

Journal

****The California Department of Consumer Affairs, Board of Psychology Newsletter ****

IN THIS ISSUE:

President's Welcome.....	1
Finding the Way Back to Practice	2
Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Information	3
Share Your Expertise — Become a Board of Psychology Expert Reviewer	5
Spectrum of Administrative Actions.....	7
Explanation of Disciplinary Language and Actions	10
Disciplinary Actions.....	11
Regulatory Update	16
Active Board Positions	18
Board Members	20
2026 Meeting Calendar	20

President's Welcome

By Lea Tate, Psy.D., President, Board of Psychology



Welcome to the fall season!

Fall is here! For me, it's about drinking the first pumpkin spice latte, holiday decorating, cozy slippers, and fuzzy blankets.

You may have noticed that a few chairs were missing at our last board meeting. We currently have two vacant board member positions.

When the new members are appointed, they will attend the next available board meeting. We are looking forward to welcoming the next two board members!

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) hours are required every two years. All licensed psychologists may obtain CPD hours from four different categories: Professional Activities, Academic, Sponsored Continuing Education, and Board Certification. Attending committee or board meetings qualify for CPD credit in the Professional Activity category. With the new CPD requirements, the Board of Psychology meetings and committee meetings have been well attended and full of public comment.

As a reminder, all board and committee meetings are updated on the Board website at www.psychology.ca.gov. We have one more board meeting for 2026. It is a two-day meeting scheduled for November 12-13, 2026, in Southern California.

Thank you to everyone who attended our meeting in San Diego in August. It was standing room only for a brief moment—what a surprise! The Board continues to enjoy seeing new faces in the audience and hearing public comment.

We hope to see you at our next board meeting November 12-13, 2026, in Southern California!

Lea Tate, Psy.D.

www.psychology.ca.gov



[www.facebook.com/
BoardofPsychology](https://www.facebook.com/BoardofPsychology)



x.com/CABDofPsych
X handle: @CABDofPsych

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS



BREEZE

To verify a license: www.breeze.ca.gov

To update address of record or
email address: www.breeze.ca.gov

Contact us: bopmail@dca.ca.gov

Sign up for our email list:
www.psychology.ca.gov



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
**CONSUMER
AFFAIRS**





Finding the Way Back to Practice

By Shacunda Rodgers, Ph.D., Vice President, Board of Psychology

The practice of mindfulness has been one of my core wellness strategies for the last 20 years. I have always appreciated its simplicity and really value the way

Jon Kabat-Zinn has described the components of mindful awareness. He says that it is paying attention in a particular way: on purpose, in the present moment, without judgment, and with compassion. There has been such freedom in knowing that the goal is to simply wake up to life as it is, noticing what's happening around us, while also paying attention to what is happening internally (without judging what we find). It has taught me the beauty of holding the moments that unfold, the people I encounter, and my circumstances with compassion and care. It has been a heart-opening experience that has made me more tender and gentle with myself and with others.

As much as this practice has taught me, there are times when life feels too busy and too full to carve out a few moments of quiet reflection. As the daily tasks and responsibilities increase, it feels like there is less and less time to commit to the practice that has sustained, centered, and grounded me. Rather than drift further away from what has been so nourishing for me, I am trying to return to a few simple mindfulness practices, beginning with mindfulness of the breath.

In *Being with Busyness: Zen Ways to Transform Overwhelm and Burnout*, authors Brother Phap Huu and Jo Confino offer a breathing meditation practice called, *Stop and Lay Down Your Burdens*. Here's a short excerpt of the practice:

*"As you breathe in, just say, 'This is my in-breath.'
As you breathe out, just say, 'This is my out-breath.'
Breathe in and out....
Deep in-breath. Slow out-breath.
As I breathe in, I recognize calm in me.
As I breathe out, I breathe out with ease.
In, calm. Out, ease."*

So simple: In, calm. Out, ease.

One breath at a time, one moment at a time, we can regain our footing and return to this life, and all that is unfolding around us. By returning to the breath, we are able to slow down a bit, and turn our attention inward, focusing on our body's natural rhythm of inhaling and exhaling. Focusing on each in-breath and out-breath helps to slow the rapid pace of the times we are in, and the distractions and demands competing for our attention. One breath at a time, we can find a moment of rest and restore ourselves.

The breath, in its simplicity, is quite powerful, as it is a true portal to the present moment. As we focus on the stillness of the body and the movement of each breath, we offer ourselves a temporary refuge, and the opportunity to find clarity beneath the chaos. In an article, "Too Busy to Meditate," Vinny Ferraro shares this insight: "I understand the practice as one of arrival, a kind of homecoming if you will. In this way, it can be a great relief from the fragmented awareness of multitasking." An arrival, a homecoming, a return to center, an opportunity to reset an overworked nervous system: these are all the gifts afforded to us by this simple, yet profoundly transformative practice.

So, the next time you find yourself in an endless loop of tasks tugging at your attention, I invite you to slow down for just a few moments, offering yourself the phrase, "In, calm. Out, ease." Notice the difference it makes.

May we all find our way back to moments of simplicity that allow us to really touch into what it means to be a human being in the midst of all that we are asked to do. In *Living with Your Heart Wide Open: How Mindfulness and Compassion Can Free You from Unworthiness, Inadequacy, and Shame*, Steve Flowers and Bob Stahl remind us, "Here's a simple but profound truth: The moment you realize you aren't present, you're present once again. Mindfulness is always that close." May we remember that the breath is always an available pathway back to the present. May we also find our way back to practice in these small ways, as we continue to walk the path ahead.

Until next time, dear colleagues, be well.



Continuing Professional Development Information

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) offers multiple categories for licensees to earn hours for renewal. The CPD requirements are structured into 15 activities grouped into four CPD learning categories, with specific hour requirements for Law and Ethics and Cultural Diversity/Social Justice.

Licensees must accrue hours in at least two of the four CPD learning categories to complete the required 36 CPD hours per renewal cycle. The 36 CPD hours include the required four hours in the topic of Law and Ethics and four hours in the topic of Cultural Diversity/Social Justice.

Self-Directed Learning vs. Sponsored Continuing Education

CPD Learning Category No. 2 (Academic) includes the Self-Directed Learning activity. This activity is meant for independent educational activities focused on maintaining, developing, or increasing conceptual and applied competencies relevant to psychological practice, education, or science, such as reading peer-review journal, articles, or books (physical or e-books), watching videos or webcasts, or listening to podcasts. The activity must be an unstructured learning activity and does not include CE hours granted upon completion.

The maximum CPD hours that can be credited for this activity is six. The CPD hours are credited on an hour for hour basis. Licensees must maintain a record that includes the date(s), medium (e.g. podcast, book), topic or title, and the total number of CPD hours completed.

CPD Learning Category No. 3 (Sponsored Continuing Education (CE)) is any approved structured sequenced learning activity that can be conducted either in-person or online. The CE provider must be approved by at least one of the following approved entities:

- [American Psychological Association \(APA\)](#)
- [California Psychological Association \(CPA\)](#)
- [Association of Black Psychologists \(ABPsi\)](#)
- [California Medical Association \(CMA\)](#)
- [Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education \(ACCME\)](#)

A maximum of 27 CPD hours can be credited for this activity toward the required 36 CPD hours. Licensees must keep the proof of attendance given by the CE provider.



(continued from page 3)

Board Meeting Attendance for CPD credit

CPD hours can be earned by attending a board or committee meeting. For a board or committee meeting that is three hours or less, CPD hours will be credited on an hour-for-hour basis. If the meeting lasts more than three hours or lasts the full day, a total of six hours will be credited.

If looking to earn CPD hours by attending a board or committee meeting, the Board Meeting/Event Calendar can be accessed on our website at www.psychology.ca.gov/about_us/meetings/index.shtml. If a meeting is posted as with a physical location, physical attendance is required to receive credit. Hybrid meetings allow attendees to earn CPD credit by attending in-person or remotely. No pre-registration is required to attend any board or committee meeting.

Upcoming Board and Committee Meeting Dates

- **October 9 – Outreach and Communications Committee – Webex**
- **November 12 and 13 – Board Meeting – Southern California**

CPD Resources

The CPD webinar recording offers a comprehensive overview of CPD with a real-time Q&A session can be accessed online at www.youtube.com/watch?v=ghh-A727MUM. The webinar offers three CPD hours credit under Self-Directed Learning (Category No. 2). The three CPD hours are also credited toward Law and Ethics.

All CPD resources can be found on our website at www.psychology.ca.gov/licensees/ce.html.

A full list of the categories and approved activities can be found on our website at www.psychology.ca.gov/licensees/ce_faqs.shtml.

To view a full list of CPD FAQs, visit our website at www.psychology.ca.gov/licensees/cpd_faqs.shtml.

The Board offers a courtesy **CPD reporting form**, however, licensees may use their own reporting form.

To learn more about these updates or to get in touch with the CPD coordinator for further information, email BOPCE@dca.ca.gov.





Share Your Expertise — Become a Board of Psychology Expert Reviewer

The Board's Enforcement Program is recruiting qualified psychologists to serve as expert reviewers.

Expert reviewers play an important role in the Board's enforcement process. They independently review case materials, provide clinical expertise, prepare written expert opinions, and testify at administrative hearings when necessary. Their expertise helps investigators, attorneys, and administrative law judges understand complex psychological and professional issues.

Expert reviewers are paid \$150 to \$200 per hour (depending upon the services rendered) for case reviews, preparation of expert opinion reports, and testimony at administrative hearings.



Why Become an Expert Reviewer?

Put Your Expertise to Work

Apply your professional knowledge and experience to cases involving the practice of psychology.

Support the Standard of Care

Help the Board evaluate professional practice and determine whether the care or conduct at issue met the applicable standard of care.

Give Back to Your Profession and Community

Contribute your expertise to a process that supports professional accountability and protection of California consumers.

(continued on page 6)



(continued from page 5)

Expand Your Professional Knowledge

Gain greater familiarity with the Board's complaint and enforcement process, preparation of expert opinions, application of the standard of care, and effective testimony in administrative proceedings.



What Makes a Successful Expert Reviewer?

The Board is seeking psychologists who are:

- Objective, fair, and unbiased.
- Knowledgeable and experienced in their areas of practice.
- Able to independently and impartially evaluate case materials.
- Effective communicators, both in written reports and testimony.
- Accessible, responsive, and cooperative.
- Committed to maintaining confidentiality.

Expert reviewers should provide opinions within the boundaries of their professional competence and base their professional judgments on appropriate information and methods. These principles are consistent with established professional standards concerning competence and the bases for psychological judgments.



Who Can Apply?

To be considered an expert reviewer, applicants must:

- Possess a current California psychology license in good standing.
- Have forensic experience and be willing to testify if a case proceeds to a hearing.

- Maintain an active practice of at least 80 hours per month in direct patient care, clinical activity, psychometric testing, and/or teaching.
- Have three or more years of expertise in specific areas of practice.
- Have no prior or current charges or formal disciplinary actions related to a healing arts license or other professional license, registration, certificate, or credential in the United States or a foreign country.
- Have no criminal convictions, including convictions that were expunged or dismissed.



Interested in Serving?

Qualified psychologists who would like to be considered should submit:

- A cover letter describing their current practice, work setting, forensic experience, and interest in serving as an expert reviewer.
- A completed Expert Reviewer Application.
- A current, dated curriculum vitae.



Lend Your Expertise to the Board

Your professional knowledge can help ensure that complex psychological issues receive informed, independent, and objective review. Consider joining the Board as an expert reviewer.



Spectrum of Administrative Actions

The Board has a range of administrative and enforcement actions available when addressing consumer complaints involving licensees. The appropriate outcome depends on the facts and evidence developed during the review or investigation of each matter.

Not all complaints result in disciplinary action. Depending on the situation, a matter may be closed without action, handled through a non-disciplinary administrative or enforcement step, or lead to formal disciplinary proceedings. When determining an appropriate disciplinary outcome, the Board considers factors such as the nature and seriousness of the conduct, actual or potential harm, prior disciplinary history, the number or types of violations, mitigating or aggravating circumstances, evidence of rehabilitation, cooperation during the investigation, the passage of time, and any corrective action taken.

NON-DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATIVE OPTIONS

CASE CLOSED – NO ACTION

The Board may close a complaint without action when the matter is outside its jurisdiction, the evidence does not establish a violation, or the available evidence is insufficient to support further administrative action. The Board may close a complaint after its initial review or after obtaining and evaluating additional information.

When the Board closes a case without administrative action, it does not impose disciplinary action.

EDUCATIONAL LETTER

In appropriate cases involving a minor concern, the Board may issue an educational letter to advise a licensee about applicable legal or professional requirements and to encourage future compliance.

An educational letter may identify the concern raised by the complaint, explain the applicable

requirements, and advise the licensee that similar future conduct could result in an enforcement action. The purpose is educational and corrective, not disciplinary.

An educational letter is not formal disciplinary action.

CITATION AND FINE

The Board may issue a citation and, when authorized, an administrative fine and Order of Abatement for violations of the Psychology Licensing Law. Citations provide an administrative enforcement mechanism that may be appropriate when formal disciplinary proceedings are not warranted.

An Order of Abatement requires the cited individual to correct or discontinue the identified violation. Depending on the circumstances, a citation may also include an administrative fine. Citations may be issued in matters involving licensed individuals as well as certain violations involving unlicensed activity.

A citation is not formal disciplinary action; however, it is public information. A person who receives a citation can follow procedures to contest the citation in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATIVE OPTIONS

Formal discipline generally follows the administrative disciplinary process. A disciplinary matter may be resolved through a negotiated stipulated settlement or, if contested, through the administrative hearing process and subsequent Board action. The appropriate penalty depends on the facts and circumstances of the case and applicable law.

PUBLIC LETTER OF REPROVAL

A public letter of reproof is a form of disciplinary action that may be used to resolve a pending disciplinary matter when the circumstances support that level of discipline. Unlike an educational letter, a public letter of reproof is formal discipline action and becomes part of the public disciplinary record.



(continued from page 7)

A letter of reproof is generally reached through the **stipulated settlement process after an accusation has been filed**. The Board does not impose it simply by sending a letter to the licensee. The licensee and, when represented, the respondent's counsel, must agree to the proposed resolution and its terms. The settlement terms are negotiated between the licensee, the licensee's counsel (if applicable), and the deputy attorney general, who represents the Board in the disciplinary proceeding. The resulting proposed stipulated agreement is submitted to the Board for its consideration and possible action.

The terms of a reproof may address the conduct alleged in the accusation. The reproof may include requirements in response to the alleged conduct and require remediation of the identified issues to protect the public. Depending on the circumstances, those terms may include coursework or other educational requirements, cost recovery, and other appropriate conditions authorized by law and consistent with the Board's disciplinary guidelines.

As a negotiated resolution, a letter of reproof may include terms tailored to the facts, evidentiary considerations, mitigating or aggravating factors, and other relevant aspects of the case. Agreement between the parties does not make the settlement effective. The Board retains the authority to accept or reject the proposed stipulated resolution. Once approved and effective, the public letter of reproof constitutes disciplinary action and becomes part of the licensee's publicly available disciplinary history.

PROBATION

A licensee may be placed on probation following the filing of an accusation. Probation results from a stipulated settlement or from the administrative adjudication process.

Under the Board's disciplinary framework, when a license is placed on probation, the license is revoked, the revocation is stayed, and the licensee is permitted to continue practicing subject to the specified probationary period and associated terms and conditions.

The Board's disciplinary guidelines contain standard and optional terms and conditions of probation. Depending on the facts of the case, conditions may include education, examinations, psychotherapy, psychological evaluation, practice or billing monitoring, restrictions on practice, cost recovery, and other requirements intended to address the conduct and protect the public.

A licensee must comply with all terms and conditions imposed by the disciplinary order. Failure to comply may result in additional enforcement proceedings and may jeopardize the licensee's ability to continue practicing.

Probation is a disciplinary action and is public information.

SUSPENSION

The Board may impose a period of suspension as part of a disciplinary order when warranted by the facts of the case. During a period of suspension, the licensee may not practice psychology as authorized by the license.

The Board's disciplinary guidelines set out the conditions under which a period of suspension or a requirement to cease practice may be appropriate. Certain probation conditions may also require a licensee to cease practicing until specified requirements have been satisfied.

Suspension imposed through a disciplinary order is public information.

INTERIM SUSPENSION ORDER

In situations involving an immediate threat to the public health, safety, or welfare, an Interim Suspension Order may be sought through the administrative process. This provides a mechanism for restricting a licensee's ability to practice while the underlying disciplinary matter continues through the administrative process.

If an Interim Suspension Order is issued, the licensee must immediately comply with the order's restrictions.

An Interim Suspension Order is an interim protective measure and should be distinguished from the final

(continued on page 9)



(continued from page 8)

disciplinary disposition of the underlying case. The underlying allegations must still proceed through the applicable administrative process.

SURRENDER OF LICENSE

Rather than proceeding through a contested administrative hearing, a licensee may agree to surrender the license through a stipulated disciplinary resolution.

A surrender is not accomplished merely by allowing a license to expire or by voluntarily ceasing practice. In the disciplinary context, surrender occurs through a stipulated agreement submitted to the Board for consideration. Once the Board accepts it and it takes effect, the individual formally relinquishes the legal authority to practice under the license.

A surrendered license constitutes disciplinary action and is public information.

Under the Board's disciplinary framework, an individual whose license has been surrendered generally must wait at least three years before petitioning for reinstatement. Reinstatement is not automatic and is subject to applicable laws, regulations, and all reinstatement requirements established by law and the Board.

REVOCATION

Revocation results in the loss of the authority to practice under the license. It represents the most serious disciplinary outcome available to the Board.

Revocation may result from an administrative hearing and subsequent Board action, or it may be reached through a stipulated disciplinary resolution. The Board's disciplinary guidelines identify situations in which revocation may be appropriate and provide guidance for determining penalties based on the facts of the case.

An individual whose license has been revoked may not practice psychology under that license. Revocation is a disciplinary action and is public information.

An individual whose license has been revoked generally must wait at least three years before petitioning the Board for reinstatement. The passage of three years does not create a right to reinstatement. A petitioner must demonstrate rehabilitation and fitness for licensure, and the Board determines whether reinstatement is appropriate and whether to impose any conditions consistent with the disciplinary guidelines.

WHY OUTCOMES MAY DIFFER

Each enforcement matter is evaluated based on its individual facts and evidence. Similar allegations do not necessarily result in identical outcomes because relevant factors may differ from case to case.

Except where law requires a particular outcome, the Board's disciplinary guidelines provide a framework for evaluating the appropriate level of discipline. Relevant considerations may include the nature and severity of the conduct, actual or potential harm, prior disciplinary history, the number or variety of violations, mitigating and aggravating factors, rehabilitation, cooperation with the investigation, corrective action, and the amount of time that has passed.

These considerations allow the Board to evaluate each case while promoting consistent disciplinary decision-making and fulfilling its consumer-protection responsibilities.



Explanation of Disciplinary Language and Actions

Gross negligence: An extreme departure from the standard of care.

Incompetence: Lack of knowledge or skills in discharging professional obligations.

Public letter of reproof: Formal discipline that consists of a reprimand of a licensee that is a matter of public record for conduct in violation of the law.

Accusation: A formal, written statement of charges.

Stipulated settlement of decision: The case is formally negotiated and settled prior to hearing.

Surrender: To resolve a disciplinary action, the licensee has given up his or her license, subject to acceptance by the Board of Psychology.

Suspension from practice: The licensee is prohibited from practicing or offering to provide psychological services during the term of suspension.

Revoked: The right to practice has ended due to disciplinary action.

Revocation stayed, probation with terms and conditions: “Stayed” means the revocation is postponed. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of any term of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.





Disciplinary Actions

Michael Kelly Abbott, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 27701, Modesto

On February 12, 2026, the Board of Psychology adopted an administrative law judge's proposed decision revoking the psychologist license of Michael Kelly Abbott, Psy.D. The decision became effective March 14, 2026.

The decision found that Abbott willfully disclosed confidential information about multiple patients to people with whom he had personal relationships, allowed other people to observe therapy sessions without the patients' consent, and pursued a romantic and sexual relationship with a former patient within two years after therapy ended. The findings established causes for discipline, including unauthorized disclosure of confidential information, gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, sexual behavior with a former patient, ethical violations, and unprofessional conduct.

The decision concluded that Abbott had not demonstrated sufficient insight, remorse, or rehabilitation and that probation would not adequately protect the public. In addition to revoking the license, the Board ordered Abbott to pay \$58,204.25 in investigation and enforcement costs if the license is reinstated.

Fernando Alessandri, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 29410, Lancaster

On February 23, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist's license of Fernando Alessandri, Ph.D. The decision became effective March 25, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging that Alessandri pursued an intimate relationship with a patient by inviting her to meet socially and proposing marriage approximately one week after terminating therapy. The accusation also alleged related disciplinary actions involving his Texas and Wisconsin psychology licenses and his failure to report the Wisconsin discipline to the California Board within 30 days. The alleged causes included sexual behavior with a client or former client, gross negligence, ethical violations, out-of-state discipline, and unprofessional conduct.

Under the stipulated order, Alessandri surrendered all rights and privileges associated with his California license. He may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$17,062.25 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Jeffrey Kitts Bone, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 20017, Newport Beach

On February 24, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist license of Jeffrey Kitts Bone, Psy.D. The decision became effective March 26, 2026.

The action arose from a First Amended Accusation alleging sexual misconduct with a patient, including inappropriate sexual communications and electronic sexual activity during the therapeutic relationship. It also alleged that Bone aided and abetted a supervisee's unlicensed practice, maintained conflicting professional roles, and submitted inaccurate or backdated supervision and experience-verification documents. The alleged causes included sexual misconduct, gross negligence, repeated negligence, dishonesty, ethical violations, and unprofessional conduct.

Under the stipulated order, Bone surrendered all rights and privileges associated with his California license. He may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$70,214.40 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Kimberly Leicester, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 22058, Nevada City

On April 28, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist license of Kimberly Leicester, Ph.D. The decision became effective May 28, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging that Leicester failed to maintain professional boundaries with a patient and entered an ongoing sexual relationship with the patient immediately after therapy ended. The accusation also alleged

(continued on page 12)



(continued from page 11)

failures to obtain or document informed consent, clarify roles and confidentiality in family or couples therapy, and maintain adequate records. The alleged causes included sexual contact with a patient or former patient, gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, recordkeeping violations, and unprofessional conduct.

Under the stipulated order, Leicester surrendered all rights and privileges associated with her California license. She may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$29,935.05 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

R. Guy Lewis, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 14784, Los Angeles

On May 11, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist license of R. Guy Lewis, Ph.D. The decision became effective June 10, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging that Lewis made inappropriate sexual comments, shared sexual material, and engaged in nonconsensual sexual touching or contact with patients during psychotherapy sessions. The alleged causes included sexual abuse, misconduct, behavior, or contact; gross negligence; repeated negligent acts; and unprofessional conduct.

Under the stipulated order, Lewis surrendered all rights and privileges associated with his California license. He may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$67,567.50 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Nicole Amanda Mirkin, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 33337, Studio City

On March 12, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist license of Nicole Amanda Mirkin, Psy.D. The decision became effective April 11, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging two alcohol-related driving arrests and two misdemeanor

driving-under-the-influence convictions in Arizona; dangerous use of alcohol; discipline of her Arizona psychology license; and practice while that license was suspended. The stipulated agreement states that Mirkin admitted to each charge and allegation and agreed that cause existed for discipline.

Under the stipulated order, Mirkin surrendered all rights and privileges associated with her California license. She may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$9,560 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Denise M. Novell, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 13009, Fresno

On February 12, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist license of Denise M. Novell, Psy.D. The decision became effective March 14, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging that Novell entered an unethical multiple relationship with a patient by hiring him during treatment to perform personal handyman work at her home and office, as well as tasks for her mother. The accusation alleged that the arrangement created conflicts of interest, exposed a vulnerable patient to exploitation and harm, and constituted repeated negligent acts.

Under the stipulated order, Novell surrendered all rights and privileges associated with her California license. She may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$30,473.75 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Gregory Max Vogt, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 13317, Farmington, New Mexico

On April 7, 2026, the Board of Psychology accepted the stipulated surrender of the psychologist's license of Gregory Max Vogt, Ph.D. The decision became effective May 7, 2026.

The action arose from an accusation alleging dishonesty, fraud, gross negligence, and unprofessional conduct in connection with an online

(continued on page 13)



(continued from page 12)

emotional support animal letter. It alleged that Vogt used a nonstandard internet questionnaire, issued a diagnosis and letter without a live examination or informed consent, and failed to maintain the patient's records.

Under the stipulated order, Vogt surrendered all rights and privileges associated with his California license. He may not petition for reinstatement for three years from the effective date and must pay \$28,069.75 in investigation and enforcement costs before a new or reinstated license may be issued.

Petition Decision

Amy V. Thompson, Ph.D.

Former License No. PSY 19296

On January 6, 2026, the Board of Psychology denied Amy V. Thompson, Ph.D.'s petition for reinstatement of her psychologist license. The decision became effective February 5, 2026.

The Board had accepted Thompson's license surrender effective January 11, 2007, in resolution of an accusation based on sexual misconduct with a correctional-facility patient. At the November 6, 2025, reinstatement hearing, Thompson expressed remorse, described sustained treatment for bipolar disorder, and presented evidence of rehabilitative efforts and community service.

The Board found that Thompson did not prove rehabilitation by clear and convincing evidence. Although substantial time had passed and she had remained in treatment, the Board found that she showed limited understanding of professional boundaries, referrals, and resources for difficult clinical situations and had not demonstrated the competence necessary to resume practice safely. The petition for reinstatement was therefore denied.

Citation Decision

Aron M. Deutinger, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 23164, Walnut Creek

On August 13, 2026, the Board of Psychology ordered that its decision affirming the citation would take effect on September 12, 2026. The citation includes an Order of Abatement and a \$250 fine.

The decision found that Deutinger failed to update his address of record within 30 days as required by California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1380.5. As a result, he did not receive two Board inquiries, and the Board's investigation was delayed. The administrative law judge concluded that the admitted violation established cause for citation under Business and Professions Code section 2960(k). The decision separately noted that the underlying patient-care investigation was closed without further action after an expert found no departure from the standard of care.

The Order of Abatement requires Deutinger to familiarize himself with the address-of-record regulation and provide the Board with a signed statement confirming compliance. He was ordered to pay the \$250 fine and comply with the Order of Abatement within 30 days of the decision's effective date.

Citations and Fines

Jenna A. Glover

Unlicensed, Centennial, Colorado

On April 21, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Jenna A. Glover that included an Order of Abatement and a \$2,500 fine.

The citation alleges that, while responsible for establishing clinical policies at Headspace, Glover failed to ensure adequate advance notice before terminating clinical staff, thereby preventing therapists from providing pretermination counseling, arranging continuity of services, retrieving safety information for at-risk patients, and conducting final sessions. It also alleges inadequate patient notice and clinical handoffs, misleading communications to patients, and failure to take reasonable steps to minimize foreseeable harm.

The Order of Abatement requires Glover to familiarize herself with specified provisions of the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, including Standards 1.03, 3.01, 3.04, 3.12, and 10.10 and Principle C, and to submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

(continued on page 14)



(continued from page 13)

Lisa Marie Lavaysse, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 20002, San Carlos

On April 21, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Lisa Marie Lavaysse, Psy.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$1,000 fine.

The citation alleges that Lavaysse failed to maintain timely, complete, and professionally adequate clinical records, including leaving multiple patient reports and progress notes unwritten or incomplete and impairing continuity of care and clinical accountability. The citation identifies alleged violations of Business and Professions Code section 2960(i), (k), (n), and (r).

The Order of Abatement requires Lavaysse to familiarize herself with specified APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct concerning competence, avoiding harm, continuity of care, recordkeeping, training, and termination, and to submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Teri D. Davis, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 29799, Corona

On May 8, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Teri D. Davis, Ph.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$750 fine.

The citation alleges that Davis abruptly terminated a client's services by telephone without conducting a clinically indicated termination session, failed to document or ensure receipt of referral resources, and initiated a group communication involving multiple clients without appropriate informed consent or documentation. It identifies alleged violations of Business and Professions Code section 2960(i), (k), (p), and (r).

The Order of Abatement requires Davis to read and understand the cited statutory provisions and the specified APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct addressing harm, continuity of care, confidentiality, recordkeeping, group therapy, and termination, and to submit a statement, signed under penalty of perjury, confirming compliance.

Sunghee Park

Unlicensed, Fullerton

On February 13, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Sunghee Park that included an Order of Abatement and a \$500 fine.

The citation alleges that Park provided psychological services, including therapy sessions, and signed a disability form for a client without holding a California psychology license, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2903.

The Order of Abatement requires Park to cease all unauthorized practice of psychology; read and understand Business and Professions Code sections 2902, 2903, 17500, and 2960(n); and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Marie Elizabeth Secrist, Ph.D.

License No. PSY 31471, San Diego

On April 27, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Marie Elizabeth Secrist, Ph.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$250 fine.

The citation alleges that Secrist, while serving in a supervisory role, failed to provide guidance, set an appropriate example, and handle conflicts effectively, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2960(k).

The Order of Abatement requires Secrist to respond to the Board's inquiry, maintain a current address of record, familiarize herself with Business and Professions Code section 2960(k), and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Stephanie Manginelli-Herring

Unlicensed, North Bend, Washington

On April 21, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Stephanie Manginelli-Herring that included an Order of Abatement and a \$500 fine.

The citation alleges that Manginelli-Herring represented herself as a clinical psychologist in multiple letters to third parties and implied that the diagnoses discussed in those letters were her own, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2903(a).

(continued on page 15)



(continued from page 14)

The Order of Abatement requires Manginelli-Herring to cease representing herself as a psychologist and cease activities requiring a psychology license; read and understand Business and Professions Code sections 2902, 2903, 17500, and 2960(n) and APA Ethics Code Standard 5.01; and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Jessica Bol, Ph.D.

Unlicensed, Los Angeles

On April 27, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Jessica Bol, Ph.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$2,500 fine.

The citation alleges that Bol failed to renew her license for two full renewal cycles and provided psychological services for four years without a current license, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2903.

The Order of Abatement requires Bol to cease representing herself as a psychologist and cease activities requiring a psychology license, read and understand Business and Professions Code section 2903, and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

John C. Sanders, Psy.D.

Registration No. PSB 94021351, Oakland

On April 27, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to John C. Sanders, Psy.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$1,250 fine.

The citation alleges that Sanders continued to practice after reaching the 72-month limit on his psychological assistant registration and after the registration lapsed. It states that he regularly treated 10 individual therapy clients from February 5 through August 31, 2020, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2903.

The Order of Abatement requires Sanders to cease representing himself as a psychologist and cease activities requiring a psychology license, read and understand Business and Professions Code section 2903, and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Teresa Zapata Marroquin

Unlicensed, San Jose

On June 16, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Teresa Zapata Marroquin that included an Order of Abatement and a \$500 fine.

The citation alleges that Zapata Marroquin advertised herself as a clinical psychologist, provided services to a client on October 8 and October 13, 2025, and sought reimbursement from the Department of Family and Children's Services at \$180 per session, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2903(a).

The Order of Abatement requires Zapata Marroquin to cease representing herself as a psychologist and cease activities requiring a psychology license; read and understand Business and Professions Code sections 2902, 2903, and 17500; and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.

Sara Elizabeth Heinemann, Psy.D.

License No. PSY 94029376, Burbank

On May 28, 2026, the Board of Psychology issued a citation to Sara Elizabeth Heinemann, Psy.D., that included an Order of Abatement and a \$1,500 fine.

The citation alleges that, after her employment at California State University, San Marcos, ended in July 2025 and while she was not licensed, practicing under supervision, or employed as a mental-health provider, Heinemann provided personal contact information to former clients. The citation characterizes the conduct as breaches of client confidentiality and privacy and improper professional-boundary conduct and identifies alleged violations of Business and Professions Code section 2960(h) and (n).

The Order of Abatement requires Heinemann to respond to the Board's inquiry, maintain a current address of record, familiarize herself with APA Ethics Code Standards 3.04 and 4.01, and submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury confirming compliance.



Regulatory Update

Below are the Board's pending regulatory changes and their status in the formal rulemaking process.

Title 16 CCR sections 1395.2 – Disciplinary Guidelines and Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abusing Licensees

Status: This regulatory package is in the Final Stage. This phase includes submission of a final regulation package to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The 45-day comment period concluded. Board staff is preparing final filing phase documents and will be submitting them to the director and Agency for final review.

This regulatory package does the following: This regulatory package updates the Board's disciplinary guidelines including conforming changes required by the passage of AB 2138, the Board's new regulations on criminal convictions and substantial relationship criteria, and the Department's [Uniform Standards for Substance Abusing Healing Arts Licensees](#).

Title 16 CCR sections 1381, 1387, 1387.10, 1388, 1388.6, 1389, and 1389.1 – Applications – Implementing AB 282

Status: This regulatory package is in the Drafting Phase. This phase includes drafting proposed regulatory text and collaborative reviews by board staff, budget staff, and regulatory counsel. Board staff is drafting the proposed text.

This regulatory package does the following: This regulatory package was originally designed to

accomplish two changes: updates the statutory and regulatory sections needed to implement the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) Part 2 (EPPP-2) and implement the mandates of AB 282.

The Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) paused the decision to make EPPP a two-part exam effective on January 1, 2026. Board staff paused the regulatory work related to implementing EPPP Part 2 based on this new development.

Board staff is currently revising regulations to implement the mandates of AB 282 and will present these updates to the Board for future review and discussion. As a result, the anticipated implementation date is expected to be postponed to spring 2027.

Title 16 CCR sections 1382, 1382.3-1382.5, and 1397.60.1-1397.70 – Research Psychoanalyst

Status: This regulatory package is in the Drafting Phase. This phase includes drafting proposed regulatory text and collaborative reviews by board staff, budget staff, and regulatory counsel. Board staff is drafting proposed regulatory text.

This regulatory package does the following: On July 2, 2025, Senate Bill 775 (SB 775)—the Board's Sunset Bill—incorporated the Board-approved regulations expanding the Board's authority over research psychoanalysts (RPAs) and student research psychoanalysts. SB 775 established new one-time coursework requirements—such as child abuse assessment and reporting, suicide risk assessment and intervention, and any additional coursework adopted by the Board (e.g., alcohol and chemical dependency)—as well as a CPD requirement of 36 hours every two years for renewing RPAs.

After the governor approved SB 775, board staff, regulatory counsel, and budget staff met on November 24, 2025, to determine whether additional regulatory amendments were needed to implement these new requirements. The group determined that further changes were necessary to clarify the Board's authority and to put the new training standards into effect.



(continued from page 16)

Title 16 CCR 1397.50 – Citations and Fines for Probation Violations

Status: This package is in the Concept Stage. This phase includes a kick-off meeting to establish production steps, expectations, and timelines for developing proposed regulatory text.

This regulatory package does the following: This regulatory package amends Section 1397.50 to expand the Board's citation and fine authority to include violations of probation terms contained in Board-issued disciplinary orders. The amendments clarify that the executive officer or designee may issue a citation, order of abatement, and/or administrative fine when a licensee fails to comply with any condition of probation, and that such citations may be used as an intermediate enforcement tool in addition to, and not in place of, formal disciplinary action. These changes improve enforcement efficiency, promote timely correction of probation violations, and enhance consumer protection by providing the Board with a broader range of responses to non-compliance.

Title 16 16 CCR sections 1380.6, 1393, 1396, 1396.1, 1396.2, 1396.4, 1396.5, 1397, 1397.1, 1397.2, 1397.35, 1397.37, 1397.39, 1397.50, 1397.51, 1397.52, 1397.53, 1397.54, 1397.55 - Enforcement Provisions

Status: This regulatory package is in the Drafting Phase. This phase includes drafting proposed regulatory text and collaborative reviews by board staff, budget staff, and regulatory counsel. Board staff is drafting proposed regulatory text.

This regulatory package does the following: This regulatory package updates numerous sections of Title 16 to align Board regulations with current statutory language and enforcement practices. It clarifies that "licensee" applies to both psychologists and psychological associates, replaces gender specific terms with gender neutral language, and modernizes procedures for petitions, probation modifications, and probation termination to better reflect how the Board currently processes enforcement matters.

The Board approved the proposed regulatory text in February 2023, and in November 2025 staff reconvened to determine next steps. During that meeting, staff directed the Enforcement Unit to re review the previously approved text to identify whether updates are needed before the package continues through the formal rulemaking process. If revisions are warranted, staff will amend the text and return it to the Board for further review.

Title 16 16 CCR sections 1380.6, 1393, 1396, 1396.1, 1396.2, 1396.4, 1396.5, 1397, 1397.1, 1397.2, 1397.35, 1397.37, 1397.39, 1397.50, 1397.51, 1397.52, 1397.53, 1397.54, 1397.55 - Enforcement Provisions

Status: This regulatory package is in the Drafting Phase. This phase includes drafting proposed regulatory text and collaborative reviews by board staff, budget staff, and regulatory counsel. Board staff is drafting proposed regulatory text.

This regulatory package does the following: This regulatory package updates numerous sections of Title 16 to align Board regulations with current statutory language and enforcement practices. It clarifies that "licensee" applies to both psychologists and psychological associates, replaces gender specific terms with gender neutral language, and modernizes procedures for petitions, probation modifications, and probation termination to better reflect how the Board currently processes enforcement matters.

The Board approved the proposed regulatory text in February 2023, and in November 2025 staff reconvened to determine next steps. During that meeting, staff directed the Enforcement Unit to re review the previously approved text to identify whether updates are needed before the package continues through the formal rulemaking process. If revisions are warranted, staff will amend the text and return it to the Board for further review.



Active Board Positions

AB 1979 (Bonta) Health care services: artificial intelligence

This bill would require specified health facilities, including physician's offices, to ensure that no clinical decision is based solely on the output of a clinical decision support system, as defined. These facilities would be prohibited from using artificial intelligence (AI) to guide or supervise unlicensed personnel in performing any function that requires a professional license. Licensing boards may pursue an injunction or restraining order for practicing health care without a license.

Board Position: Support if Amended

To view the text of the bill, click below:

[AB-1979 Health care services: artificial intelligence](#)

AB 2164 (Bauer-Kahan) Legally protected activities

This bill expands California's protections for individuals engaged in legally protected health care activities, including reproductive and gender-affirming care. It extends existing safeguards to individuals who provided or supported these services while in another jurisdiction, so long as the conduct was lawful in that jurisdiction and would be protected in California. The bill also limits the circumstances under which the governor may authorize extradition related to such activities and prohibits recognition of certain out-of-state criminal liability tied to legally protected health care services.

Board Position: Support

To view the text of the bill, click below:

[AB-2164 Legally protected activities](#)

AB 2575 (Ortega) Health care services: artificial

intelligence

This bill establishes new requirements governing the use of AI and clinical decision support tools in patient care. It requires health facilities and providers to disclose detailed information about AI tools, including their development, limitations, and potential biases, and affirms that health care workers may override AI-generated output based on their professional judgment. The bill also prohibits employers from limiting clinical judgment or retaliating against workers for overriding or relying on AI tools and clarifies that developers and users of AI cannot avoid liability by attributing harm to a provider's failure to override the technology.

Board Position: Support if Amended

To view the text of the bill, click below:

[AB-2575 Health care services: artificial intelligence](#)

SB 903 (Padilla) Mental health professionals: AI

This bill establish new statutes to regulate how AI may be used in therapy and psychotherapy services. The bill is intended to protect consumers by prohibiting unlicensed individuals or entities from offering therapy or psychotherapy services through artificial intelligence. For licensed professionals, the bill would require clear patient consent when AI is used to support recorded or transcribed therapy sessions and would ensure that AI does not make independent therapeutic decisions or replace professional clinical judgment. The bill also authorizes the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to investigate violations and impose civil penalties.

Board Position: Support

To view the text of the bill, click below:

[SB-903 Mental health professionals: artificial intelligence](#)

(continued on page 19)





(continued from page 18)

SB 934 (Wiener) Sexual orientation or gender identity change efforts: actions for recovery of damages; statute of limitations

This bill expresses the Legislature's intent to enact legislation that would provide individuals harmed by sexual orientation or gender identity change efforts performed by licensed mental health providers with additional time to seek civil remedies for those harms. Under existing law, engaging in sexual orientation change efforts with a patient under 18 years of age is considered unprofessional conduct and subject to disciplinary action by the provider's licensing board.

Board Position: Support

To view the text of the bill, click below:

[SB-934 Sexual orientation or gender identity change efforts: actions for recovery of damages; statute of limitations](#)

SB 1391 (Wahab) DCA: retired category licenses

This bill requires boards, bureaus, and commissions within DCA that offer a retired category of licensure to disclose that information on their internet websites. While existing law authorizes boards to establish retired license categories by regulation, this bill adds a transparency requirement to ensure that information about such licensure options is publicly accessible.

Board Position: Support. On August 14, 2026, this bill failed to meet the deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(14.)

To view the text of this bill, click below:

[SB-1391 Department of Consumer Affairs: retired category licenses](#)



Board Members

Lea Tate, Psy.D. (President)

Shacunda Rodgers, Ph.D. (Vice President)

Sheryll Casuga, Psy.D., CMPC

Seyron Foo

Mary Harb Sheets, Ph.D.

Julie Nystrom

Ana Rescate

2026 Meeting Calendar

BOARD MEETINGS

November 12-13

OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATIONS

October 9

Have an idea for an article?

Email us at bopmail@dca.ca.gov

