

1 **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

2
3 Department of Consumer Affairs
4 1625 N. Market Blvd., Third Floor, Trinity Room
5 Sacramento, CA 95834

6
7 **TELECONFERENCE LOCATIONS**

8
9 8920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 334
10 Beverly Hills, CA 90211

11
12 Los Angeles Harbor College
13 1111 Figueroa Place, Suite NEA147
14 Wilmington, CA 90744

15
16 Ronald Reagan State Building
17 300 South Spring Street, Auditorium
18 Los Angeles, CA 90013

19
20
21 **Friday, April 21, 2017**

22
23 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session teleconference
24 meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to
25 all interested parties.

26
27 **Members Present:**

28 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President
29 Nicole J. Jones, Vice-President
30 Alita Bernal
31 Jacqueline Horn, PhD
32 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo
33 Michael Erickson, PhD

34
35 **Others Present:**

36 Antonette Sorricks, Executive Officer
37 Jeff Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
38 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
39 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager
40 Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator
41 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Unit Manager
42 Natasha Lim, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator
43 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel
44 Dr. Jo Linder-Crow - Chief Executive Officer – California Psychological Association
45 Dr. Alpa A. Bajaj - Program Chair of Graduate Studies - School of Behavioral Sciences,
46 California Southern University

47 Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman – Director of Professional Affairs - California Psychological
48 Association
49 Dr. Parul Patel - Director of Clinical Training, California Southern University
50 Dr. Melodie Schaefer – Division II of the California Psychological Association and the
51 California Psychology Internship Council.
52 Amanda Levy - Director, Government Affairs, California Psychological Association
53
54

55 **Agenda Item #2: President’s Welcome**

56
57 Dr. Phillips welcomed those in attendance and read the Board’s mission statement.
58

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

60
61 There were no public comments.
62

63 **Agenda Item #4: Policy and Advocacy Committee Report and Consideration of**
64 **Committee Recommendations on Board Positions**

65
66 **a) Legislative Update**

67
68 **1) Omnibus Proposal – Amendments to Business and Professions Code Section**
69 **2987 (Fee Schedule)**
70

71 Ms. Burns discussed the Board’s pending Omnibus proposal. She reported that since
72 the submission of the proposal, additional changes were deemed necessary. The
73 updated change to the psychological assistant fee, removes language that specifies that
74 the supervisor pays the fee, and will now not specify who can pay the fee, therefore
75 allowing the fee to be paid by anyone.
76

77 Regarding the Board’s current delinquent fee, the Board has not updated this fee since
78 1978. Currently the delinquent fee for a psychologist is \$25.00 and a psychological
79 assistant is \$20.00. The Board is looking to update this language to change the
80 delinquent fee to 50 percent of the renewal fee with a maximum of \$150. This language
81 is used by most other DCA boards .
82

83 Ms. Jones asked for Board discussion regarding the fee change language. No comment
84 was received.
85

86 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the recommended changes to the
87 omnibus proposal.
88

89 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Schaefer was concerned with the verbiage in
90 2987(e). She wondered if the Board can be more explicit, to say the fee is to be paid by
91 either the supervising psychologist or the psychological assistant.
92

93 Dr. Phillips advised that the fee could also be paid by the institution.

94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140

Ms. Marks expressed that the language as written is sufficient.

Dr. Schaefer withdrew her concern.

Dr. Phillips suggested addressing the change in a newsletter article to ensure that everyone understands the changes to the process.

Ms. Marks suggested to take out the word “total” in subsection (h).

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

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

Ms. Jones advised AB 89 (Levine) is now in the Senate. Ms. Burns stated that since the Board’s last meeting, AB 89 went through the Assembly as follows: AB 89 passed out of the Business and Professions Committee with a 14-1-1 vote; the Appropriations Committee with a 17-0-0 vote; and the Assembly Floor yesterday, with a 72-1-7 vote. She advised that no additional amendments have been introduced at this time, and that staff would be meeting with the opposition to AB 89 (Levine) shortly.

Ms. Jones thanked Ms. Burns for the update. She confirmed that no action is necessary at this time. Ms. Jones shared that during the Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting, she and Dr. Erickson talked about writing a joint newsletter article discussing AB 89 (Levine).

Dr. Horn wanted to remind people who will be at the opposition meeting, the reasons why we are sponsoring AB 89 (Levine). She stated that it is not because there are gaps in training. She believes we have demonstrated that a majority of psychology trainees sometime in their training get exposure to suicide assessment and intervention. As suicide is a big problem in California, the Board wants to take a leadership role and highlight this issue, and make sure all of our licensees get exposure to this training and education. The Board did not specify in the language that this change would mandate additional coursework because they wanted to allow previous coursework and applied experience to count. That is the message that she wants to make sure we are taking to the meeting. That message better reflects the Licensing Committee’s thinking, not that there are gaps in the training.

Ms. Jones stated the Policy and Advocacy Committee advised that even though there is no intent language in the bill, she wanted to point out that our advocacy information has relayed that sentiment.

Dr. Phillips stated that the real moving force behind this bill, is not due to a concern about gaps in training, but of variances in the amount of training. The Board’s survey showed a certain amount of variability, and given the crisis around suicide, the Board

141 wants to ensure that all licensees have a minimal level of exposure to training, and can
142 demonstrate this if requested.

143
144 Ms. Jones believed that sentiment was put in the advocacy materials.

145
146 Dr. Phillips also wanted to acknowledge what the Central Services Unit and Executive
147 Officer have done regarding disseminating the information and the professionalism of
148 their efforts.

149
150 Ms. Jones asked for any other Board comments. No additional comments were
151 received.

152
153 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Linder-Crow asked if first time licensees are
154 going to be required to demonstrate this for their first license renewal, and does the
155 Board plan on a 100 percent audit, or is the requirement going to be rolled into the
156 Continuing Education requirements so that only those selected for a Continuing
157 Education audit are required to demonstrate compliance.

158
159 Ms. Burns advised that all initial applicants will show compliance during the application
160 process, and current licensees will show proof upon audit (which is typically ten percent
161 of licensees).

162
163 Dr. Schaefer is concerned that this bill might send the message that psychologists are ill
164 prepared, and if that is not the intent, will the Board put forth-additional language for
165 other health care professionals, as this might help show that there is not a perceived
166 deficit.

167
168 Dr. Linder-Crow clarified that the Board is scheduled to meet with the authors office and
169 the California Psychological Association.

170
171 Dr. Schaefer reiterated her message of having the Board expand this requirement to
172 other health care professionals.

173
174 Ms. Jones thanked everyone for their comments and advised that the Board's message
175 will be included in the newsletter article. Ms. Jones confirmed Staff would keep the
176 Board apprised of any changes with AB 89 (Levine).

177
178 Ms. Sorrick stated that the bill would most likely be referred next to the Senate
179 Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee.

180
181
182 Dr. Erickson stated to Dr. Schaefer that he believes we do not see psychologists as
183 deficient and believes if this does go forward as law, that we have taken a leadership
184 role and hopefully that will spread to other professions.

185
186 Dr. Schaefer thanked Dr. Erickson and stated that she believes it will be good to bring
187 others to the table.

188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234

b) Review and Consideration of Committee Recommendations on Legislation:
1) Newly Introduced Bills – Review of Bill Analyses and Potential Action

A. Recommendations for Active Positions on bills

1. AB 244 (Cervantes) – Maternal Mental Health

A summary of the bill was read by Ms. Burns. She advised that staff recommends a “Support if Amended” position, as there is the possibility of exclusion for our licensees since the bill includes psychological services as a component of the pilot program.

Dr. Horn commented that ‘perinatal’ is only immediately before and after birth. The program in the bill would extend the possibility of care for up to one year. This language does not fit with the term ‘perinatal’. Maybe the title of the program should be changed. She stated that when people do have a mood disorder prior to pregnancy and then get pregnant many antidepressants cannot be taken as they may cause birth defects. This puts women with pre-existing conditions at risk, where psychological interventions would be much more important. She also stated that research shows that medication helps get the mood in a place that it is not so disruptive and people can actually make use of psychotherapy. She supports the intention of the bill. She stated that one of the components could be called “access to perinatal psychiatric and psychological consultation.” Also, in our analysis, she wants to caution staff about saying “a lost opportunity for licensees.” She believes the loss of important services is most important.

Ms. Jones thanked Dr. Horn for her comments. There were no other Board comments or questions.

It was M/(Erickson)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to take a “Support if Amended” position on AB 244 (Cervantes).

Ms. Jones asked for public comment:

Dr Schaefer recommended the term: perinatal and postpartum psychiatric and psychological consultation.

Dr. Horn agreed.

Dr. Erickson approved of the friendly amendment, Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo also agreed.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

2. AB 710 (Wood) – Department of Consumer Affairs: Board Meetings

235
236 Ms. Jones introduced AB 710 (Wood), and asked Mr. Leitzell to go over the bill. A
237 summary of the bill was read by Mr. Leitzell. Ms. Sorrick advised that the Board
238 currently can meet in a rural areas but does not necessarily need to be required to.
239

240 Ms. Jones pointed out that the Board does have a live webcast for all of its
241 meetings.
242

243 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked how the Board can put out advocacy information
244 explaining how those in rural areas can participate in Board meetings.
245

246 Ms. Burns advised that we can include that information on our position letter.
247

248 Dr. Horn asked if there is any way we could also offer a call in number at all
249 meetings.
250

251 Ms. Burns said that staff could look into having a call-in option available at all
252 meetings.
253

254 It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to oppose AB 710 (Wood).
255

256 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.
257

258 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.
259

260 The Board took a 10-minute break.
261

262 **3. AB 1116 (Grayson) – Peer Support and Crisis Referral Services Act** 263

264 A summary of AB 1116 (Grayson) was read by Mr. Glasspiegel.
265

266 Dr. Phillips stated that he believes this is a wonderful way to have peer support, as
267 many in this line of work do not seek psychological services. Dr. Phillips believes
268 the recent update correctly illustrates the appropriate privileged communication
269 without expanding the term psychotherapist. No other Board comments were
270 received.
271

272 Ms. Jones advised that due to the most recent amendment, the bill should now be a
273 “Watch” bill. Dr. Phillips agreed.
274

275 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.
276

277 **4. AB 1188 (Nazarian) – Health Professions Development: Loan Repayment** 278

279 A summary of AB 1188 (Nazarian) was read by Mr. Leitzell. He advised that the
280 Policy and Advocacy Committee took a “Support” position, and recommended that
281 position to the Board.

282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328

It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to support AB 1188 (Grayson).

Ms. Jones asked for Board comment. No comment received.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Schaefer is concerned that money collected from psychologists will be supporting LPCC interns and other license types.

Ms. Burns clarified that funds collected by each license type go towards loan repayment grants for the same license type.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

5. SB 572 (Stone) - Healing Arts Licensees: Violations: Grace Period

A summary of SB 572 (Stone) was read by Mr. Glasspiegel. Ms. Monterrubio advised that there are multiple situations where we cite people for infractions which, it could be argued, do not cause irreparable harm.

Ms. Marks added that the Board has prosecutorial discretion on any infraction.

Dr. Phillips sees where this may be beneficial, but not for the Board of Psychology.

It was M/(Phillips)/S(Erickson)/C to oppose SB 572 (Stone)

Ms. Jones asked for Board comment. No other board comment received.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Winkelman had a question regarding the Board's current Continuing Education citation and fine practices.

Ms. Burns advised of current practices. Dr. Winkelman thinks that this could arguably make sense for psychologists.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

6. SB 798 (Hill) – Healing Arts: Boards (Research Psychoanalysts Registration Program)

A summary of the SB 798 (Hill) was read by Ms. Burns. She advised of the current staff concerns. The bill has no delayed implementation language for this new licensure population. Board staff would like a one-year extension for implementation of this population. Staff are also concerned that the bill does not have language to allow rulemaking authority to transfer from the Medical Board to the Board of Psychology. Additionally, staff would like a clarifying amendment to have any funds from the registration program go the Psychology Fund.

329 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked if a year is enough time. Ms. Burns went into additional
330 details regarding breakdown of the anticipated implementation timeline.

331
332 Dr. Erickson asked about a history of discipline for research psychoanalysts. Ms.
333 Burns advised there is was one case of discipline reported in the prior year; but
334 clarified that staff have not met with the Medical Board staff yet.

335
336 Dr. Horn asked how many of the research psychoanalysts are licensed in other
337 states.

338
339 Dr. Phillips advised most are not licensed elsewhere. The challenge is that many of
340 these folks may not have any grounding in psychopharmacology. Additionally, there
341 may be no ethics code applied to the group of registrants. He believes there has not
342 been a lot of scrutiny of the group, and it is not unusual for more than one third of
343 their time to be spent in clinical practice. He believes many are highly trained, and
344 frequently publish their research. They are highly respected but there may be holes
345 in their regulations. He expressed agreement that this population be under the
346 auspices of a mental health board.

347
348 Ms. Marks advised section 2930 of the Business and Professions Code (BPC)
349 might be sufficient to cover the regulatory authority for adding the additional section
350 within the chapter. From her review of the language, she is not sure how to revoke
351 an exemption or issue a registration exemption. Additionally section 92 of the bill
352 references section 2950 of the BPC for unprofessional conduct, which lists section
353 726 of the BPC and the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, and section
354 2951 of the BPC, but also might need to reference section 2953 of the BPC. She
355 also questions whether a revocation can be stayed.

356
357 Dr. Erickson commented that it sounds like we want a year before we take the
358 group under our jurisdiction. He questioned if we would use existing regulations
359 they have to administer the program until we promulgate our own. He also asked if
360 this population would fall under the same disciplinary guidelines as psychologists.
361 Dr. Erickson also agreed with Dr. Phillips on the level of respect for these found in
362 the profession.

363
364 Dr. Horn believes the Board might want to start the ad-hoc committee within the first
365 year.

366
367 Ms. Sorrick explained a committee could be created similar to how the ABA
368 Taskforce was created.

369
370 Ms. Jones would like to have staff illustrate the anticipated timeline.

371
372 Ms. Burns advised staff recommends a "Support if Amended" position on SB 798
373 (Hill), with requests to add in a delayed implementation, the transfer of rulemaking
374 authority, and a clarifying amendment of a transfer of funds.

375

376 Ms. Sorrick said that staff can bring more information back to the June Board
377 meeting.
378
379 Dr. Erickson asked who will create the new committee.
380
381 Ms. Sorrick believes Dr. Phillips would nominate those for the committee, which
382 would include one person from the registered population and one Board Member.
383
384 Ms. Burns believes it would be good to bring these questions back to the June
385 meeting.
386
387 Ms. Jones stated that she believes this should be larger than a two-person
388 committee or, at a minimum, post all meetings and have teleconference availability
389 if it is not a three-person committee.
390
391 It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson)/C to take a "Support if Amended position on SB 798
392 (Hill) with staff's requested amendments.
393
394 Ms. Jones asked for public comments. None received.
395
396 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.
397
398 Ms. Marks requested that the Board delegate the authority to express the positions
399 taken at the meeting to the author.
400
401 It was M/(Erickson)/S(Horn)/C to delegate the authority. Ms. Jones asked for Board
402 and public comment. No public or Board comment received
403
404 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.
405
406 **B. Recommendations for Board to Watch Bills**
407
408 Ms. Jones gave an overview of the Board's reason for watching bills and spot bills,
409 and advised that the Policy and Advocacy Committee thinks the Board should
410 continue to watch the attached bills in case additional action becomes necessary.
411
412 Ms. Jones asked the Board if any members have concerns regarding any of the
413 watch bills.
414
415 Dr. Horn stated that she had concerns regarding item #41 ACR 8 (Jones-Sawyer).
416 She was unsure of the purpose of this resolution. She was aware that if signed, it
417 would not become a new diagnostic code. She was wondering if the purpose of this
418 resolution would be to name post-traumatic street disorder as a problem.
419
420 Ms. Jones indicated that they talked about this in the Policy and Advocacy
421 Committee.
422

423 Ms. Burns advised that this is not a bill that would be codified in statute. The
424 purpose of a resolution is to bring an issue to light. She does want staff to connect
425 with the author's office to get more information.

426
427 Ms. Levy indicated that the California Psychological Association is aware of this
428 resolution and has taken an Oppose position. She does not think the bill will move
429 out of the Health Committee. She advised that this resolution is due to episode of a
430 TV show, "Vice", where the term was used.

431
432 Dr. Linder-Crow advised that this is not how new diagnoses are established and it is
433 not appropriate for the legislature to attempt to create a new diagnosis through a
434 resolution.

435
436 No additional Board comment was received regarding any of the watch bills.

437

438 **C. Recommendations for Board to Watch Spot Bills**

439

440 This agenda item was covered in the explanation for "B. Recommendations for
441 Watch Bills" above.

442

443 **c) Update Regarding the California Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act** 444 **(CANRA) and Mandated Reporting – Penal Code Sections 261.5, 288, and** 445 **11165.1.**

446

447 Mr. Glasspiegel reviewed updates to CANRA.

448

449 Dr. Erickson asked for additional background regarding the decision that was
450 affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

451

452 Discussion ensued regarding the different aspects of the legal decision and its
453 current location with the California State Supreme Court.

454

455 Dr. Schaefer asked what current licensees are supposed to do.

456

457 Ms. Marks clarified that the Board does not enforce CANRA, as that is a violation of
458 the Penal Code. The Board may, however, take action against a licensee due to a
459 conviction based on a violation of the Penal Code.

460

461 Ms. Sorrick confirmed that we have not received complaints regarding violations of
462 failure to report a mandatory report based on the Board's concerns with CANRA.

463

464 Dr. Winkelman said that she appreciates Ms. Mark's comments. She believes
465 receiving the opinion of the Attorney General will be helpful even if it is delayed.

466

467 Dr. Phillips advised he is as frustrated as the rest of the licensees regarding lack of
468 clarification around CANRA.

469

470 Dr. Schaefer stated that she is more than a bit concerned with the pending
471 clarification as she is aware that a psychologist can be penalized for not reporting
472 an act as required by CANRA. She also stated that she believes the right course
473 should be to report an act to the Department of Children and Family Services and
474 they will determine if action needs to be taken to protect the child.
475

476 Discussion ensued regarding what the Board should or can do regarding providing
477 any type of guidance to licensees, and what information could be provided.
478

479 **D. Regulatory Update**

480 **1) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10,**
481 **1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants**

482 **2) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1387(b)(10)(11) and 1387.1 – Verification of**
483 **Experience and Supervision Agreement Forms**
484

485 Mr. Glasspiegel provided an update of the pending regulatory packages the Board
486 is working on. He advised that the psychological assistant regulatory package is to
487 be submitted to the Board’s legal counsel for review by end of the day today or by
488 Monday. Additionally, the Verification of Experience regulatory package was
489 returned from the Department today and is ready to go to the Office of
490 Administrative Law, which should be done Monday.
491

492 Dr. Linder-Crow asked whether a psychological assistant must be a W-2 employee.
493

494 Ms. Sorrick reminded the Board that the determination regarding W-2 and
495 independent contractor status is not determined by the Board.
496

497 Dr. Linder-Crow thinks information needs to go out to psychologists to clarify that if
498 someone hires a psychological assistant, they must be hired as an employee rather
499 than 1099 contractor.
500

501 Ms. Cheung advised that any information provided by the Board was by courtesy
502 and provided by the Franchise Tax Board. Any questions regarding whether a
503 psychologist needs to hire a psychological assistant as an employee, should be
504 directed to the Franchise Tax Board.
505

506 **Agenda Item #5: Review and Approve Possible Input to ASPPB on Draft** 507 **Documents**

508 **a) Draft Regulations**

509 **b) Draft Model Act**

510 **c) Draft Code of Ethics**
511

512
513
514
515

516 Ms. Sorrick provided an overview of this agenda item. She stated that staff had met
517 and had no concerns with the draft documents. Her recommendation was to have
518 the Board provide feedback that we appreciated the opportunity to comment to
519 ASPPB, but had no further input.

520
521 It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Bernal) to accept the staff recommendation to
522 provide the requested to ASPPB.

523
524 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

525
526 **Agenda Item #6: Licensing Committee Report and Consideration and Possible**
527 **Approval of Committee Recommendations**

528
529 **a) Consider and Possible Approval of Licensing Committee Recommendation**
530 **Regarding Requests for Extension to the 72-Month Registration Period for**
531 **Registered Psychological Assistants Pursuant to Section 1391.1(b) of the**
532 **California Code of Regulations**

533
534 **1) Psychological Assistant #1 – Request for a Two-Year Extension to the 72-**
535 **month registration period**

536
537 Ms. Cheung reported on results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session
538 discussion regarding psychological assistant #1.

539
540 Dr. Horn provided more details on the cases. She advised that psychological
541 assistant #1 wanted to keep practicing past the 6-year limit but has not been able to
542 pass the national examination.

543
544 Dr. Erickson advised the 6-year limit was created long after this person had begun
545 practicing.

546
547 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo confirmed with Dr. Horn that the registrant has been unable to
548 pass the examination.

549
550 It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson) to approve the Licensing Committee’s recommendation
551 to deny the extension request.

552
553 Vote: 4 Aye (Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-2 (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal)

554
555 **2) Psychological Assistant #2 – Request for a Three-year-and-five month**
556 **Extension to the 72-month registration period**

557
558 Ms. Cheung reported on the results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session
559 discussion regarding psychological assistant #2.

560
561 There were no questions by the Board.

562

563 It was M/(Jones)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the Licensing Committee
564 recommendation to grant the request.

565
566 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
567

568 **b) Consider and Possible Approval of Licensing Committee Recommendation**
569 **Regarding Supervision Agreement Plans for Supervised Professional**
570 **Experience in Non-Mental Health Services Pursuant to Section 1387.3 of**
571 **the California Code of Regulations**
572

573 Ms. Cheung reported on the results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session
574 discussion regarding psychological assistant #3.

575
576 The Board had no questions.

577
578 It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to accept the recommendation of the
579 Committee to approve the non-mental health supervision agreement plan.

580
581 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
582

583 **Agenda Item #7: Review and Approve Possible Input to Judicial Council on**
584 **Competence to Stand Trial Draft Guidelines**
585

586 Ms. Monterrubio presented the information on the Draft Guidelines and the nine
587 points.

588
589 Dr. Horn asked a question about point #5 which discusses treatment with
590 antipsychotic medications and whether that is medically appropriate; if
591 psychologists do the evaluation, is this outside of a psychologist's scope of
592 practice?
593

594 Dr. Phillips stated that psychologists could opine on whether someone is competent
595 to make a determination, but we might want to say that these guidelines are
596 primarily aimed at psychiatrists.
597

598 Dr. Horn stated psychologists could comment on items inside their scope of
599 practice, but not point #5.
600

601 Dr. Linder-Crow stated she has never seen these guidelines before, but has a
602 number of forensic psychologists that work in this field.
603

604 Ms. Sorrick advised the stakeholder meeting was an outgrowth of a bill last year
605 that mandated this stakeholder meeting occur and get input.

606 Dr. Winkelman agreed that point #5 would be problematic for psychologists.
607

608 Dr. Phillips commented that the scope of practice is worth following-up on.
609

610 It was M/(Jones)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo) to accept staff's report and recommendations
611 with additional comments on item 5 about scope of practice.

612
613 No public comments received.

614
615 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

616
617 **Agenda Item #8: Legislative Items for Future Meeting.**

618
619 None Provided

620
621 **Agenda Item #9: Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**

622
623 None Provided

624
625 **Agenda Item #10: President's Report**

626
627 **a) 2017 Meeting Calendar and Locations**

628 **b) Committee Updates**

629
630 Ms. Burns advised that the Board may need an August teleconference meeting for
631 legislative purposes, and will inform the members of this as the year progresses.

632
633 Dr. Linder-Crow asked about the June Board meeting location. She was provided with
634 the information for the Sheraton Ontario Airport.

635
636 Ms. Sorrick thanked the Central Services Unit for preparing the Board packets and the
637 legislative materials, and Dr. Phillips for his testimony at the Assembly Committee on
638 Business and Professions.

639
640 **Agenda Item #11: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board**
641 **Meetings.**

642
643 Ms. Jones confirmed the custody issue raised at the February meeting was going to be
644 agendized for next meeting

645
646 Dr. Phillips confirmed it would be included.

647
648 **Agenda Item #12: Closed Session**


649
650 The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section
651 11126(c)(3) to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including Petitions for Reconsideration,
652 Stipulations, and Proposed Decisions.

653
654 **ADJOURNMENT**

655 The Board returned to open session but was unable to establish a quorum due to
656 technical challenges and adjourned at 3:02 pm.

657
658
659
660
661


President


Date