

1 **LICENSURE COMMITTEE MEETING**

2  
3 **Department of Consumer Affairs**  
4 1625 N. Market Blvd., Hearing Room # 102  
5 Sacramento, CA 95834  
6 (916) 574-7720  
7

8 **Thursday, September 12, 2019**  
9

10 **Agenda Item #1: Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum**

11 Jacqueline Horn, PhD, Chairperson, called the open session meeting to order at 10:15  
12 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.  
13

14 **Members Present**

15 Jacqueline Horn, PhD – Chair  
16 Seyron Foo, Public Member  
17

18 **Members Absent**

19 Mary Harb Sheets, PhD  
20

21 **Others Present**

22 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer  
23 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer  
24 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel  
25 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager  
26 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager  
27 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager  
28 Mai Xiong, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator  
29 Liezel McCockran, Continuing Education and Renewals Coordinator  
30 Evan Gage, Special Projects Analyst  
31 Sarah Irani – SOLID  
32 Trisha St. Clair – SOLID  
33 Suzanne Mayes – SOLID  
34

35 **Agenda Item #2: Public Comment(s) for Items not on the Agenda. Note: The**  
36 **Committee may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this public**  
37 **comment section, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of**  
38 **a future meeting [Government Code Sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]**  
39

40 No public comment received.  
41

42 **Agenda Item #3: Informational Video for Supervisors: Stakeholders' Discussion**  
43 **and Recommendations for Content to be Included in the Video (Department of**  
44 **Consumer Affairs – SOLID)**

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77

a) Laws and Regulations

b) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

c) Best Practices

Ms. Trisha St. Clair and Ms. Suzanne Mayes with DCA’s SOLID Training Solutions facilitated this discussion with input and participation from several stakeholders.

**Agenda Item #4: Informational Video for Supervisors: Recommended for Content to be Included (this item will continue to Friday (if necessary))**

a) Laws and Regulations

Discussion ensued following the SOLID-facilitated session.

Jo Linder-Crow, PhD, CPA, commented that CPA wanted to communicate to students and supervisors that it is their responsibility to know the laws and regulations relating to the licensure requirements, but that the Board’s information should be the most up-to-date and understandable.

Carol Falender, PhD, CPA Division II, expressed concern on behalf of students at a recent seminar who worry that their own programs are not up-to-date and that they could lose time and experience if their program provides outdated information.

Dr. Horn cited confusion between what the Board regulates and what it doesn’t, but that the Board should repeatedly reinforce what the responsibilities of the supervisor are, what the relationship of the supervisor is to the Board, and what the obligations of the supervisor to the trainee and to the Board are.

Dr. Horn mentioned that in talking to other boards of psychology about complaints relating to supervision, the other boards immediately looked at the supervisor, sending a very strong message about the supervisor’s responsibility to the supervisee.

Discussion continued as to how the Board should balance the large amount of information against what was most relevant for supervisors to know.

Mr. Foo recommended that the discussion be based on Business and Professions Code (B&P) Section 2914, which is the most relevant statute relating to supervision hours. Dr. Horn agreed with Mr. Foo’s recommendation.

Other pertinent sections to be included in the FAQs included B&P Sections 2910 and 2913, the latter of which defines registrants, and which would be important for supervisors to understand.

78 Discussion moved on to which regulations should be included in FAQs. Dr. Horn felt  
79 that all the regulations should be included, except waiver of examinations, which does  
80 not concern supervisors.

81 b) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

82 Discussion ensued as to which questions should be included in the FAQs.

83 Mr. Foo suggested using the FAQs developed by Dr. Winkelman as the basis for the  
84 FAQs the Board was developing, while leaving out questions that pertained only to  
85 supervisees. He recommended that staff review the list to determine which of Dr.  
86 Winkelman's questions would fall under the purview of the Board.

87 Dr. Horn agreed and expressed that this Committee and the Board should be the final  
88 deciders of the content under their purview.

89 Discussion addressed the types of activities would be considered acceptable for  
90 supervised professional experience (SPE), especially the difference between 'usual'  
91 and 'administrative' duties.

92 Dr. Falender suggested that 'activities in support of clinical work' would be general  
93 enough.

94 Dr. Horn requested that staff come back to the Licensure Committee in 2020 with a list  
95 of the specific criteria staff want clarification on in terms of granting hours of SPE.

96 Dr. Linder-Crow requested that this proposed language specify that supervisees are not  
97 to be used as administrative assistants.

98 Sandra Smith, PhD, Bay Area Association of Black Psychologists (BAABPsi),  
99 commented that private practice is a grey area, because in such a setting not all  
100 activities would necessarily count towards licensure.

101 Mr. Foo wanted to add the question, "What forms do I need to submit and maintain as a  
102 supervisor?"

103 Discussion ensued as to how weekly logs should be formatted. Mr. Foo requested that  
104 staff find out what formats are in use by other jurisdictions.

105 c) Best Practices

106 Discussion ensued and Dr. Falender will be providing materials relating to Best  
107 Practices for the Committee's consideration.

108 Ms. Marks cautioned that by posting 'Best Practices,' the Board might run the risk of  
109 promulgating underground regulations.

110 Discussion continued on what else to call this section. Dr. Falender said that she will  
111 provide suggestions for alternate names at the next Licensure Committee meeting in  
112 2020.

113 The Licensure Committee adjourned to closed session at 2:56 p.m.

114 **CLOSED SESSION**

115 Adjournment at 4:31 p.m.

116 **Friday, September 13, 2019**

117 **Agenda Item #5: Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum**

118 Dr. Horn, Chairperson, called the open session meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A  
119 quorum was present, and Dr. Horn read the Goal of the Committee.

120

121 **Members Present**

122 Jacqueline Horn, PhD – Chair

123 Seyron Foo, Public Member

124

125 **Members Absent**

126 Mary Harb Sheets, PhD

127

128 **Others Present**

129 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer

130 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer

131 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel

132 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager

133 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager

134 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager

135 Mai Xiong, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator

136 Liezel McCockran, Continuing Education and Renewals Coordinator

137 Evan Gage, Special Projects Analyst

138

139 **Agenda Item #6: Public Comment(s) for Items not on the Agenda. Note: The**  
140 **Committee may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this public**  
141 **comment section, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of**  
142 **a future meeting [Government Code Sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]**

143

144 No public comment received

145

146 **Agenda Item #7: Approval of Licensure Committee Meeting Minutes: June 13,**  
147 **2019**

148

149 Dr. Horn mentioned that the Licensure Committee name and goal were amended at the  
150 August Board Meeting and that those amendments are captured in these minutes.

151  
152 It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to approve the minutes as amended with any technical, non-  
153 substantive changes previously submitted by Committee Members.

154  
155 There was no public comment.

156  
157 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

158  
159 **Agenda Item #8: Pupil Personnel Services Credential: Presentation and**  
160 **Discussion by Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for a Credential with**  
161 **a Specialization in School Psychology**

162  
163 Tammy Duggan, of Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), presented this item.

164  
165 Ms. Duggan stated that CTC is only responsible for the registration of school  
166 psychologist credentialing and does not oversee the employment issues of those who  
167 hold such credential.

168  
169 Following a slideshow presentation by Ms. Duggan, Mr. Foo asked whether there was a  
170 structural change that caused a spike in waivers in FY 2016/17. Ms. Duggan replied that  
171 she did not have data to explain this increase.

172 Dr. Horn asked whether CTC wants the school psychologists to be credentialed to  
173 confirm that they are preparing students adequately. Ms. Duggan confirmed that this is  
174 correct.

175 Dr. Horn asked whether someone would then need to be licensed by the Board to work  
176 outside the school setting. Ms. Duggan replied that she could not answer that, since it  
177 was an employment question and not related to registration.

178 Ms. Duggan stated that CTC does monitor schools for participation and compliance.  
179 She says the Board's licensees would still have to be evaluated whether they are fit to  
180 practice in schools, perhaps even needing additional training.

181 Dr. Horn asked whether an individual who possesses a doctoral degree would still have  
182 to obtain a school psychologist credential to work under the Individualized Education  
183 Program (IEP) or work under contract. Ms. Duggan confirmed that would be the case.

184 Public Comments:

185 Dr. Linder-Crow asked whether a Baccalaureate degree is enough to be registered as a  
186 school psychologist. Ms. Duggan explained that 60 post-baccalaureate hours are  
187 required.

188 Dr. Linder-Crow asked about assessment services, asking to confirm that a  
189 psychologist would not be eligible to develop and assess an IEP without the credential.  
190 Ms. Duggan confirmed that this is true.

191 Dr. Linder-Crow asked Ms. Duggan what qualifications CTC is looking for in a  
192 psychologist to be able to do assessment and development of an IEP. Ms. Duggan  
193 replied that she did not know as this was an employment question.

194 Dr. Linder-Crow asked Ms. Duggan about psychological counseling as scope of  
195 practice. Ms. Duggan replied that she did not know as this was outside her purview. Dr.  
196 Linder-Crow sought clarification and suggested that the Board could look into this.

197 Armando Fernandez, Lead Psychologist of Elk Grove Unified School District, explained  
198 that they referenced the Education Code criteria when conducting an assessment for  
199 the purpose of an IEP. School psychologists do complete some parts of the cognitive  
200 assessment, but multiple parties are involved in the development of an IEP. Since 2011,  
201 the law has changed to require schools to provide psychological services to students  
202 identified on IEPs. It is necessary for school psychologists to conduct social and  
203 emotional assessments. Psychological counseling in this context refers to social and  
204 emotional counseling. Mr. Fernandez viewed Licensed Educational Psychologist (LEP)  
205 as an advanced credential, which could allow one to work outside the school setting, but  
206 it is still education-focused.

207 Dr. Horn asked if a psychologist working outside the school system completed an  
208 assessment and provided it to a school, would the school be able to incorporate that  
209 into an IEP? Mr. Fernandez answered that the program could consider it, but that the  
210 school would be doing their own assessment internally already.

211 Mr. Foo asks about what does psychological counseling on social and emotional issues  
212 look like and when to refer to a licensed psychologist? Mr. Fernandez answered that it  
213 could be anxiety or depression for non-IEP students and counseling could be offered  
214 short-term. IEP students could be emotionally-disturbed and could receive counseling  
215 on multiple levels. He explained that working as a counselor in a school required the  
216 awareness and readiness in gathering all available resources to provide service.

217 Dr. Horn commented that there was a lot of confusion outside the school system with  
218 the use of the term "psychologist," for instance, what services they can provide. Dr.  
219 Horn pointed out that Mr. Fernandez confirmed that all school psychologists are  
220 credentialed and capable of working within the school system. Mr. Fernandez said the  
221 school IEP team obtains permission to refer students for other services outside the  
222 school system. He did not directly address Dr Horn's concern. However, Mr. Fernandez  
223 acknowledged that it might be confusing to parents when a student applies to the IEP  
224 program because their own outside psychologist says they have a need for an IEP, and  
225 the parents don't understand why.

226 Dr. Linder-Crow asked Mr. Fernandez who provides the diagnosis for ADHD or for  
227 autism spectrum. Mr. Fernandez answered that an ADHD diagnosis would come from  
228 private clinicians or pediatricians typically. He stated that the DSM-V was not used in  
229 the school setting.

230 Dr. Linder-Crow asked Mr. Fernandez whether an outside diagnosis of ADHD would be  
231 enough for program eligibility, and he answered 'no.' There are limiting criteria.

232 Dr. Linder-Crow asked how the diagnosis happens. Mr. Fernandez said there is a DSM-  
233 V diagnosis for autism, and staff developing the IEP will consider the diagnosis.  
234 However, they are required to adhere to the Education Code criteria and ensure that the  
235 assessment abides by the Education Code standard. He pointed out that IEP staff use  
236 rating scales but are not providing a depression or other DSM-V diagnosis.

237 Dr. Linder-Crow commented that a school psychologist might put in their notes that a  
238 pupil exhibits spectrum traits but no referral to outside service is provided. She asked  
239 whether parents understood the distinction between IEP services and outside  
240 psychological services. Is the distinction confusing to parents? Mr. Fernandez replied to  
241 Dr. Linder-Crow that a lot of education for parents takes place on this subject. He  
242 explained that a high-functioning spectrum pupil may be well qualified for outside  
243 psychological services but maybe not for IEP.

244 Mr. Foo asked whether a psychologist in private practice has ever made a diagnosis  
245 and then told the parents to go seek services through the school. Mr. Fernandez  
246 answered yes, that with parental consent, there is an exchange of information between  
247 the private practitioner and the school setting. Mental health practitioners receive  
248 education on the requirement of an IEP as well since many think they can simply  
249 prescribe an IEP and that the school will provide those services based on the  
250 recommendation.

251 Mr. Foo asks whether schools use a best practice guideline regarding how these  
252 services are advertised. Mr. Fernandez answered that this was not really the case, but  
253 that parents typically come to the program and are educated by Mr. Fernandez about  
254 how the program works. Case-by-case interchange of information as to how all parties  
255 work together to provide these services is usually the method used to educate the  
256 parents.

257 Mr. Foo noted that the system ideally would be seamless between schools and private-  
258 practice psychologists.

259 Cynthia Root, PhD, licensed psychologist, asked Mr. Fernandez the purpose of an LEP  
260 working outside of a school setting using DSM-V diagnosis. Mr. Fernandez replied to  
261 Dr. Root that he is familiar with DSM-V, but that he would not use it while working as an  
262 LEP. He would use it to assist him in making educational recommendations.

263 Dr. Root expressed confusion about an LEP including a DSM-V diagnosis. Dr. Horn  
264 redirected the conversation, noting that Dr. Root's questions fall outside of the school  
265 setting which Fernandez and Duggan have been discussing.

266 Dr. Root clarified that she wondered about the impact of seeing an LEP report that  
267 included a DSM-V diagnosis. Mr. Fernandez explained that he would hope that an LEP  
268 would have familiarity with the Education Code when making any such diagnosis.

269 Ms. Marks advised that this agenda item is more specifically on teacher credentialing  
270 and that these other considerations might come back to a future agenda should the  
271 Committee desire.

272 **Agenda Item #9: Update on the California Association of School Psychologists**  
273 **Regarding Written Statement to Clarify the Role of Licensed Educational**  
274 **Psychologists**

275  
276 Dr. Horn introduced this item by explaining that the scope of practice and role of an LEP  
277 is codified in BBS statute and that nothing further is needed to be done to define either.  
278 Dr. Horn tied this item to item #10 to follow and would call for public comment after both  
279 items had been introduced.

280  
281 **Agenda Item #10: Discussion and Consideration of How to Inform Consumers**  
282 **Regarding the Respective Roles of a Licensed Psychologist, Licensed**  
283 **Educational Psychologist, and Individuals Holding a Credential with a**  
284 **Specialization in School Psychology**

285  
286 Dr. Horn stated that the Board wants stakeholder's input from all boards and other  
287 interested parties to determine the best way to educate parents on the role and scope of  
288 practice of LEPs and that the Board would conduct a stakeholder meeting to determine  
289 what resources were available to pupils.

290  
291 Mr. Foo asked what would be the product from this Committee to bring to the full Board  
292 in October – would it be to ask the Board to direct staff to work jointly with BBS and  
293 CTC on an educational campaign for parents? Dr. Horn suggested that we could also  
294 include California Association of School Psychologists (CASP) and CPA. Mr. Foo  
295 agreed.

296  
297 In response to Mr. Foo's earlier question about what this Committee would bring to the  
298 Board in October, Dr. Horn replied that the Licensure Committee would bring only their  
299 recommendations for a stakeholder meeting.

300  
301 It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to recommend that the Board direct staff to work with other  
302 entities to co-host a stakeholder meeting in 2020 to solicit feedback on how best to  
303 inform the public regarding the different roles of each entity.

304  
305 Public Comments:

306  
307 Kim Madsen, Executive Officer of the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS), commented  
308 that BBS would welcome that partnership.

309



310 Heidi Holmblad, CASP, commented that CASP looks forward to this collaboration and  
311 hopes to be called to participate.

312  
313 Dr. Root commented that Dr. Horn's explanation today got to the heart of what was  
314 confusing to parents regarding LEPs in private practice doing psychological  
315 assessments using DSM-V rather than Education Code criteria. Dr. Root stated that she  
316 is asking for advice and counsel because LEPs seek to be able to do autism  
317 assessments beyond the school setting, utilizing DSM-V criteria. Dr. Root felt that there  
318 was no central clearinghouse for this information and expressed disappointment that  
319 there will not be a white paper drafted to provide this guidance.

320  
321 Dr. Horn replied to Dr. Root that these are issues that might come out of the 2020  
322 stakeholder meeting, and that governmental agencies should be the ones to come up  
323 with the questions to address in that meeting.

324  
325 Dr. Root asked whether LEPs asking for referrals to do DSM-V assessments would be a  
326 matter of enforcement for unlicensed practice.

327  
328 Ms. Marks admonished that the discussion was getting off-topic and that the Committee  
329 could not discuss enforcement at this meeting since it was not noticed on the agenda.

330  
331 Dr. Linder-Crow suggested that the motion before the Committee be expanded to  
332 include a discussion of the scope of practice of LEPs.

333  
334 Ms. Madsen stated that BBS would not be open to the discussion of LEP scope of  
335 practice since this scope is already defined in statute, and that there is already a  
336 partnership in place between schools and LEPs to provide parents with information.

337  
338 Dr. Linder-Crow asked Ms. Madsen whether LEPs can use DSM-V to provide a  
339 diagnosis and Ms. Madsen replied that with adequate training, it could be appropriate  
340 for an LEP to provide a DSM-V diagnosis.

341  
342 Mr. Foo asked whether SOLID would be involved to curate this process, and Dr. Horn  
343 replied that she believed this to be the case.

344  
345 Dr. Horn commented that some of this information will come out of the stakeholder  
346 meeting and that we cannot clearly foresee everything that needs to be addressed until  
347 then.

348  
349 Mr. Foo asked Ms. Sorrick to explain what it would take to compile a list of stakeholders  
350 to invite. Ms. Sorrick replied to Mr. Foo by stating that she views the stakeholder  
351 meeting as an opportunity for governmental agencies to drum up an agenda. She  
352 declared that there is a teamwork dynamic between BBS, Board of Psychology, and the  
353 Department of Education and that the Board does not intend to define turf. She

354 explained to Mr. Foo that she wants CASP and the other interested entities to pull their  
355 own stakeholders in, but that this would be a governmental process.

356  
357 Mr. Foo asked what would happen once the governmental agencies drummed up their  
358 agenda. He asked whether SOLID would then reach out to stakeholders from the  
359 various lists.

360  
361 Dr. Horn replied by suggesting that interested entities and parties could RSVP.

362  
363 Ms. Sorrick replied that we could ask SOLID to take this step for our Board's  
364 stakeholders, but that the Board could also use its ListServ email service to reach out to  
365 many potential stakeholders. Each agency will need to determine and contact relevant  
366 stakeholders.

367  
368 Mr. Foo asked whether the stakeholder meeting would be publicly-noticed, with the  
369 Licensure Committee attending and chairing.

370  
371 Ms. Sorrick replied to Mr. Foo that the stakeholder meeting would be publicly-noticed  
372 and recommended that the Licensure Committee host the meeting.

373  
374 Dr. Horn commented that these details could be determined later.

375  
376 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

377  
378 **Agenda Item #11: Informational Video for Supervisors: This item was not carried**  
379 **over from the previous day.**

380  
381 Dr. Horn briefly recapped the previous day's SOLID workshop on the informational  
382 video for supervisors. She stated that initial feedback indicated that video presentation  
383 of this information is not the ideal medium, and so 'informational video' is being changed  
384 to 'informational resources'.

385  
386 Staff will take SOLID's report and make a recommendation to the Board. Staff will draft  
387 content for each of the three areas for the Licensure Committee which will be presented  
388 to the Board for final approval.

389  
390 **Agenda Item #12: Consideration of Renaming Registered Psychological Assistant**

391  
392 At the May 4, 2017 and August 22, 2017 Licensing Committee meetings, the idea arose  
393 to rename "Registered Psychological Assistants" to "Registered Psychological  
394 Associates." Board President, Dr. Stephen Phillips, and Ms. Sorrick discovered at the  
395 Mid-year ASPPB meeting that 'psychological associate' was used as a license category  
396 in some other jurisdictions and not as a training category the way this Board defines it.

397

398 Mr. Foo commented that the term ‘associate’ really resonated with the stakeholders and  
399 he wished to honor their preferred title for this training category.

400  
401 Dr. Horn agreed with Mr. Foo that the use of ‘associate’ to describe this training  
402 category would be fine.

403  
404 Ms. Sorrick suggested that Pathways continue to use the term “Psychological  
405 Associate”.

406  
407 It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to continue to use “Psychological Associate” in Pathways and  
408 to bring this recommendation to the Board.

409  
410 No public comment followed.

411  
412 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

413  
414 **Agenda Item #13: Discussion and Consideration for Grievance Process: Options**  
415 **in Resolving a Discrepancy between Weekly Log and Verification of Experience**

416  
417 Dr. Horn explained that staff met with Legal Counsel and came up with three options for  
418 resolving discrepancies between weekly supervision logs and the Verification of  
419 Experience form (VOE) for the Committee’s consideration.

420  
421 Ms. Cheung explained that the first option staff came up with was to amend 16 CCR  
422 section 1387.5 to require submission of the weekly log with the VOE. The second option  
423 was to mandate completion of the weekly log as a component of face-to-face  
424 supervision. This option relied upon the fact that regulations do not specify what exactly  
425 is supposed to occur during these weekly meeting, so this step could be added here.  
426 The third option was to rely on the Licensure Committee’s expertise to review each  
427 discrepancy on a case-by-case basis.

428  
429 Mr. Foo said that he appreciated option three because discrepancies could be resolved  
430 much more quickly than trying to fix the process through regulatory language, which  
431 could take at least three years. He asked staff to recommend which option they would  
432 choose; Ms. Cheung deferred this recommendation to the Committee so that the  
433 Committee would direct staff to implement one of these options.

434  
435 Dr. Horn asked Ms. Cheung how often this type of discrepancy arises, and Ms. Cheung  
436 replied that this occurs rarely.

437  
438 Dr. Horn opined that while the matter of these discrepancies could eventually be  
439 addressed in regulations, in the meantime staff could absorb the present instances into  
440 their workload on a case-by-case basis.

441

442 It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to adopt option three as the process to resolve discrepancies  
443 identified between the weekly supervision log and the VOE and to recommend this  
444 option to the full Board for consideration.

445  
446 Ms. Marks advised the Committee that unless and until this is addressed in regulations,  
447 the Board can not require the supervisor/supervisee to provide the logs.

448  
449 Mr. Foo commented that the Board should address this issue as an educational item on  
450 our website and Ms. Sorrick requested that Mr. Foo write an article on this topic for our  
451 Journal.

452  
453 Ms. Marks commented that she does not view the use of option three as a change in  
454 policy, pointing out that the Board would not be laying out any specific steps, rather that  
455 staff could simply approach the Committee for resolution on a case-by-case basis.

456  
457 There was no public comment.

458  
459 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

460  
461 **Agenda Item #14: Consideration of Seeking Statutory Change to Allow the**  
462 **Licensure Committee to Meet in Closed Session to Make Final Licensure**  
463 **Determinations**

464  
465 Ms. Cheung reported that staff met with Legal Affairs about providing an avenue by  
466 which the Licensure Committee could make final licensure determinations, rather than  
467 recommending a decision to the full Board for approval.

468  
469 Ms. Cheung explained that the goal would be to provide a timelier response to  
470 applicants who might otherwise have to wait months longer to be heard at a full Board  
471 meeting.

472  
473 Dr. Horn asked what it would take to allow the Licensure Committee to be granted the  
474 ability to make final licensure determinations without first obtaining the full Board's  
475 approval.

476  
477 Ms. Marks noted that an advisory committee like the Licensure Committee can already  
478 meet in closed session for matters of applicant privacy, but they can not otherwise hold  
479 a closed session.

480  
481 Ms. Sorrick explained that language approved by this Committee would go to the full  
482 Board in October and thereafter seek an author. She feels this might be a non-  
483 substantive change and that we may want to include it as part of our Sunset Review  
484 package.

485

486 Mr. Foo asked Ms. Cheung to confirm that staff is bringing this matter before the  
487 Committee to reduce the timeline for decision-making and not to get around the fact that  
488 the Board cannot discuss these cases in closed session. Ms. Cheung confirms that the  
489 former is true.

490  
491 It was M/(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to approve the proposed amended language and bring it to  
492 the full Board in October for approval and to seek legislation.

493  
494 No public comment received

495  
496 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

497  
498 **Agenda Item #15: Licensing Report**

499  
500 Ms. Cheung and Ms. Xiong provided the update on this item.

501 Ms. Xiong referred the Board to documents contained in the meeting materials and  
502 explained that one parameter was changed on the workflow report on Attachment B to  
503 capture application statistics back to January 1, 2013 rather than just for the past year.  
504 The statistics for initial psychologist licensure are now more accurate and shows a jump  
505 in licenses granted compared to the previous cycle. Attachment D shows that passing  
506 rates for July 2019 were lower than the previous year, but she cannot offer an  
507 explanation as to this decrease.

508 **Agenda Item #16: Discussion and Consideration of Revisions to the Guidelines**  
509 **for the Review of Requests for Extension to the California Code of Regulations**  
510 **Sections 1391.1(b) and 1387(a)**

511  
512 Committee discussion ensued and reviewed Attachment B, the revised guidelines.

513  
514 It was M(Foo)/S(Horn)/C to approve agenda item #16, Attachment B, and recommend  
515 that the Board adopt the revised guidelines.

516  
517 There was no public comment.

518  
519 Vote: 2 ayes (Foo, Horn), 0 noes

520  
521 **Agenda Item #17: Continuing Education and Renewals Report**

522  
523 Dr. Horn asked Ms. McCockran to explain the improving pass rates for CE audits.

524 Ms. McCockran speculated that through social media and through their own networking,  
525 licensees were helping to get the word out about the audit process.

526 Ms. Sorrick made quick mention of the fact that the Board is going PaperLite. As of  
527 January 2020, the Board will no longer be mailing out the multipage renewal packet but  
528 will instead be sending out postcards with instructions for renewing online.

529 **Agenda Item #18: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Committee**  
530 **Meetings. Note: The Committee May Not Discuss or Take Action on any Matter**  
531 **Raised During This Public Comment Section, Except to Decide Whether to Place**  
532 **the Matter on the Agenda of a Future Meeting [Government Code Sections 11125**  
533 **and 11125.7(a)]**

534  
535 There were no recommendations for future agenda items.

536  
537 The meeting adjourned at 1:53 pm.

538  
539

540  
541

542 \_\_\_\_\_  
543 Committee Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_ Date