting
927 packets. She indicated that the processing time for licensure applications as of January
928 26, 2017 was 25 business days. She also referred to the Licensing Population Report
929 indicating that as of January 26, 2017, there were 17,660 current licensed
930 psychologists, 1,528 active psychological assistants and 279 active registered
931 psychologists.

932
933 Ms. Cheung also reported on licensing staffs' efforts regarding consolidating
934 psychological assistant registrations for those individuals who currently hold multiple
935 registrations, since psychological assistants are now only required to hold one
936 registration instead of registered to each separate employer.

937
938 Ms. Cheung also indicated that the Licensing Committee will continue to discuss the
939 Pathways to Licensure at its next meeting after which the Board will be conducting two
940 stakeholder meetings, one in Northern California in May and another in Southern
941 California in August, to solicit feedback regarding the proposed changes.

942
943 Ms. Bernal asked why there was no data provided for 2013/2014 on the Licensing
944 Report. Ms. Sorrick explained that this was the period during which we were
945 transitioning to the new BreEZe system; therefore, data was not available.

946
947
948 **Agenda Item #24: Continuing Education Report**

949
950 Ms. Everhart presented the Continuing Education report that was provided in the Board
951 meeting packets. She clarified that in the Continuing Education Audits report for
952 January through April 2016, the information contained in the "Failed" column represents
953 the number of licensees who failed once the audit had been completed, which is also
954 reflected in the CE Audit Overview: Pass vs. Fail report, which indicates that 13% of
955 licensees who were audited during this period failed the audit. She noted that the most
956 common reason for failing an audit is that the licensee did not complete enough hours
957 of continuing education. Ms. Everhart also reported that from October 28, 2016 through
958 January 25, 2017, the Board issued a total of six citations for continuing education
959 deficiencies of which four have come into compliance while two are still out of
960 compliance.

961
962 Dr. Phillips announced that Ms. Everhart has accepted a new position as an Associate
963 Governmental Program Analyst with the Department of Justice and will be leaving the
964 Board of Psychology. He gave her a card from the Board members and thanked her for
965 her contributions. Ms. Everhart stated that she has enjoyed working for the Board of
966 Psychology.

967
968 **Agenda Item #25: Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda and**
969 **Recommendation for Future Licensing Committee Meetings**

970
971 No comments or recommendations were received.

972

973 **Agenda Item #26: Review and Consider Amendments to Board Administrative**
974 **Procedures Manual**

975
976 Mr. Glasspiegel indicated that there are three additions to be made to the Board
977 Administrative Manual which were previously approved by the Board.

978
979 It was M(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Jones) to adopt the amendments to the Board
980 Administrative Manual.

981
982 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no
983

984
985 **Agenda Item #27: President's Report**

986
987 Dr. Phillips thanked Senator Steven Glazer for arranging the room for the Board
988 meeting. He also announced that Deputy Attorney General Joshua Templet will be
989 getting married in the next week and shared congratulations.

990
991 **a) 2017 Meeting Calendar and Locations**

992
993 Dr. Phillips referred to the 2017 Board Meeting/Event Calendar provided in the meeting
994 packets.

995
996 **b) Committee Updates**

997
998 Dr. Phillips stated that there are still three vacancies on the Board, therefore, there are
999 no Committee updates to provide at this time. He thanked the Board Members for
1000 pulling double-duty on committees during these vacancies.

1001
1002 **Agenda Item #28: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings**

1003
1004 Ms. Everhart provided the recommendations as made by the Board members
1005 throughout the meeting:

- 1006
1007
- 1008 • Process by which child custody evaluation complaints are processed and
1009 investigated by the Board
 - 1010 • Central Services staff to ascertain which pages of the Board's website are most
1011 important to track by determining the types of questions received by staff instead
1012 of solely reporting on the top five pages
 - 1013 • Add California statistics into the intent language for AB 89 and provide the
1014 minutes from today's discussion to the Policy and Advocacy Committee for their
1015 meeting to review the intent language
 - 1016 • Clarify language regarding Practice Acts in section 1387.1(c) in Pathways
 - 1017 • Possible use of probationary status

1018 **Adjournment**

1020 The Board adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

1021

1022

1023

1024

Original signed by Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD

1025 President

Date

1026