Thursday, August 16, 2018

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
Alita Bernal, Vice-President
Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo
Michael Erickson, PhD
Seyron Foo
Jacqueline Horn, PhD

Others Present
Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer
Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel
Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
Curtis Gardner, Probation Monitor
Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator

Agenda Item #2: Presidents Welcome

Dr. Phillips welcomed the attendees to the Board’s quarterly meeting and thanked the Wright Institute for allowing the Board to hold their quarterly meeting on school grounds. He read the Board’s mission statement.

Agenda Item #3: Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda. The May Not Discuss or Take Action on Any Matter Raised During this Public Comment Section, Except to Decide Whether to Place the Matter on the Agenda of a Future Meeting [Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]

No public comments were made.

Agenda Item #4: President’s Report
Dr. Phillips spoke about the 2019 draft meeting calendar. He explained that a majority of the first day is dedicated to petition hearings. He also stated that staff recommended adding a day to the Los Angeles Meeting or adding a 5th meeting.

The Board discussed their preference of adding a day to a Board meeting. Consensus amongst the Board members was adding a day to the April 5, 2019 Board meeting.

Dr. Phillips stated that at the end of the second day there is going to be an agenda item that will be discussing how Board members indicate their interest in being nominated for President and Vice President for November 2018. He read the duties and responsibilities for the President and Vice President.

**Agenda Item #5 – Executive Officer’s Report**

Ms. Sorrick provided the Executive Officer’s Report

**Agenda Item #6 – Petition for Early Termination of Probation – Maurizio Assandri, PhD**

Administrative Law Judge Karen Reichmann presided. Deputy Attorney Brenda Reyes was present and represented the People of the State of California. Maurizio Assandri, PhD, was present and represented himself.

**Agenda Item #7 – Petition for Early Termination of Probation – Angie Maez, PhD**

Administrative Law Judge Karen Reichmann presided. Deputy Attorney Brenda Reyes was present and represented the People of the State of California. Angie Maez, PhD, was present and represented by Alan Kaplan, JD.

**Agenda Item #8 – Closed Session**

The Board Will Meet in Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including the Above Petitions, Proposed Decisions, Stipulations, Petitions for Reconsideration, and Remands.

**Agenda Item #9 – Closed Session**

The Board will meet in Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(e) to Confer with and Receive Advice from Legal Counsel Regarding Pending Litigation.

**Agenda Item #10 – Review and Consider Options for Knowledge and/or Skill Based Examination(s) for Purposes of Licensure**
Dr. Horn recused herself for this agenda item because she works for the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), the organization that created the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology Part 2 (EPPP2).

Dr. Phillips stated that Dr. Matt Turner, Head of the Examination team, from ASPPB will be presenting information to the Board regarding the EPPP2.

Dr. Phillips asked Dr. Turner what was the evidence base that showed a skill portion of the exam was required. Dr. Turner stated that ASPPB has not been assessing skills and that was a critique of the EPPP.

Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked about the diversity between item writers. Dr. Turner showed a picture of the attendees of the item writer workshop and spoke about what their job entails.

Dr. Turner stated most doctoral level healthcare professions have two to three exams: knowledge exams that are typically done after coursework, a skills exam that are completed closer to licensure, and medical doctors have an additional exam that is an observation of skills. Dr. Turner stated that rather than an observational exam, he thought that ASPPB could demonstrate skills on a computer based program.

Gil Newman, Vice President of Academic Affairs of the Wright Institute, stated his concerns about the process for taking this exam and how it might create a longer delay in receiving a license and impact the graduate curriculum. Dr. Turner stated that ASPPB will be providing the Board with more information, referring to the letter the Board is awaiting in response to their concerns. Dr. Turner also stated that the earlier a student takes the exam the more likely they are to pass. He stated that students gain a foundational training and as they get closer to licensing some of that may be forgotten and that inadvertently fuels the test prep industry, he does believe the ability to take the exam earlier would be cheaper and provide an advantage.

Discussion ensued regarding the EPPP and some of the Board member’s personal experiences in taking the exam, and the item writer’s educational backgrounds.

Mr. Pulliati, California Psychology Internship Council (CAPIC), asked where is the evidence showing the EPPP2 is needed and that it will solve the perceived problems.

Dr. Turner stated the reasoning for the EPPP2 is that there is not a legally defensible way to assess skills. He stated that historically ASPPB has not collected ethnicity data because some jurisdictions had legal prohibition; however, not being part of the jurisdictions, the ASPPB Board has voted to start collecting that data. Dr. Turner stated that now ASPPB can do item level analysis and that will allow ASPPB to look at red flag items that show performance differentially and have those items reviewed to reduce the probability of bias.
Dr. Jo Linder-Crow, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the California Psychological Association (CPA), asked Dr. Turner to clarify his concern about the implementation date of 2020. Dr. Linder-Crow also asked that the Board, as well as ASPPB, look at the accommodations for individuals with disabilities.

Dr. Turner stated that the implementation date is still being discussed, and the Board of Directors are going to send a letter to all jurisdictions once it is finalized as well as address all other concerns. Dr. Turner stated that ASPPB is looking at how to develop an exam that can be administered in a different way if needed.

Mr. Foo provided the EPPP2 taskforce report.
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Agenda Item #10: Review and Consider Options for Knowledge and/or Skill Based Examination(s) for Purposes of Licensure

Mr. Foo provided the EPPP2 taskforce report.

Dr. Paul Marcille, President of CPA, stated that the taskforce had some concerns that the EPPP will burden graduate students and prove a financial barrier for students. Dr. Marcille provided alternatives to having the EPPP2 such as more training or more CE requirements.

Board discussion ensued regarding the cost, and other jurisdictions adopting the EPPP2. The Board also discussed the three main concerns: affordability of the examination, timing as to implementation of the new test and the sequencing when an
applicant can take the examination, and the last concern of the time required to adopt regulations that the Board would have to create.

Renee Pulliati, Executive Officer of CAPIC, stated his concerns about the effects on mobility of licensure, ASPPB’s overstepping their bounds into the regulatory jurisdiction of the Board, and the issue with having to be from an APA accredited school to get early eligibility to take examination where not many people of color and low socioeconomic status are able to attend.

Dr. Phillips stated that these concerns were brought to ASPPB’s attention and in response they stated they would send out a letter that would provide an answer to these concerns. Dr. Phillips stated that once the letter is received, the Board should have a telephonic Board meeting to discuss the letter.

Dr. Jo Linder-Crow, CEO of CPA, asked the Board if the letter from ASPPB will be available to the public and also if the purpose of the taskforce was to make a recommendation to the Board. Board members and Board staff let Dr. Linder-Crow know that the letter from ASPPB will be made public and that the original intention of the taskforce was to find out what the concerns were with the EPPP2. Board members and staff stated that an orientation will be held for any future taskforce meetings.

The Board decided to hold a telephonic Board meeting once a response is received back from ASPPB to decide as to whether to adopt or not adopt the EPPP2.

**Agenda Item #12 - Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda. The May Not Discuss or Take Action on Any Matter Raised During this Public Comment Section, Except to Decide Whether to Place the Matter on the Agenda of a Future Meeting [Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]**

No comments were received.

**Agenda Item #16 – EPPP Part 2 Task Force Report**

Mr. Foo reiterated the concerns of the EPPP2 taskforce. Ms. Burns provided an overview of the current examination process and three possible business scenarios to implement the EPPP2 to the Board. She stated that Board staff and the Task Force agreed, if the Board decides to proceed with the EPPP2 implementation, that Option 3 would be the best possible process.

It was M(Foo)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to adopt the recommended language for noticing and set for hearing for option 3 without adopting the use of the EPPP2.

Vote: 5 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Phillips), 0 no

It was M(Foo)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to designate non-substantive changes to staff.
Vote: 5 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Phillips), 0 no

It was M(Foo)/S(Bernal)/C to direct staff to move forward with looking for an author for the legislative changes provided in Attachment B contingent on Board’s approval of the EPPP2.

Vote: 5 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Phillips), 0 no

Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman asked if the Board would have the power to set when the EPPP Part 1 could be taken. Dr. Phillips stated that ASPPB will not set the criteria.

Dr. Jo Linder-Crow wanted to clarify that the Board’s motion is not to adopt the EPPP2 but be a criterion to use the EPPP. She also stated that since ASPPB has made the EPPP a two-part package, that when the regulation is created the Board states that EPPP now has two parts.

Dr. Marcille asked the Board if they would certify students to take the test and if so what are the staffing implications. Board staff responded by stating that eligibility would come from the Board and would not change if the Board decided to implement the EPPP2 and that staffing implications would be reviewed.

Cindy Yee-Bradbury, Director of Clinical Training at UCLA, asked if a California graduate student took the EPPP1 and moved to another state, who would the graduate student contact to take the EPPP2. She also stated that the EPPP2 will have a huge impact on students who decide to move and this would be a huge burden on students depending on where they move to. Board members stated that the graduate student would follow the licensure process of the state in which they were trying to get licensed and that the option to take the EPPP1 early for those who attended an accredited school is only an option and not a requirement.

Mr. Pulliati agreed with the Board’s recommendation for option 3.

The Board discussed the motion, stating that option 3 is only if the Board decides to move forward with the EPPP2. The regulatory process was described as lengthy and Board staff having the ability to get a head start would be beneficial. If the Board decides to not move forward with the EPPP2 then the regulatory package can be pulled.

Agenda Item #13 – Approval of the Board Meeting Minutes: May 10-11, 2018

It was M(Foo)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to adopt minutes as amended.

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

Agenda Item #14 – DCA Executive Update
Karen Nelson, Assistant Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations, provided the Board with an update on current activities of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

The Board asked Ms. Nelson about what the Implicit Bias Training entailed and if there were links and attachments from the training that would be available to the Board. Ms. Nelson provided an overview of the training and stated she will have the attachments from the training made available to the Board.

**Agenda Item #15 – Budget Report**

Ms. Burns provided the budget report to the Board.

Dr. Jo Linder-Crow asked the Board if there was a possibility that licensing fees would be lowered. Ms. Sorrick stated that any fee changes would be discussed after facility needs and licensing and enforcement timelines were reviewed. She stated that in past Board meetings the topic of fees was brought up and the Board decided that an improvement of service is wanted before the reduction of fees.

Ms. Bernal asked Board staff why the in-state travel budget displayed a deficit. It was explained that Board staff is working with the Budget Office to do a budget realignment for the budget report to more accurately reflect current spending. With bottom line budgeting DCA is concerned that the numbers zero out in the end more than each line item zero out.

**Agenda Item #17 – Enforcement Report**

Ms. Monterrubio provided the enforcement report to the Board.

**Agenda Item #18 – Enforcement Committee Report and Consideration of Committee Recommendations**

a) **Proposed Amendments to Expert Reviewer Application**

Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that the enforcement committee met on June 22, 2018 to review the expert reviewer application. She stated that the committee is asking the Board to review the changes and provide any comments/edits they may have.

Board discussion ensued regarding the expert reviewer application. The Board provided their comments, edits and suggestions to Board staff. The Board also discussed the application process and tolling of probationers.

Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman asked what the expert trainings consisted of, the duration, and if there were training documents available to the public. Josh Templet, Office of the Attorney General, stated that the Office of Attorney General helps with conducting the
training by providing a review of options of legal conduct. He stated that training
documents are not available to the public and that the training lasts one day. Ms.
Monterrubio stated that the expert reviewer would go to training once they have been
selected and a refresher course is required every two years.

It was M(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Bernal)/C to approve the Enforcement Committee’s
recommended changes to the Expert Reviewer Application as amended.

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

**Agenda Item #19 – Licensing Report**

Ms. Cheung provided the Board with the licensing report.

Dr. Horn stated that in a month we have more people going through our process than
most states. She asked what things will keep an application pending. Ms. Cheung
stated that she would gather the information and present it at the next licensing
committee meeting.

**Agenda Item #20 – Continuing Education and Renewals Report**

Ms. McCockran provided the Board with the continuing education and renewals report.

The Board discussed the pass and fail rates from 2014-2016. Dr. Horn stated that for
the next licensing committee meeting she would like to discuss the audit process and
disciplinary actions for licensees who fail their second audit.

**Agenda Item #21 – Licensing Committee Report and Consideration of Committee
Recommendations**

a) Standardization of Training Categories

b) Pathways to Licensure:

1) Proposed Amendments to Business and Professions Code:

   §§ 25, 28, & 2915.5 (Training in Human Sexuality, Child, Elder, and
   Dependent Adult Abuse Assessment and Reporting, and Aging and
   Long-term Care);

   • § 27 (Disclosure of Information);

   • § 2903 (Licensure Requirements);

   • §§ 2909, 2909.5, 2910, & 2911 (Exemptions);

   • § 2913 (Psychological Assistant);

   • § 2914 (Applicant’s Requirement);

   • § 2915 (Continuing Professional Development);

   • §§ 29 & 2915.7 (Continuing Education: Chemical Dependency and
   Alcoholism and Aging and Long-term Care)

   • §§ 2940 & 2941 (Application and Examination Fees);
• §§ 2942, 2943, & 2944 (Examination Time and Subjects);
• § 2946 (Reciprocity and Temporary Practice);
• § 2948 (Issuance of License); and
• § 2960 (Grounds for Disciplinary Action)

2) Proposed Amendments to Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations:
• § 1380.3 (Definitions);
• §§ 1381, 1381.1, & 1381.2 (Applications);
• § 1381.4 (Failure to Appear for an Examination);
• § 1381.5 (Failure to Pay Initial License Fee);
• § 1381.6 (Permit Processing Times);
• §§ 1382, 1382.3, 1382.4, 1382.5, & 1382.6 (Pre-licensing Courses);
• § 1386 (Evaluation of Education);
• § 1387 (Supervised Professional Experience);
• §§ 1387.1 & 1387.2 (Qualifications of Primary and Delegated Supervisors);
• § 1387.3 (Non-Mental Health Services);
• § 1387.4 (Out-of-State Experience);
• § 1387.5 (SPE Log);
• §§ 1388, 1388.6, 1389, & 1389.1 (Examinations-Waiver/Reconsideration);
• §§ 1387.7, 1390, 1390.1, 1390.2, & 1390.3 (Registered Psychologists);
• §§ 1387.6, 1391, 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.3, 1391.4, 1391.5, 1391.6,
  1391.7, 1391.8, 1391.10, 1391.11, & 1391.12 (Psychological Assistants);
• § 1390.2 (Psychological Assistant Fees); and
• § 1397.71 (CE Provider Status)

a) Consideration of Licensing Committee Recommendations Regarding an Extension of the 72-Month Registration Period Limitation for Registered Psychological Assistant Pursuant to Section 1391.1(b) of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

b) Consideration of Licensing Committee Recommendations Regarding an Extension of the 30-Consecutive Month Limitation to Accrue 1500 Hours of Post-Doctoral Supervised Professional Experience Pursuant to Section 1387(a) of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

Dr. Horn provided the licensing committee report. Ms. Cheung stated the goal of the licensing committee is to complete pathways at the October licensing committee meeting.

Agenda Item #22 – Legislative Update – Discussion and Possible Action

a) Sponsored Legislation for the 2018 Legislative Session: Review and Potential Action
1) AB 2968 (Levine) – Amend Sections of the Business and Professions Code Regarding the Brochure Addressing Sexual Contact Between a Psychotherapist and a Patient

Ms. Burns provided an overview of the bill.

Dr. Winkelman stated that the American Psychological Association (APA) met earlier this month and they adopted the term of the use of ‘patient’ instead of ‘client’. She stated that in this document and in other proposed legislation by the Board, the term ‘client’ is being used. She recommended using the term ‘patient or client’.

Dr. Horn stated that one of the reasons the Board decided to use the term ‘client’ is because the brochure will be addressing general healthcare. Ms. Sorrick stated that there will be a definitions section in the brochure that will make that clear.

b. Review and Consideration of Positions on Legislation
   1) Recommendations for Active Positions on Bills
      A. AB 1436 (Levine) – Board of Behavioral Sciences: Licensees: Suicide Prevention Training
         Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill.
         It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to take a Support position on AB 1436.
         Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Horn, Phillips), 0 no
      B. AB 2483 (Voepel) – Indemnification of Public Officers and Employees: Antitrust Awards
         Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill. Discussion ensued regarding how the bill provides the legal certainty and protection our Board members need to make necessary regulatory decisions to protect the public without fear of being personally sued for those decisions.
         It was M(Phillips)/S(Foo)/C to move forward with language as amended.
         Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Horn, Phillips), 0 no
      C. AB 2221 (Bloom) – Occupational therapy
         Ms. Burns provided an overview of the bill. Discussion ensued regarding the concerns with the bill.
         It was M(Bernal)/S(Erickson)/C to Oppose unless Amended.
Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Foo, Horn, Phillips), 0 no

Dr. Linder-Crow stated that CPA’s Board of Directors met last week and took an Opposed unless Amended position to make it clear that it has no impact on the practice of psychology.

Dr. Erickson stated that there are representatives from the Occupational Therapy Association of California (OTAC) that would like to address the Board.

Ivan Altamura, Capitol Advocacy, provided a background of the bill. Mr. Altamura stated that the Occupational Therapy Practice Act was passed in 2000 and there have been no substantive changes since that time. He explained that there have been advancements in the field Occupational Therapy (OT). OTAC has done a wide range of research and reached out to different organizations to start amending the practice act. Regarding the Board’s concerns that this bill could potentially expand the scope of practice of OT’s such as psychotherapy, OTAC wants to make it clear that OT is not the practice of psychology but more of assisting clients and patients with coping and how to do daily activities.

Bryant Edwards, Vice President of OTAC, stated that the purpose of amending the practice act is to clarify the role of OT’s. In no way is the intention to expand the scope or to practice psychology.

Dr. Karen McCarthy, Professor at the Dominican University of California, provided the Board with a description of the role of an OT. She stated that the amendments to the practice act are not trying to expand the role of an OT but to better define it.

Shelby Surfas, Associate Professor of OT at University of Southern California, explained to the Board what her job as an OT entails. She stated that mental health providers work with the clients that are outside of an OT’s scope of work and that mental health professionals and OT’s work together to get their client to meet their mental health goals. The primary focus of an OT is occupation but the primary population that OT’s work with have mental health issues.

Elizabeth Ching, Assistant Professor at Samuel Merritt University, provided an example of a situation where an OT treated a client.

Discussion ensued between the Board and the public members who spoke about the roles of an OT regarding creating/editing the language in the bill the Board was concerned about.

Dr. Linder-Crow encouraged OTAC to reach out to CPA.
Dr. Winkelman expressed her concern with the language in the bill calling OT’s ‘mental health provider’. She asked that the scope of practice be redefined.

It was M(Foo)/S(Erickson)/C to move to reconsider the motion on Agenda Item #22(b)(1)(C)

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

The Board, Mr. Altamura, and members of OTAC provided amendments to the bill that Mr. Altamura will bring back to his client.

It was M(Foo)/S(Erickson)/C to Support in Amended position with articulated amendments as discussed.

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

Dr. Winkelman stated she does not understand why the focus on mental health disorders is needed in the scope of practice unless it is in the idea of providing mental health services. Dr. Winkelman asked the Board what the difference is between Support if Amended and Oppose unless Amended. Dr. Phillips explained that within the administrative manual, if amendments are not made then the chair and president have the power to oppose the bill.

**Agenda Item #22(c)(1) – AB 282 (Jones-Sawyer) – Aiding, Advising, or Encouraging Suicide: Exemption from Prosecution**

Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill. No Board or public comments were made.

**Agenda Item #22 (c)(2) – AB 2138 (Chiu and Low) Licensing Boards: Denial of Application: Criminal Conviction**

Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill. He also highlighted the recent changes to the bill.

Discussion ensued regarding the implications of the bill and the other Board’s and Bureaus positions on the bill.

**Agenda Item #22(c)(3) – AB 2143 (Caballero) – Mental health: Licensed Mental Health Service Provider Education Program**
Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill.

**Agenda Item #22(c)(4) – AB 2943 (Low) Unlawful Business Practices: Sexual Orientation Change Efforts**

Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill.

**Agenda Item #22(c)(5) – SB 1125 (Atkins) Federally Qualified Health Center and Rural Health Clinic Services**

Mr. Glasspiegel provided an overview of the bill.

**Agenda Item #22(d) – Review of Bills with Watch Status Approved by the Board**

No Board or public comments were made.

**Agenda Item #22(e) – Review and Consideration of Statutory Revisions to Section 2960.1 of the Business and Professions Code Regarding Denial, Suspension and Revocation for Acts of Sexual Contact**

Ms. Burns provided an overview of the statutory revisions.

Board discussion ensued regarding the revisions.

It was M(Bernal)/S(Erickson)/C to accept the amendments provided and delegate staff to use these revisions as the starting point for discussion in a stakeholder meeting to be organized and held in the Fall 2018.

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

**Agenda Item #23 – Legislative Items for Future Meeting. The Board May Discuss Other Items of Legislation in Sufficient Detail to Determine Whether Such Items Should be on a Future Board Meeting Agenda and/or Whether to Hold a Special Meeting of the Board to Discuss Such Items Pursuant to Government Code Section 11125.4**

Dr. Winkelman would like to request consideration of the licensing committee when discussing pathways to licensure to add an exemption for neuropsychology testing technicians, also called psychometricians.

Ms. Sorrick explained that the pathways to licensure is how the experience is accrued and applying for licensure. She stated that the issue Dr. Winkelman has brought up is
more akin to scope of practice which the Board can advocate if there was an existing bill. If CPA wanted to author a bill the Board can review it and decide if it would like to take a position.

**Agenda Item #24 – Regulatory Update, Review, and Consideration of Additional Changes**

- a) 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10, 1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants
- b) 16 CCR Section 1396.8 – Standards of Practice for Telehealth
- c) 16 CCR Sections 1381.9, 1381.10, 1392 – Retired License, Renewal of Expired License, Psychologist Fees
- d) 16 CCR Sections 1381.9, 1397.60, 1397.61, 1397.62, 1397.67 – Continuing Professional Development

Mr. Glasspiegel stated that all regulatory packages were submitted to legal for review.

Ms. Burns brought up concerns that Ms. Marks had regarding the telehealth regulatory package. She explained the hand carry item which had language that Ms. Marks recommended. Discussion between the Board members, Board staff, legal counsel and the public ensued regarding the suggested language. The Board had issues with whether they were going to approach interstate practice and provide guidelines on interstate practice and had questions on the use of domicile or residency of the patient. A consensus amongst Board members is to get the package noticed and amend the language during a later phase if the Board decides to adopt a different policy.

It was M(Foo)/S(Erickson)/C to approve the language for 16 CCR Section 1396.8 – Standards of Practice for Telehealth as amended.

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

**Agenda Item #25 – Outreach and Education and Committee Report**

- a) Strategic Plan
- b) Communications Plan
- c) Website
- d) Social Media
- e) Newsletter
- f) Outreach Activities
- g) Outreach Plan for High Schools, Community Colleges, and State and University System to Increase Licensing Population
- h) Two-Year Outreach and Education Campaign Update
- i) DCA Brochure “Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex” – Update
The agenda item will be discussed at the February 2019 Board Meeting.

**Agenda Item #26 – PsyPACT – Status of PsyPACT and Review of Board Concerns and Feedback**

The agenda item will be discussed at the February 2019 Board Meeting.

Dr. Phillips stated that the pocket license hard cards are now available and can be ordered by paying Central Services Unit $5.00.

**Agenda Item #27 – Discussion of How Board Members Indicate Their Interest in Being Nominated for President or Vice-President of the Board in November 2018**

Dr. Phillips stated that if you are interested in being nominated for office, you may express your interest. He stated if you choose not to say anything now, it does not mean you cannot be nominated. Dr. Phillips stated he is interested in getting nominated for President for 2019.

**Agenda Item #28 – Recommendations for Agenda Items For Future Board Meetings. Note: The Board May Not Discuss or Take Action on Any Matter Raised During This Public Comment Section, Except to Decide Whether to Place the Matter on the Agenda of a Future Meeting [Government Code Sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]**

There were no recommendations made.

Dr. Phillips reminded the Board and the public that the next Board meeting will be held in San Diego, California on November 15th and 16th.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.