


MEMORANDUM

DATE	May 30, 2017
TO	Board of Psychology
FROM	 Jason Glasspiegel Central Services Coordinator
SUBJECT	Agenda Item #5 – Approval of Minutes: April 21, 2017

Background:

Attached is the draft minutes for the April 21, 2017 Board Meeting.

Action Requested:

Motion to approve the Minutes.

Attachment A: Draft minutes of the April 21, 2017, Board Meeting.

1 **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

2
3 Department of Consumer Affairs
4 1625 N. Market Blvd., Third Floor, Trinity Room
5 Sacramento, CA 95834
6 (916) 574-7720
7

8 **TELECONFERENCE LOCATIONS**

9
10 8920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 334
11 Beverly Hills, CA 90211
12 (310) 275-4194
13

14 Los Angeles Harbor College
15 1111 Figueroa Place, Suite NEA147
16 Wilmington, CA 90744
17 (310) 223-4069
18

19 Ronald Reagan State Building
20 300 South Spring Street, Auditorium
21 Los Angeles, CA 90013
22 (213) 897-2241
23

24
25 **Friday, April 21, 2017**

26
27 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session teleconference
28 meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to
29 all interested parties.
30

31 **Members Present:**

32 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President
33 Nicole J. Jones, Vice-President
34 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo
35 Alita Bernal
36 Michael Erickson, PhD
37 Jacqueline Horn, PhD
38

39 **Others Present:**

40 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer
41 Jeff Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
42 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
43 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager
44 Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator
45 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Unit Manager
46 Natasha Lim, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator

47 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel
48 Dr. Jo Linder-Crow - Chief Executive Officer – California Psychological Association
49 Dr. Alpa A. Bajaj - Program Chair of Graduate Studies - School of Behavioral Sciences,
50 California Southern University
51 Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman – Director of Professional Affairs - California Psychological
52 Association
53 Dr. Parul Patel - Director of Clinical Training, California Southern University
54 Dr. Melodie Schaeffer – Division II of the California Psychological Association and the
55 California Psychology Internship Council.
56 Amanda Levy - Director, Government Affairs, California Psychological Association
57
58

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

60
61 Dr. Phillips welcomed those in attendance and read the Board’s mission statement.
62

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

64
65 There were no public comments.
66

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

69
70 **a) Legislative Update**

71
72 **1) Omnibus Proposal – Amendments to Business and Professions Code Section**
73 **2987 (Fee Schedule)**
74

75 Ms. Burns discussed the Board’s pending Omnibus proposal. She reported that since
76 the submission of the proposal, additional changes were deemed necessary. The
77 updated change to the psychological assistant fee, removes language that specifies that
78 the supervisor pays the fee, and will now not specify who can pay the fee, therefore
79 allowing the fee to be paid by anyone.
80

81 Regarding the Board’s current delinquent fee, the Board has not updated this fee since
82 1978. Currently the delinquent fee for a psychologist is \$25.00 and a psychological
83 assistant is \$20.00. The Board is looking to update this language to change the
84 delinquent fee to 50 percent of the renewal fee with a maximum of \$150. This language
85 is used by most other DCA boards .
86

87 Ms. Jones asked for Board discussion regarding the fee change language. No comment
88 was received.
89

90 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the recommended changes to omnibus
91 proposal.
92

93 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Schaefer is concerned with the verbiage in
94 2987(e). She is wondering if the Board can be more explicit, to say the fee is to be paid
95 by the supervising psychologist or the psychological assistant.

96
97 Dr. Phillips advised that the fee could also be paid by the institution.

98
99 Ms. Marks expressed that the language as written is sufficient.

100
101 Dr. Schaeffer withdrew her concern.

102
103 Dr. Phillips suggested addressing the change in a newsletter article to ensure that
104 everyone understands the changes to the process.

105
106 Ms. Marks suggests in subsection (h) to take out the word “total.”

107
108 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

109
110 **2) AB 89 (Levine) - Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention Coursework**
111 **Requirements – Addition of Section to the BPC (Coursework in Suicide Risk**
112 **Assessment and Intervention)**

113
114 Ms. Jones advised AB 89 (Levine) is now in the Senate. Ms. Burns stated since the
115 Board’s last meeting, AB 89 went through Assembly as follows: AB 89 passed out of the
116 Business and Professions Committee with a 14-1-1 vote; the Appropriations Committee
117 with a 17-0-0 vote; and the Assembly Floor yesterday, with a 72-1-7 vote. She advised
118 no additional amendments have been introduced at this time, and staff would be
119 meeting with the opposition to AB 89 (Levine) shortly.

120
121 Ms. Jones thanked Ms. Burns for the update. She confirmed no action is necessary at
122 this time. Ms. Jones shared that during the Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting,
123 she and Dr. Erickson talked about writing a joint newsletter article discussing AB 89
124 (Levine).

125
126 Dr. Horn hoped to remind people who will be at the opposition meeting, the reasons
127 why we are sponsoring AB 89 (Levine). She stated it is not because there are gaps in
128 training. She believes we have demonstrated that a majority of psychology trainees
129 sometime in their training get exposure to suicide assessment and intervention. As
130 suicide is a big problem in California, the Board wants to take a leadership role and
131 highlight this issue, and make sure all of our licensees get exposure to this training and
132 education. The Board did not specify in the language that this change would mandate
133 additional coursework because they wanted to allow previous coursework and applied
134 experience to count. That is the message that she wants to make sure we are taking to
135 the meeting. That message better reflects the Licensing Committee’s thinking, not that
136 there are gaps in the training.

137

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

141
142 Dr. Phillips stated the real moving force behind this bill, is not due to a concern about
143 gaps in training, but of variances in the amount. The Board's survey showed a certain
144 amount of variability, and given the crisis around suicide, the Board wants to ensure that
145 all licensees have a minimal level of exposure to training, and can demonstrate this if
146 requested.

147
148 Ms. Jones believes that sentiment was put in the advocacy materials.

149
150 Dr. Phillips also wants to acknowledge what the Central Services Unit and Executive
151 Officer have done regarding disseminating the information and the professionalism of
152 their efforts.

153
154 Ms. Jones asked for any other Board comments. No additional comments received.

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

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

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

170
171 Dr. Linder-Crow clarified the Board is not meeting with the public who might oppose the
172 bill. There is a meeting scheduled with the authors office, the California Psychological
173 Association, and the Board.

174
175 Dr. Schaeffer reiterated her message of having the Board expand this requirement to
176 other health care professionals.

177
178 Ms. Jones thanked everyone for their comments and advised that the Board's message
179 will be included in the newsletter article. Ms. Jones confirmed Staff would keep the
180 Board apprised of any changes with AB 89 (Levine).

181
182 Ms. Sorrick stated that the bill would most likely be referred next to the Senate
183 Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee.

184

185
186 Dr. Erickson stated to Dr. Schaeffer that he believes we do not see psychologists as
187 deficient and believes if this does go forward as law that we have taken a leadership
188 role and hopefully that will spread to other professions.

189
190 Dr. Schaeffer thanked Dr. Erickson and believes it will be good to bring others to the
191 table.

192
193 **b) Review and Consideration of Committee Recommendations on**
194 **Legislation:**

195 **1) Newly Introduced Bills – Review of Bill Analyses and Potential Action**

196
197 **A. Recommendations for Active Positions on bills**

198
199 **1. AB 244 (Cervantes) – Maternal Mental Health**

200
201 A summary of the bill was read by Ms. Burns. She advised that staff recommend a
202 support if amended position, as there is the possibility of exclusion for our licensees
203 as the bill includes psychological services as a component of the pilot program.

204
205 Dr. Horn commented that perinatal is only immediately before and after birth. The
206 program in the bill would extend the possibility of care for up to one year. This
207 language does not fit with the term perinatal. Maybe the title of the program should
208 be changed. She stated when people do have a mood disorder prior to pregnancy
209 and then get pregnant many antidepressants cannot be taken as they may cause
210 birth defects. This puts women with pre-existing conditions at risk, where
211 psychological interventions would be much more important. She also stated that
212 research shows that medication helps get the mood in a good enough place, so it is
213 not so disruptive that people can actually make use of psychotherapy. She supports
214 the intention of the bill. She stated one of the components could be called access to
215 perinatal psychiatric and psychological consultation. Also, in our analysis, she wants
216 to caution staff in saying a lost opportunity for licensees. She believes the loss of
217 important services is most important.

218
219 Ms. Jones thanked Dr. Horn for her comments. There were no other Board
220 comments or questions.

221
222 It was M/(Erickson)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to take a support if amended position on
223 AB 244 (Cervantes).

224
225 Ms. Jones asked for public comment:

226
227 Dr Schaeffer recommended the term: perinatal and postpartum psychiatric and
228 psychological consultation.

229
230 Dr. Horn agreed.

231

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

234
235 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
236

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

238
239 Ms. Jones introduced AB 710 (Wood), and asked Mr. Leitzell to go over the bill. A
240 summary of the bill was read by Mr. Leitzell. Ms. Sorrick advised that the Board
241 currently can meet in a rural areas but does not necessarily need to be required to.
242

243 Ms. Jones pointed out that the Board does have a live webcast for all of their
244 meetings.
245

246 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked how the Board can put out advocacy information
247 explaining how those in rural areas can participate in Board meetings.
248

249 Ms. Burns advised we can include that information on our position letter.
250

251 Dr. Horn asked if there is any way we could also offer a call in number at all
252 meetings.
253

254 Ms. Burns said that staff could look into having a call-in option available at all
255 meetings.
256

257 It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to oppose AB 710 (Wood).
258

259 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.
260

261 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.
262

263 The Board took a 10-minute break.
264

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

266 A summary of AB 1116 (Grayson) was read by Mr. Glasspiegel.
268

269 Dr. Phillips stated that he believes this is a wonderful way to have peer support, as
270 many in this line of work do not seek psychological services. Dr. Phillips believes
271 the recent update correctly illustrates the appropriate privileged communication
272 without expanding the term psychotherapist. No other Board comments were
273 received.
274

275 Ms. Jones advised that due to the most recent amendment, the bill should now be a
276 watch bill. Dr. Phillips agreed.
277

278 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.

279
280
281
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

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

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

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 there are multiple situations where we cite people for infractions, which 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. WinkelmanWinkelman had a question regarding the Board’s current Continuing Education citation and fine practices.

Ms. Burns advised of current practices. Dr. WinkelmanWinkelman 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

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

326 of this population. Staff are also concerned that the bill does not have language to
327 allow rulemaking authority to transfer from the Medical Board to the Board of
328 Psychology. Additionally, staff would like a clarifying amendment to have any funds
329 from the registration program go the Psychology Fund.

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

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

337
338 Dr. Horn asked how many of the research psychoanalysts are licensed elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

372

373 Ms. Burns advised staff recommend a support if amended position on SB 798 (Hill),
374 with requests to add in a delayed implementation, the transfer of rulemaking
375 authority, and a clarifying amendment of a transfer of funds.

376
377 Ms. Sorrick advised staff can bring more information back to the June Board
378 meeting.

379
380 Dr. Erickson asked who will create the new committee.

381
382 Ms. Sorrick believes Dr. Phillips would nominate those for the committee, which
383 would include one person from the registered population and one Board Member.

384
385 Ms. Burns believes it would be good to bring these questions back to the June
386 meeting.

387
388 Ms. Jones stated that she believes this should be larger than a two-person
389 committee or at a minimum post all meetings and have teleconference availability if
390 it is not a three-person committee.

391
392 It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson)/C to take a support if amended position on SB 798
393 (Hill) with staffs requested amendments.

394
395 Ms. Jones asked for public comments. None received.

396
397 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

398
399 Ms. Marks requests the Board delegate the authority to express the positions taken
400 at the meeting to the author.

401
402 It was M/(Erickson)/S(Horn)/C to delegate the authority. Ms. Jones asked for Board
403 and public comment. No public or board comment received

404
405 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

406
407 **B. Recommendations for Board to Watch Bills**

408
409 Ms. Jones gave an overview of the Board's reason for watching bills and spot bills,
410 and advised that the Policy and Advocacy Committee believes the board should
411 continue to watch the attached bills in case additional action becomes necessary.

412
413 Ms. Jones asked the Board if any members have concerns regarding any of the
414 watch bills.

415
416 Dr. Horn stated that she has concerns regarding item #41 ACR 8 (Jones-Sawyer).
417 She is unsure of the purpose of this resolution. She is aware that if signed, it would
418 not become a new diagnostic code. She is wondering if the purpose of this
419 resolution would be to name post traumatic street disorder as a problem.

420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464

Ms. Jones advised they talked about this in the Policy and Advocacy Committee.

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

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

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

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

C. Recommendations for Board to Watch Spot Bills

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

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

Mr. Glasspiegel reviewed updates to CANRA.

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

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

Dr. Schaeffer asked what current licensees are supposed to do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

480

481

482 **D. Regulatory Update**

483

484 **1) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10,**
485 **1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants**

486

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

489

490 Mr. Glasspiegel provided an update of the pending regulatory packages the Board
491 is working on. He advised the psychological assistant regulatory package is to be
492 submitted to the Board's legal counsel for review by end of the day today if not
493 Monday. Additionally, the Verification of Experience regulatory package was
494 returned from the Department today and is ready to go to the Office of
495 Administrative Law, which should be done Monday.

496

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

498

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

501

502 Dr. Linder-Crow thinks information needs to go out to psychologists to clarify that if
503 someone hires a psychological assistant they must be hired as an employee rather
504 than 1099 contractor.

505

506 Ms. Cheung advised any information provided by the Board was by courtesy and
507 provided by the Franchise Tax Board. Any questions regarding whether a
508 psychologist needs to hire their psychological assistant as an employee, should be
509 directed to the Franchise Tax Board.

510

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

- 513
514 **a) Draft Regulations**
515 **b) Draft Model Act**
516 **c) Draft Code of Ethics**

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

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

525
526 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

551
552 It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson) to approve the Licensing Committee's recommendation
553 to deny the extension request.

554
555 Vote: 4 Aye (Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-2 (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal)

556

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

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

562
563 There were no questions by the Board.

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

567
568 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
569

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

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

577
578 The Board had no questions.

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

582
583 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
584

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

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

590
591 Dr. Horn asked a question about point #5 which discusses treatment with
592 antipsychotic medications and whether that is medically appropriate; if
593 psychologists do the evaluation, is this outside of a psychologist's scope of practice.
594

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

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

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

604
605 Ms. Sorrick advised the stakeholder meeting was an outgrowth of a bill last year
606 that mandated this stakeholder meeting occur and get input.
607 Dr. WinkelmanWinkelman agreed that point #5 would be problematic for
608 psychologists.
609
610 Dr. Phillips commented that the scope of practice is worth following-up on.
611
612 It was M/(Jones)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo) to accept staff's report and recommendations
613 with additional comments on item 5 about scope of practice.
614
615 No public comments received.
616
617 Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0
618
619 **Agenda Item #8: Legislative Items for Future Meeting.**
620
621 None Provided
622
623 **Agenda Item #9: Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**
624
625 None Provided
626
627 **Agenda Item #10: President's Report**
628
629 **a) 2017 Meeting Calendar and Locations**
630 **b) Committee Updates**
631
632 Ms. Burns advised the Board may need an August teleconference meeting for
633 legislative purposes, and will inform the members of this as the year progresses.
634
635 Dr. Linder-Crow asked about the June Board meeting location. She was provided with
636 the information for the Sheraton Ontario Airport.
637
638 Ms. Sorrick thanked the Central Services Unit for preparing the Board packets and the
639 legislative materials, and Dr. Phillips for his testimony at the Assembly Committee on
640 Business and Professions.
641
642 **Agenda Item #11: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board**
643 **Meetings.**
644
645 Ms. Jones confirmed the custody issue raised at the February meeting was going to be
646 agendized for next meeting
647
648 Dr. Phillips confirmed would be included.
649
650 **Agenda Item #12: Closed Session**

651
652 The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section
653 11126(c)(3) to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including Petitions for Reconsideration,
654 Stipulations, and Proposed Decisions.

655
656 **ADJOURNMENT**

657 The Board returned to open session but was unable to establish a quorum and
658 adjourned at 3:02 pm.

659
660
661
662
663

President

Date