

## 1 MINUTES OF LICENSURE COMMITTEE MEETING

2 JULY 19, 2024

3  
4 **Primary Location (Members/Staff):**5 Department of Consumer Affairs  
6 1625 N. Market Blvd., El Dorado Room  
7 Sacramento, CA 958348  
9 **Teleconference Locations / Additional Locations at Which the Public Could**  
10 **Observe or Address the Committee and Where Members Were Present:**11 12803 Pimperl Way  
12 San Diego, CA 9212913  
14 2888 Eureka Way, Ste. 200  
15 Redding, CA 9600116  
17 **Committee Members**18 Mary Harb Sheets, PhD, Chairperson  
19 Julie Nystrom  
20 Lea Tate, PsyD21  
22 **Committee Members Absent**

23 None

24  
25 **Board Staff**26 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer  
27 Jonathan Burke, Assistant Executive Officer  
28 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Program Manager  
29 Cynthia Whitney, Central Services Manager  
30 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager  
31 Sarah Proteau, CPD/Renewals Coordinator  
32 Mai Xiong, Licensing/BreEZe Coordinator  
33 Susan Hansen, Examination Coordinator  
34 Evan Gage, Special Projects Analyst  
35 Anthony Pane, Board Counsel36  
37 **Agenda Item #1: Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum**38  
39 Dr. Harb Sheets called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. A quorum was present and  
40 due notice had been sent to all interested parties.41  
42 Ms. Proteau provided information related to Continuing Professional Development  
43 (CPD).  
44

**Agenda Item #2: Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda. 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)].**

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Public comments received via email prior to the start time of the meeting are entered into the record in the form they were received:

**Messages Received Via Email Prior to the July 19, 2024 Licensure Committee Meeting**

Hello, my name is Dr. Blaha and I am writing to the board to express my concern regarding the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) pass rates and the impending addition of the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) in January 2026. To date, there is documented evidence that strongly suggests a racial disparity in the pass rates of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx test takers compared to their White counterparts (Saldaña, Callahan, & Cox, 2024; Sharpless, 2019; Sharpless, 2021). ASPPB has made the claim that there is no racial bias in the EPPP but lacks adequate data to counter what has been uncovered in the literature thus far. Personal anecdotes from individuals within these communities who have been expressing their frustrations for years also indicate the need for a deeper investigation into this matter. In addition to the issues with Part 1, there are also concerns about the impact that Part 2 will have on the licensing process. ASPPB continues to disregard the multitude of problems Part 2 will inevitably cause as well as the insufficient justification that an additional exam would resolve concerns associated with skills-based competency.

Because of these serious concerns, I am requesting that the board investigate how the current Part 1 cutoff score is contributing to the dearth in representation of BIPOC psychologists in California and implement appropriate strategies to address this concern, which includes considering lowering the cutoff score. Additionally, I am asking that the California state board take a firm stance against EPPP (Part 2-Skills) and follow the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists' lead in submitting a request to ASPPB to consider amending the bylaws so that Part 2 can be put to a vote for member jurisdictions. As an advocate for advancing the psychology profession for all psychologists of diverse backgrounds, it's important to ensure transparency and accountability to reduce the gap in service delivery and systematic barriers experienced by ethnic minority and Black psychologists. Now is the time to take corrective action that can not only positively impact the lives of individuals pursuing a license but also ensure more access to qualified and capable clinicians for community members across California. Thank you for your consideration.

--

Jonalyn Blaha, Psy.D.

---

---

Hello, my name is Dr. *Krista Edwards* and I am writing to the board to express my concern regarding the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) pass rates and the impending addition of the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) in January 2026. To date, there is documented evidence that strongly suggests a racial disparity in the pass rates of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx test takers compared to their White counterparts (Saldaña, Callahan, & Cox, 2024; Sharpless, 2019; Sharpless, 2021). ASPPB has made the claim that there is no racial bias in the EPPP but lacks adequate data to counter what has been uncovered in the literature thus far. Personal anecdotes from individuals within these communities who have been expressing their frustrations for years also indicate the need for a deeper investigation into this matter. I myself have taken the test twice and failed both times with a score between 480-495. I am excited to give back to the community and went to an APA accredited university and completed an APPIC internship, graduating with a 3.9 GPA. This test continues to be a barrier for people like me who are more than qualified to do the work. In addition to the issues with Part 1, there are also concerns about the impact that Part 2 will have on the licensing process. ASPPB continues to disregard the multitude of problems Part 2 will inevitably cause as well as the insufficient justification that an additional exam would resolve concerns associated with skills-based competency.

Because of these serious concerns, I am requesting that the board investigate how the current Part 1 cutoff score is contributing to the dearth in representation of BIPOC psychologists in California and implement appropriate strategies to address this concern, which includes considering lowering the cutoff score. Additionally, I am asking that the California state board take a firm stance against EPPP (Part 2-Skills) and follow the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists' lead in submitting a request to ASPPB to consider a bylaws change so that Part 2 can be put to a vote for member jurisdictions. As an advocate for advancing the psychology profession for all psychologists of diverse backgrounds, it's important to ensure transparency and accountability to reduce the gap in service delivery and systematic barriers experienced by ethnic minoritized, disable, and Black psychologists. Now is the time to take corrective action that can not only positively impact the lives of individuals pursuing a license but also ensure more access to qualified and capable clinicians for community members across California. Thank you for your consideration.

Krista Edwards, PhD

---

---

I am a Licensed Clinical Psychologist writing to the board to express my ethical concerns about the implementation of the EPPP Part 2, particularly while the EPPP Part 1's documented racial disparities persist unaddressed and unacknowledged by ASPPB (Saldaña, Callahan, & Cox, 2024; Sharpless, 2019; Sharpless, 2021) BIPOC emerging psychologists deserve equitable access to professional, financial, and personal stability, yet ASPPB's actions appear to contradict that fundamental professional value we share as psychologists.

The dearth of BIPOC psychologists negatively impacts my personal and professional communities daily. During my doctoral coursework and internship, multiple of my Black

female colleagues were disproportionately impacted by unaccommodating academic barriers, as well as unfounded allegations against their professionalism and competency, and many of my BIPOC loved ones experience a harmful lack of competent psychological care.

Because of these serious concerns, I am requesting that the board investigate how the current Part 1 cutoff score is contributing to the dearth in representation of BIPOC psychologists in California and implement appropriate strategies to address this concern, which includes considering lowering the cutoff score. Additionally, I am asking that the California state board take a firm stance against EPPP Part 2 and follow the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists' lead in submitting a request to ASPPB to consider amending the bylaws so that Part 2 can be put to a vote for member jurisdictions.

Moving forward with Part 2 without meaningfully addressing the concerns about its implementation and without holding ASPPB accountable to Part 1's racial biases would be a significant step backwards at a time when we have the knowledge and skill to do otherwise, both as psychologists and as community members who deserve a diverse community of health care providers.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

--

Jasper Jacques Privat, Psy.D.

---

---

I am a doctoral candidate in an APA-accredited program in clinical science actively preparing to apply to internship and post-doctoral training sites across the State of California, among other states, in the coming months.

I would appreciate if this entire e-mail correspondence could be publicly read and formally documented as part of the Board's record for the upcoming meeting today, July 19th at 09:00AM CST.

As a soon-to-be licensed psychologist, my correspondence serves to communicate and raise two (2) primary areas of concern to the Board:

1) The lack of readily available and accessible data for the general public on the California Board of Psychology's website as to the racial, ethnic and disability composition and demographic background of its licensed psychologists across the State

2) The lack of available data for the general public on the California Board of Psychology's website as to the racial, ethnic and disability composition and

demographic background of all its Licensee applicants who have attempted the EPPP, including information as to its pass and failure rates.

Relatedly: I have severe concerns regarding the EPPP (Part 1-Knowledge) pass rates and the impending addition of the EPPP (Part 2-Skills) in January 2026. As all may be clearly aware, there is growing, documented evidence that strongly suggests a racial disparity in the pass rates of Black/African American and Latine test takers compared to White applicants. As a result of serious litigation initiated by the State of Texas over the past year against the ASPPB as to EPPP-2, ASPPB has made baseless claims that there is "no racial bias in the EPPP". Numerous psychology students, applicants, fellows and psychologists over the past year have provided contradicting evidence as to these baseless claims, and we continue to express growing frustrations as to the ASPPB's lack of accountability as to this severe matter. In addition to structural, systemic racial disparities with the EPPP with Part 1, there are also concerns, severe concerns about the impact that Part 2 will have on the licensing process for applicants within the State of California. ASPPB remains dismissive as to these concerns, especially the multitude of problems Part 2 will inevitably cause as well as the insufficient justification that an additional exam would resolve concerns associated with skills-based competency.

I am requesting that the board investigate how the current EPPP Part 1 cutoff score is contributing to the dearth in representation of Black, Indigenous, Latine and other racially minoritized psychologists in the State of California and implement appropriate strategies to address this concern, which includes considering lowering the "cutoff" score to meet licensure requirements. Additionally, I am asking that the State of California Psychology Board take a firm stance against EPPP (Part 2-Skills) and follow the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists' lead and litigation against ASPPB in submitting a request to ASPPB to consider amending the bylaws so that Part 2 can be put to a vote for member jurisdictions.

As an advocate for advancing the psychology profession for all psychologists of diverse backgrounds, it's important to ensure transparency and accountability to reduce the gap in service delivery and systematic barriers experienced by racially and ethnically minoritized Psychologists, especially Black and Latine psychologists in your state. Now is the time to take corrective action that can not only positively impact the lives of individuals pursuing a license but also ensure more access to qualified and capable clinicians for community members across the State of California.

Ultimately, to attract competent licensed psychologists, competitive talent, and, dramatically increase the availability of culturally-responsive providers and clinical scientists to serve the general public across the State of California, I strongly believe the Board should take meaningful, timely steps to address the above areas of concern.

I sincerely look forward to my correspondence being recorded and directly addressed by the State of California's Board of Psychology, as well as learning as to what timely action-plans will be taken by its leadership to address the above matters.

Respectfully submitted,

--  
P. Karima  
Doctoral Candidate, Clinical Science

---

To fellow member jurisdictions of ASPPB:

After many months of engaging with each other on the questions surrounding adoption of the new skills exam (EPPP Part 2), Texas plans to submit the attached proposed bylaw amendment to ASPPB for a vote by membership during the upcoming annual meeting in October. It is essentially the proposed language we shared with you in late June designed to remove the mandate that jurisdictions adopt EPPP Part 2. This is not a confidential or private document. We are sharing this with all the jurisdictional emails we have been able to collect – and we would welcome you sharing with all interested parties. Should any jurisdiction have feedback on the attached language, or wish to co-sponsor this amendment when we file, we would welcome your reply by next Friday, July 26th to provide sufficient time to respond. We must file the amendment by July 29th in order to meet a 90-day notice requirement before the annual meeting.

Whether before or after the amendment is filed, though, we welcome your jurisdiction's support of this effort and request you share this proposed amendment and the discussion below with your boards. If we can be of help to answer any questions about the intention and scope of this amendment, we are happy to meet with you or appear before your board. We also hope you will each be able to send a delegate to the annual meeting to vote on this matter. If you are interested in supporting the amendment, but are uncertain about your ability to send a delegate, please reach out to me. We believe there is an option available for proxy voting that we would be happy to discuss.

Again, we appreciate your jurisdiction's consideration of the proposal and welcome any discussion, questions, or feedback you have. We look forward to welcoming you all to Dallas in the fall for the annual meeting and bringing this discussion before the full membership.

Thanks y'all,

Robert Romig  
Deputy Executive Director  
Texas Behavioral Health Executive Council

[END OF EMAILED COMMENTS]

Ted Scholz, PhD, Vice President of Academic Affairs at the Chicago School of Psychology commented on specific graduation requirements relating to B&P 2914 and was referred back to board staff for further discussion.

Michelle Watson asked whether it was possible for applicants who were denied licensure to learn the reasons why; she was referred back to board staff for assistance.

### **Agenda Item #3: Chairperson's Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Dr. Harb Sheets offered opening remarks and welcomed all participants.

There was no Committee or public comment offered.

### **Agenda Item #4: Review and Possible Approval of Licensure Committee Meeting Minutes: February 2, 2024**

It was (M)Nystrom/(S)Tate/(C) to adopt the February 2, 2024, Licensure Committee meeting minutes.

There was no committee or public comment offered.

Votes

3 ayes (Harb Sheets, Nystrom, Tate), 0 noes

### **Agenda Item #5: Staff Reports**

#### **a. Licensing Report (M. Xiong)**

Ms. Xiong provided the Licensing Unit report, starting on page 13 of the meeting materials. She commented that the application has been updated to include the Skill Bridge question to allow eligible applicants to have their applications expedited.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

Ms. Nystrom asked whether there were currently any glitches or delays in the application process for psychological testing technicians. Ms. Cheung replied that there were no such issues and that the process was going smoothly.

No further Committee comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

No public comment was offered.

#### **b. Continuing Education/Professional Development and Renewals Report (S. Proteau)**

Ms. Proteau provided the update on this item, starting on page 22 of the meeting materials.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comments.

Dr. Tate asked about the relative speed of renewing via BreEZe as opposed to renewing via regular mail. Ms. Proteau commented that the difference is starkly in favor of renewing via BreEZe, which usually completes within 24-48 hours, as opposed to the matter of weeks it might take for a paper renewal to be processed.

No further Committee comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman of California Psychological Association (CPA) asked about the relatively low pass rate for audits, especially as to the types of deficiencies pointing to this trend. Ms. Proteau replied that the numbers reflected in the pass rate are an average and do not take into account the as-yet uncompleted audits.

Ms. Whitney commented that further explanation could be made at the next Board meeting.

No further public comment was offered.

#### c. Examination Report (S. Hansen)

Ms. Hansen provided the update on this item, starting on page 26 of the meeting materials.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

No Committee comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

No public comment was offered.

#### **Agenda Item #6: Barriers to Telehealth Survey Follow-Up: Discuss the Content Relating to the Development of a Telehealth Best Practice Guideline**

Dr. Harb Sheets presented this item, starting on page 28 of the meeting materials.

Ms. Nystrom commented that the APA Telehealth Guidelines were updated in June 2024 and that the Board should be using this most current version.

Dr. Harb Sheets commented that there are potential resources that might be available to help licensees identify best practices, and that it would not be a good use of the Committee's time to try to craft guidelines of its own.

Committee discussion ensued.

Dr. Tate asked Ms. Sorrick to produce a digest of the APA and CPA Telehealth Guidelines for the benefit of the Committee. Dr. Tate commented that the Enforcement



Unit would no doubt be looking at these same Guidelines from the enforcement angle as well.

Ms. Sorrick suggested that the Board could create a Fact Sheet that would educate licensees on the outcome of the Survey, while also indicating that the Board had tasked itself with providing licensees with resources that would help them to identify guidelines for best practices for themselves. This information could then be linked back to the Board's website for easy review at any time. Further, she confirmed that the Enforcement Committee had the previous day reviewed statutes and regulations relating to telehealth.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked Mr. Pane whether a vote would be necessary to make the recommendation to the Board to create this one-page digest.

Mr. Pane commented that it would be appropriate to vote on this matter in order to move it out of Committee.

It was (M)Harb Sheets/(S)Tate/(C) that in response to the Board's direction to come up with telehealth best practices, the Committee shall develop a document that includes various resources to which licensees may refer for telehealth guidance, including a fact sheet regarding the Survey.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Dr. Winkelman commented that CPA does not have its own telehealth guidelines, but instead refers people to the APA telepsychology guidelines. She expressed support for the placement of resources on the Board's website to ensure that people have access to consistent and correct information.

Sheila J. Henderson commented that the APA IT Telehealth Competencies Credential courses provide a lot of good information, and she provided the link in the meeting's chat.

Kamal Freiha commented that he believed that the adoption of this modality would be harmful to the field and to the quality of services provided. He commented that the Board should view the client's side of the situation as far as accessing in-person service, and that it should not be up to practitioners to determine the trajectory of psychotherapy while the legitimacy of telehealth was still being assessed.

Damon Wood commented on the interface between teletherapy and high tech, with a number of high-tech and equity firms entering the field to provide service without any safeguards in place for therapists or clients if the firm should cease operations, as had happened in his own experience.

Christine Gerchow commented that in the San Francisco Bay Area, among the client population she works with, there is a lot of stigma related to seeking therapy to deal with the stresses of childrearing or caring for the aged, and that beyond these there is a real lack of transportation for clients to access care in person. For these populations,

teletherapy has provided an opportunity to seek services when the obstacles of stigma or local access might otherwise prove too daunting.

Karen Williams commented that telehealth could be more appropriate for some situations more than others, such as when the client has difficulty accessing local services, while telehealth could be less appropriate for marital counseling, for example, or with a child or teenager. She commented that telehealth may be a good alternative option, but that it should not be applied all the time in every situation.

Dr. Trista Carr commented that telehealth is a highly effective way of providing service when working with individuals who might otherwise have difficulty accessing services, and she agreed that there should be protection in situations such as mentioned previously with firms closing abruptly with no communication to clients nor transition of care. She commented that this is something that needs to be monitored, but not at the expense of making it more difficult for clinicians to provide service via telehealth.

Mark Loesch commented that he has found it helpful being able to provide services both in person and via telehealth. He commented that the Board should not limit one method or the other, but rather should consider that the relationship between the therapist and the client is the most important thing.

No further public comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets commented that the purpose of this agenda item was not whether or not to cancel the opportunity for providers to offer telehealth services, but rather to develop written guidelines and resources to help California providers in providing ethical telehealth services.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comments.

No further Committee comments were offered.

Votes

3 ayes (Harb Sheets, Nystrom, Tate), 0 noes

#### **Agenda Item #7: Review Proposed Changes to the Extension Request Guidelines**

Ms. Cheung provided the update on this item, starting on page 29 of the meeting materials.

Ms. Cheung commented that the purpose of the proposed revision is to clarify that, without good cause, the Board will not approve an extension beyond the current 72-month limit.

Dr. Harb Sheets commented that the Board already has a 30-month limitation on accruing the required 1,500 hours, and asked whether it is sufficient to say there is a 72-month limitation on the registration.

Ms. Cheung commented that this conversation is about the 72-month registration.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

It was (M)Tate/(S)Harb Sheets/(C) to approve and recommend to the Board the proposed changes to the extension request guidelines.

Ms. Nystrom asked Ms. Sorrick whether it might be helpful to registrants and applicants to include this information under the FAQs tab on the Board's website.

Ms. Sorrick asked Ms. Cheung to comment on where that information could currently be found on the Board's website.

Ms. Cheung commented that this information is currently on the Applicants tab.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

No further Committee comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

No public comment was offered.

Votes

3 ayes (Harb Sheets, Nystrom, Tate), 0 noes

**Agenda Item #8: Review a Courtesy Document: Weekly Log for Supervised Professional Experience**

Ms. Cheung provided the update on this item, and the materials were available as a hand-carry.

Staff consulted with Publications to draft a courtesy log to assist registrants in tracking their weekly supervised professional experience, and the Committee is being asked to review the draft.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comments.

It was (M)Tate/(S)Nystrom/(C) to approve and recommend to the Board to direct staff to finalize and post the courtesy weekly log on the Board's website to be utilized as a resource.

On Mr. Pane's recommendation, the motion was modified to be a recommendation from the Committee that the Board approve the courtesy weekly log and direct staff to finalize and post it on the Board's website to be utilized as a resource.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Dr. Winkelman commented that when this log is posted to the website, that it be clearly described as being a courtesy document and not required. She asked whether a trainee had the option to withhold a log entry that reflects unsatisfactory performance for that week.

Ms. Cheung answered that typically when a supervisor checks the box for unsatisfactory performance of a trainee, the supervisor would go on to explain the deficiencies. Staff could then ask the next question, to further clarify the negative report. She explained that trainees are not required to turn in the log unless staff requested it.

Anita Pedersen commented that many times she sees MFT trainees struggling to understand what is covered under "Other Duties" on the form and suggested finding a place between the definitions being too vague or overly specific.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked Ms. Cheung whether the items on the supervision agreement would be listed in this category list of psychological duties performed, and Ms. Cheung confirmed that this was the case.

Dr. Joy Marquez commented that there is language at the top of the courtesy document indicating that it is a recommended form, rather than just an additional resource for tracking supervised hours. As an early-career licensee, she could imagine how a trainee might mistake this courtesy log for the required log.

Anita Pedersen commented further that the Committee might do well to tie the courtesy log back to regulations with more care, because supervisors and trainees may not fully understand what is being asked for on the form and might, for example, list administrative duties, which would be disqualified under regulation. She suggested that citing the applicable regulations would allow supervisors and trainees to quickly refer back to make sure the duties are being accurately recorded and that hours are being creditably logged.

Dr. Winkelman commented further that the log lists not only "individual supervision" and "group supervision", but also "other supervision", and asked for clarification on this third type. She commented further that, based on the comments heard earlier from other supervisors, that overall maybe the log could be streamlined, maybe even to remove the list of duties, since those are already outlined in the supervision agreement.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked Ms. Cheung for an instance in which the "other supervision" type might be applicable. Ms. Cheung deferred to Ms. Hansen, who commented that the use of this category was more an effort to avoid dictating exactly what would count and what would not for the purposes of logging supervision hours.

Ms. Nystrom questioned whether the "other supervision" category could simply be removed.

Dr. Harb Sheets directed the question to Ms. Cheung, since there were no clear examples of when this category might apply.

Ms. Cheung replied that this category was available in an attempt to be all-inclusive, but that it would be no problem to remove it, since supervision would fall either under individual or group, as far as the Committee could determine it.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked what would happen if a trainee wrote “as per supervision agreement” but did not provide detail on the duties actually performed that week. Would that log be acceptable?

Ms. Cheung commented that this potential situation had not been considered as part of creating this courtesy document. The intent behind creating the log was to help people keep track of their hours in a more convenient way.

Dr. Winkelman commented that since it is not required in regulations that the list of duties be included in the log, this could be a reason to omit the list altogether. By leaving the list in there, it could create another situation where staff would have to review the duties for compliance. The more information that is requested on the form, the more confusion there could be for staff, the supervisors, and the trainees.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked Ms. Cheung to confirm that staff did not regularly request these logs, and so the additional burden on staff to review the duties reported on the log would not be an issue. Ms. Cheung affirmed Dr. Harb Sheets comment.

Dr. Joy Marquez commented further that by removing the list of duties performed, the form would only account for supervision, and would not indicate what type of patient interactions were being credited. She commented that arranging the log around a regular Monday-Friday workweek might streamline the log and better reflect the hours most trainees work under supervision.

No further public comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for further Committee comment.

Discussion followed as to whether the motion needed to be modified, with the purpose of further streamlining the log to make it more intelligible, or leaving the duties list intact to head off issues before they resulted in closed session discussion. The vote proceeded with no modification to the motion.

Votes

3 ayes (Harb Sheets, Nystrom, Tate), 0 noes

**Agenda Item #9: Discuss the Content and Propose a Date to Convene a Stakeholder Meeting Relating to the Role between a Licensed Psychologist, a Licensed Educational Psychologist, and Individuals with a Pupil Personnel Services Credential**

Ms. Cheung provided the update on this item, starting on page 31 of the meeting materials.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

Dr. Tate commented about the next windows for Licensure Committee to meet in 2025 will likely be January / February, or July / August, and that the Committee could conduct its business in the morning and hold the stakeholder meeting in the afternoon.

Dr. Harb Sheets addressed Ms. Nystrom, since Ms. Nystrom was not on the Licensure Committee when this discussion began in 2019.

Dr. Harb Sheets deferred to Ms. Sorrick to provide Ms. Nystrom some background on the initiative to hold a stakeholder meeting due to consumer confusion about what services were being provided by a particular provider who held a particular credential.

Dr. Harb Sheets commented that one of the biggest concerns the Committee had was the considerable overlap between which credentials were allowed to provide which services, which led to confusion among consumers.

Ms. Nystrom commented that one thing the Committee might come up with out of the stakeholder meeting would be a fact sheet that spelled out for consumers exactly who could provide the service they were seeking.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for a discussion on the content of the stakeholders meeting.

Dr. Tate commented that some of the previous presentations could be excerpted to provide a little history to orient new stakeholders to the discussion and bring the earlier audience up to speed, so that everyone would understand the differences and grasp the goal the Committee is trying to achieve, which is to provide clarification and clear up the confusion about which credentials would allow which services to be provided. She commented that if the meeting were to be held in the latter half of 2025, that perhaps there would be time to conduct a stakeholder survey to gather data that might inform the discussion at the meeting.

Ms. Nystrom asked whether the Board of Behavioral Sciences and the Commission of Teacher Credentialing might already have made this information available publicly, and whether the Committee might want to gather that data to be used together with the Board's own brochure to showcase the delineations between license types.

It was (M)Nystrom/(S)Tate/(C) to schedule the stakeholder meeting for the second Licensure Committee meeting of 2025.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Diane Harris Wilson commented that since there is a high degree of intersectionality between all the various professions providing related services, she recommended the Committee broaden its definition of who is a stakeholder to include trainers.

Robert Hardy appreciated the Committee's attempts to clarify where there may be overlap that might be confusing to consumers. He commented that there are potentially licensed psychologists going into schools with no background in learning disabilities, who are there for financial gain. He expressed support for the Committee conducting a survey ahead of the proposed meeting in 2025.

Dr. Winkelman requested that CPA be represented at the stakeholder meeting, and that it includes a licensed psychologist who has expertise in this area.

No further public comment offered.

Votes

3 ayes (Harb Sheets, Nystrom, Tate), 0 noes

**Agenda Item #10: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Licensure Committee Meetings**

Dr. Harb Sheets called for Committee comment.

Dr. Tate commented that the courtesy document could be discussed further in 2025, at which point Ms. Cheung could suggest whether any changes to the document are needed.

No further Committee comment offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets called for public comment.

Michelle Watson requested an agenda item be added to discuss what objective criteria are used by the Board to determine whether a specialization is one that meets Part C of BPC 2914.

A question was raised by Kim, about the vote on PsyPact that went to the Senate. She questioned when an update might be provided on that, and commented that the Committee might discuss it in 2025.

No further public comment was offered.

Dr. Harb Sheets adjourned Open Session.

Dr. Harb Sheets asked Ms. Proteau to provide the amount of CPD credit for attending this meeting.

Ms. Proteau commented that attendance at the meeting provided two (2) hours of CPD credit under Category 1.

**CLOSED SESSION**

708 12:09 p.m. – closed session commenced.

709

710 **ADJOURNMENT**

711

712

713