


## MEMORANDUM

<b>DATE</b>	May 31, 2017
<b>TO</b>	Board of Psychology
<b>FROM</b>	 Jeffrey Thomas Assistant Executive Officer
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Agenda Item #4 – Approval of Minutes: February 9-10, 2017

**Background:**

Attached is the draft minutes of the February 9-10, 2017 Board Meeting.

**Action Requested:**

Review and approve the minutes of the February 9-10, 2017 Board Meeting.

1 **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

2  
3 **State Capitol, Room 112**  
4 **Sacramento, CA 95814**  
5 **(916) 324-0333**  
6

7  
8 **Thursday, February 9, 2017**  
9

10 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session meeting to order at  
11 9:15 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.  
12

13 **Members Present:**

14 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President  
15 Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President  
16 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member  
17 Michael Erickson, PhD  
18 Jacqueline Horn, PhD  
19 Alita Bernal, Public Member  
20

21 **Others Present:**

22 Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer  
23 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer  
24 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager  
25 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager  
26 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager  
27 Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator  
28 Jacquelin Everhart, Continuing Education/Renewals Coordinator  
29 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel  
30

31 **Agenda Item #2: President's Welcome**  
32

33 Dr. Phillips welcomed the attendees to the Board's quarterly meeting and read the  
34 Board's mission statement. He thanked Senator Steven Glazer of the 7<sup>th</sup> district for  
35 sponsoring the Board Meeting at the State Capitol.  
36

37 **Agenda Item #3: Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda**  
38

39 Dr. Phillips explained that public comment is the opportunity for members of the public  
40 to make comments on items not on the agenda, however, he stated that the Board  
41 cannot discuss or take action on any of the comments received.  
42

43 Kathleen Russell, Executive Director of the Center for Judicial Excellence addressed  
44 the Board regarding the oversight of psychologists who are appointed by the court  
45 system to work in custody and visitation proceedings in family courts. She requested  
46 that the Board consider removing the child custody checklist since it is a roadblock to  
47 public protection as it shows a severe lack of understanding about the crisis in the

48 family court system in California. She requested that the Board perform a thorough  
49 review of the Board's ability to investigate psychologists that are involved in family court  
50 matters. She stated that children are routinely being taken from safe, nurturing parents  
51 and are forced into contact with physically, sexually, and emotionally abusive parents.  
52 She stated that psychologists are there to heal, but that there are a number of corrupt  
53 psychologists who are using junk science and putting kids in harm's way. She provided  
54 an article from the Sacramento News and Review regarding what is happening in  
55 California's family courts for the Board to consider.

56  
57 Tilahien Yilma also addressed the Board regarding the family court system in  
58 California.

59  
60 Arianna Riley stated that she was one of the children affected by the family court  
61 system and shared her experience with the Board.

62  
63 Darryl Riley, Ms. Riley's father addressed the Board and indicated they flew in from  
64 Seattle to address the Board on this issue. He stated that he has another daughter that  
65 is still in the program and has not been in contact for almost a year. He urged the Board  
66 to act on this issue.

67  
68 Catherine Campbell addressed the Board regarding the family court system and  
69 described how it has personally affected her.

70  
71 Mark Mulholland shared his experience with the family court system with the Board. He  
72 stated that there needs to be a better system in place for child custody evaluations and  
73 that the Board needs to be held accountable for this.

74  
75 Dr. Phillips requested individuals providing comment to the Board refrain from providing  
76 specific names of psychologists that they have submitted a complaint against as the  
77 Board is the final adjudicator in these matters and can only receive evidence through  
78 proper channels.

79  
80 **NO NAME GIVEN** addressed the Board on the importance of mothers having the right  
81 to protect their kids and the improper mislabeling of child abuse cases as parent  
82 alienation cases.

83  
84 Dr. Erickson stated that while the Board is touched by the testimony being given, Board  
85 Members are unable to respond to the comments being made since this item is not on  
86 the agenda. However, he clarified that if the item is placed on a future agenda, he would  
87 hope that the same individuals would return to talk about this issue.

88  
89 Rebeca Tripp addressed the Board regarding the family court system and her personal  
90 experience in this regard.

91

92 Dr. Horn stated that it would be helpful to know what these issues are specifically  
93 addressing and why they are being brought up now. Dr. Phillips responded by indicating  
94 that this is the public comment period and any individual wishing to address the Board  
95 can make public comment.

96  
97 Jaclyn Qirreh thanked the Board for providing the opportunity to make public comments  
98 and addressed the Board on her experience with parental alienation. She requested the  
99 Board ban the use of parental alienation in California as it takes the focus off of the  
100 children and places it instead on the parent.

101  
102 Britt Brown addressed the Board regarding the methods used to evaluate children in  
103 child custody cases.

104  
105 Connie Valentine from the California Protective Parents Association discussed the  
106 abusive practices by certain psychologists in California. She urged the Board to look  
107 into this issue.

108  
109 Jeffrey Perry shared his experience with the family court system.

110  
111 Jaimie Gay addressed the Board regarding child custody and parental alienation. She  
112 asked the Board for oversight in these issues in hopes that her experience does not  
113 happen to other families.

114  
115 Christy Ashley addressed the Board and shared her experience with the family court  
116 system.

117  
118 [REDACTED] addressed the Board and shared her experience with the family court  
119 system as well as with the Board.

120  
121 Kathleen Russell addressed the Board once again and explained that she has been in  
122 open dialogue with the Board's Enforcement Manager and that these are current issues  
123 related to the Board's child custody checklist and the procedures the Board uses in  
124 investigating and disciplining psychologists working in family courts.

125  
126 Ms. Marks indicated that based on the comments heard by the Board today, staff can  
127 present the complaint and investigation procedures for child custody evaluators at a  
128 future meeting, so the Board has a better understanding of this process.

129  
130 **Agenda Item #4: Approval of Minutes: November 17-18, 2016**

131  
132 It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo) to approve the minutes as modified.

133  
134 Vote: 6 aye (Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal, Erickson, Acquaye-Baddoo)

135  
136 **Agenda Item #5: Budget Report**

137  
138 Ms. Burns provided an update to the Board's budget and explained the budget process.  
139 She explained that the Board's budget for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 started as \$5,013,000,  
140 however, revisions and adjustments have been made, therefore, the Board's budget  
141 now stands at \$4,764,000.

142  
143 Mark Ito, DCA Budget Analyst, presented to the Board. He explained the budget reports  
144 that were provided in the Board meeting packets. He explained that DCA uses  
145 incremental budgeting which means that we use the prior year's budget act as the  
146 starting point to determine the next year's budget.

147  
148 Mr. Ito referred to the Analysis of Fund Condition report and noted that the Board's  
149 months in reserve is on a downward trend which is because the Board is currently  
150 spending more than it brought in. However, he pointed out that the Board currently has  
151 \$7,500,000 in outstanding General Fund loan repayments and that \$6,300,000 is  
152 projected to be repaid in Fiscal Year 2018/2019 which leaves an additional \$1,200,000  
153 to be repaid later. Dr. Horn asked how many months in reserve is considered healthy.  
154 Mr. Ito indicated that typically three to six months is what would trigger a General Fund  
155 loan repayment.

156  
157 Mr. Ito reported on the Board's expenditure projections. He noted that as of month six of  
158 the current fiscal year, it is projected that the Board will overspend its budget by  
159 \$15,000. However, he noted that there is budget bill language that allows health care  
160 boards to pursue a current year augmentation for the Office of the Attorney General and  
161 Office of Administrative Hearings and that staff is currently in the process of pursuing  
162 this augmentation.

163  
164 Mr. Ito explained the Psychology Fund Balance Comparison (Budgeted and Actuals),  
165 Psychology Expenditure Comparison (Budgeted vs. Actual), and Psychology Revenue  
166 Comparison (Projected vs. Actual) reports that were provided in the Board meeting  
167 packets. He also explained the difference between the discretionary and non-  
168 discretionary budget items.

169  
170 Dr. Erickson asked Mr. Ito if the Board is doing well with its budget or if he had any  
171 recommendations. Mr. Ito stated that the Board is doing a great job with its budget and  
172 that he worked with Board staff last year to realign budget items to more accurately  
173 reflect where the Board's budget is being spent.

174  
175 Dr. Phillips thanked Mr. Ito for his presentation.

176  
177 **Agenda Item #6: Enforcement Report**

178  
179 Ms. Monterrubio provided the Enforcement Report to the Board. She indicated that  
180 Curtis Gardner was recently hired as the Board's Probation Coordinator and that there  
181 are currently no vacancies in the Enforcement Unit. Since reported that since July 1,

182 2016, the Board received 657 complaints, issued 19 enforcement citations, and referred  
183 27 cases over to Office of the Attorney General for formal discipline. She also reported  
184 that enforcement staff is currently monitoring 45 probationers of which seven are out of  
185 compliance. Dr. Erickson asked what staff does with probationers that are not in  
186 compliance. Ms. Monterrubio responded by explaining that it depends on the type of  
187 violation. For minor violations such as missing a cost recovery payment or quarterly  
188 report can be addressed by the issuance of a citation, where more serious violations are  
189 referred to the Office of the Attorney General.

190  
191 Ms. Monterrubio referred to the Enforcement Performance Measures Report which was  
192 provided as a hand-carry item. She indicated that the Board opens complaints within  
193 seven days on average which is lower than the target of nine days. She indicated that  
194 the average number of days for formal discipline is 624 days with the target being 540  
195 days. She explained that this is the hardest target to meet since it involves outside  
196 factors including the investigation unit and the Office of the Attorney General. Ms.  
197 Monterrubio indicated that she is proud of the Enforcement Unit in their efforts to meet  
198 the established target dates.

199  
200 **Agenda Item #7: Press Releases on Board Enforcement Actions**

201  
202 Ms. Monterrubio stated that at the November Board Meeting, the Board received public  
203 comments regarding concerns about the Board's use of press releases. She indicated  
204 that the Board is a consumer protection agency and is committed to protecting  
205 consumers of California from harmful licensees and practices. She stated that in  
206 keeping with its statutory mandate to protect consumers of psychological services, the  
207 Board may issue press releases including but not limited to unlicensed activity, sexual  
208 misconduct, revocations, fraud and criminal arrests and convictions.

209  
210 Ms. Monterrubio indicated that the Board works with the DCA Office of Public Affairs  
211 and its Legal Affairs Division as well as the Office of the Attorney General to ensure that  
212 the information being published is accurate and informative. She stated that most press  
213 releases are issued once a case has been adjudicated, however, there are instances  
214 where a press release is issued immediately due to the egregiousness of the case such  
215 as cases involving child molestation, child abuse, elder abuse, unlicensed activity, or  
216 fraud.

217  
218 Ms. Monterrubio referred to the letter from Senator Jerry Hill to Ms. Sorricks dated  
219 February 1, 2017 that was provided as a hand-carry item. She indicated that the letter  
220 thanked the Board for its efforts in consumer protection and endorsing the posting of  
221 arrests in press releases and social media following the filing of an accusation. Dr.  
222 Phillips noted that it is fairly infrequent for the Board to issue a press release. Ms.  
223 Monterrubio stated that all press releases issued by the Board since 2014 can be  
224 viewed on the Board's website under Publications.

225  
226 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo thanked Ms. Monterrubio for her report.

227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270

**Agenda Item #8: Enforcement Mail Ballot Procedures – Discussion and Possible Change to Policy**

Ms. Monterrubio indicated that there was a discussion on this issue at the November Board Meeting and therefore, she has provided the Board with an overview of the mail ballot process as well as the Board's hold policy. She stated that for Stipulated Settlements, the Deputy Attorney General will draft a memo explaining the rationale behind the recommendation to adopt the Decision. For Proposed Decisions drafted by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the ALJ will explain the rationale for the Decision within the document itself.

Ms. Monterrubio stated that as a courtesy to the Board, staff sends a spreadsheet to each member once a week listing the names of every case that is expected to go out for vote that week. Board members are given ten days to vote to either Adopt, Hold for Discussion, or to Recuse Oneself. She explained that a minimum of five votes to adopt must be received to adopt the Decision, while a minimum of two votes to hold for discussion must be received to move the matter to the next Board meeting. She noted that a vote to reject or not adopt the proposed action or hold a decision for discussion means that the Board member either disagrees with one or more portions of the proposed action and do not want it adopted as the Board's decision or the Board Member has a question or concern about the decision and would like to discuss the matter with fellow Board members.

Ms. Monterrubio noted that if a Decision were to be non-adopted, the transcript will be ordered, and the case is referred back to Board to write its own decision. She stated that failure to obtain a quorum will also cause the matter to be non-adopted and moved to next Board meeting.

Dr. Horn thanked Ms. Monterrubio for her report. She indicated that there have been a few times that she wanted to discuss something about a Decision due to concerns, however, since she was the only one that felt it warranted a discussion, there was no way to discuss it. She indicated that she feels that a requirement for two votes to hold for discussion does not allow the Board Members to do their job and raise concerns. Although she understands that it will cause delays, she proposed changing the number of votes required to hold a matter for discussion to one.

Dr. Phillips added that he has found inaccuracies in Decisions and voted to hold the matter for discussion which did not happen since he was the only one who voted to hold it. He stated that changing it to require only one vote to hold would ensure that the Board is being mindful as to what they are signing off on, but that he also sees the advantage for the process to move quickly for consumer protection.

271 Ms. Marks clarified an earlier statement made by Ms. Monterrubio. Ms. Monterrubio had  
272 stated that a minimum of five votes to adopt must be received to adopt the Decision.  
273 Ms. Marks clarified that a minimum of five votes are required to act since five constitutes  
274 a quorum of the Board. Therefore, she indicated that if five votes were received, four of  
275 which were to adopt and one were to non-adopt, the Decision would still be adopted.  
276

277 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked what the Board would need to do if it wanted to change the  
278 requirement for holding a Decision for discussion to one vote. Ms. Monterrubio stated  
279 that this is an internal policy, therefore, the Board would need to make a motion and  
280 vote on it.  
281

282 Ms. Sorrick stated if the Board votes to change the requirement to one vote to hold for  
283 discussion, it might want to consider changing it back to two votes once all nine  
284 members have been appointed to the Board. Discussion ensued.  
285

286 It was M(Horn)/S(Jones)/C to change the Board policy that if one Board member votes  
287 to hold a Decision for discussion, then the Decision would be brought back to the next  
288 Board meeting for discussion.  
289

290 Vote: 6 aye (Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal, Erickson, Acquaye-Baddoo) 0 no  
291

### 292 **Agenda Item #9: Overview of the Legislative Process Presentation**

293

294 Ms. Burns presented an overview of the legislative process as well as the Board's and  
295 Staff's roles and responsibilities during the process. She thanked staff from the DCA  
296 Office of Legislative and Regulatory Review for their assistance in preparing the  
297 presentation.  
298

### 299 **Agenda Item #10: Executive Officer's Report**

300

#### 301 a) Organization Update

302

303 Ms. Sorrick announced that a new Probation Coordinator has been hired in the  
304 Enforcement Unit as well as a Limited Term Licensing Analyst in the Licensing Unit.  
305 She stated that as of today, the only vacancy is the Licensing/BreEZe Coordinator  
306 position in the Licensing Unit.  
307

#### 308 b) DCA Update

309

310 Ms. Sorrick referred to the information provided in the Board meeting packets.  
311

### 312 **Agenda Item #11: Strategic Plan Update**

313  
314



315 Ms. Bernal provided the Board with a Strategic Plan update. Ms. Sorrick indicated that  
316 the timeframe for four of the items listed under goal 2.1 had to be moved out since the  
317 Licensing Committee is still reviewing language to bring to the April 2017 Board  
318 meeting.

319  
320 **Agenda Item #12: Communications Plan Update**

321  
322 Ms. Sorrick reported that a draft stakeholders list was sent to the Board members by Mr.  
323 Leitzell and that it will be discussed at the next outreach meeting.

324  
325 **Agenda Item #13: Social Media Update**

326  
327 Ms. Bernal said the Board is experiencing trolls on its Twitter page. Ms. Burns explained  
328 that trolls are those who are tagging the Board in inappropriate posts that keep getting  
329 re-Tweeted. Ms. Burns stated that we have asked DCA's Office of Public Affairs to  
330 come talk to the Board about the use of social media and whether or not certain social  
331 media platforms are efficacious.

332  
333 Ms. Bernal indicated that this will be continued to be reviewed at the next Outreach and  
334 Education Committee meeting and further information will be reported back to the  
335 Board.

336  
337 **Agenda Item #14: Website Update**

338  
339 Ms. Burns provided the top five website pages that get the most views and asked if staff  
340 should provide other pages as well. She asked if it would be more beneficial for the staff  
341 to track the pages the Board finds most important. Dr. Phillips stated that feedback from  
342 Board members and staff should be solicited as to which pages are the most important.  
343 Ms. Burns indicated that staff will gather this information and add it to the agenda for the  
344 next Outreach and Education Committee meeting.

345  
346 **Agenda Item #15: Update on Newsletter**

347  
348 Ms. Bernal presented the 2016 *Fall Journal*.

349  
350 **Agenda Item #16: Outreach Activities Update**

351  
352 Ms. Bernal reported that Dr. Erickson and senior staff went to lunch with CPA on  
353 February 8, 2017 to discuss outreach, legislation, and regulation for 2017. Dr. Erickson  
354 indicated that due to circumstances, there was not much time for discussion, but that a  
355 conversation has been started.

356  
357 Ms. Sorrick stated that following the lunch with CPA, she, Dr. Erickson, Dr. Phillips, and  
358 staff made some legislative visits. She indicated that they were able to meet with  
359 Assembly Member Salas and Assembly Member Brough, as well as with staff from

360 Senator Bate's office and Senator Hill's office. She stated that the goal of the visits was  
361 to talk about what is going to be introduced in the 2017-18 legislative session as well as  
362 to provide a recap of 2016 legislation. She noted that the recap of 2016 focused on the  
363 concerns the Board had with Applied Behavior Analysis, continued concerns regarding  
364 workers' conversation, telehealth, and college mental health provision funding. She  
365 stated that there seemed to be a lot of interest in telehealth and access to care in rural  
366 areas and with veterans. Dr. Phillips also noted that they discussed the Board-  
367 sponsored legislation on suicide assessment and intervention continuing education. Dr.  
368 Erickson stated that the visits were very helpful and productive.

369  
370 Dr. Phillips thanked staff for their hard work.

371  
372

373 **Agenda Item #17: Access to Mental Healthcare in the State of California**  
374 **Campaign Update**

375

376 Ms. Bernal said this campaign has been completed and the Outreach and Education  
377 Committee will consider other campaigns at its next meeting,

378

379 Ms. Burns added that there will also be telehealth article in the upcoming newsletter that  
380 will be part of a multi-part series.

381

382

383 **Agenda Item #18: Petition for Early Termination of Probation – Gary Schummer,**  
384 **PhD**

385

386 Administrative Law Judge Marilyn Woollard presided. Deputy Attorney General John  
387 Gatschet was present and represented the People of the State of California. Gary  
388 Schummer, PhD was present and represented himself.

389

390 **Agenda Item #19: Closed Session**

391

392 The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to  
393 discuss disciplinary matters including the above petition, petitions for reconsideration,  
394 stipulations, and proposed decisions.

395

396

397 **Thursday, February 9, 2017**

398

399 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session meeting to order  
400 at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested  
401 parties.

402

403 **Members Present:**

404 Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President

405 Nicole J. Jones, Public Member, Vice-President  
406 Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo, Public Member  
407 Michael Erickson, PhD  
408 Jacqueline Horn, PhD  
409 Alita Bernal, Public Member

410

411 **Others Present:**

412 Antonette Sorricks, Executive Officer  
413 Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer  
414 Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager  
415 Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager  
416 Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Manager  
417 Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator  
418 Jacquelin Everhart, Continuing Education/Renewals Coordinator  
419 Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel

420

421 **Agenda Item #20: Legislative Update**

422

423 Ms. Jones referred to the Legislative Matrix provided in the meeting packets. She  
424 indicated that everything is currently a watch since the Policy and Advocacy Committee  
425 has not had a chance meet and review any of the bills. Ms. Burns stated that the  
426 legislative session has just started, therefore, bills are still being introduced. She  
427 indicated that some of the bills are considered intent language and do not reference any  
428 code sections at this time, however, the bills will develop over time.

429

430 **a) Legislative Proposals for the 2017 Legislative Session**

431

432

433 **1) Omnibus Proposal – Amendments to Business and Professions Code**  
434 **Sections 2290.5 (Telehealth; Patient Consent; Hospital Privileges and Approval**  
435 **of Credentials for Providers of Telehealth Services) and 2987 (Fee Schedule)**

436

437 Ms. Jones explained that omnibus proposals are ways to clean up statutory  
438 language and make non-controversial changes. Ms. Burns explained that each  
439 year, the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee  
440 (Senate BP&ED) reaches out to the boards and bureaus within DCA for any  
441 clean-up language or non-controversial changes to the Business and Professions  
442 Code which get combined into one large omnibus bill.

443

444 Ms. Burns indicated that the Board approved omnibus language at its November  
445 2016 Board meeting to allow psychological assistants to pay their own  
446 registration fees. She indicated that the proposed changes will bring section 2987  
447 into conformity with the changes made by SB 1193 (Chapter 484, Statutes of  
448 2016) which was the Board's Sunset Bill. Ms. Burns stated that the proposed  
449 language has already been submitted to the Senate BP&ED and that the

450 language will be put into a bill that will be submitted by the Committee. She  
451 indicated that a bill number has not yet been assigned, but that the Committee is  
452 working with other boards and bureaus to incorporate their changes into the bill.  
453

454 2) AB 89 (Levine) Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention Coursework  
455 Requirements – Addition of Section to the BPC (Coursework in Suicide Risk  
456 Assessment and Intervention)  
457

458 Ms. Jones introduced the discussion on Suicide Risk Assessment and  
459 Intervention Coursework Requirements and indicated that there were some  
460 hand-carry materials that have been provided. She reminded the Board that this  
461 process has been ongoing for quite some time now and that there has been a lot  
462 of activity on this issue within the last year. She indicated that at the May 2016  
463 Board meeting in Los Angeles, the Licensing Committee made two proposals to  
464 the Board, neither of which were carried. She stated that the Licensing  
465 Committee was asked to take the issue back to the Committee level and take a  
466 thorough look at the issue. Ms. Jones indicated that the Licensing Committee  
467 received public input and brought the issue back to the Board at its November  
468 2016 meeting. At that time, the Board adopted a motion to move forward with this  
469 legislation and directed staff to work with Assembly Member Levine's office to  
470 develop language for a bill. Ms. Jones stated that AB 89 has been introduced by  
471 Assembly Member Levine. She indicated that there has been a lot of discussion  
472 on this issue and that transparency has been a key value throughout the  
473 process. She stated that at this time, the Board needs to take a look at the  
474 language and determine what position it wants to take.  
475

476 Dr. Phillips acknowledged the hard work and research that former Board Member  
477 Dr. Harlem put into this issue.  
478

479 Ms. Burns provided a brief history of the Board's efforts on this issue which was  
480 explained in more detail in the Board meeting materials. She stated that at the  
481 November 2016 Board meeting, Board members expressed a desire to have the  
482 statutory language reflect the Board's intentions with proposing this legislation.  
483 The Board approved the Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention Coursework  
484 Requirement Legislative Proposal and instructed staff to move forward with the  
485 language and work with Assembly Member Levine's office, who had previously  
486 informed staff of his desire to author the bill if the proposal was approved.  
487

488 Ms. Burns stated that since the November 2016 Board meeting, staff has  
489 developed legislative intent language for the Board's consideration which was  
490 included in the Board meeting materials, and has submitted the amendments  
491 made at the November 2016 Board meeting to Assembly Member Levine's staff  
492 for inclusion in the bill text. Ms. Burns indicated that Assembly Member Levine  
493 introduced AB 89 on January 9, 2017, which includes the Suicide Assessment  
494 and Intervention Coursework Requirement text as approved by the Board.

495  
496 Ms. Burns stated that if approved, the legislative intent language would be  
497 submitted to Assembly Member Levine’s office for inclusion in AB 89. She stated  
498 that the bill will not be moved to any committee until the Board is ready for it to  
499 be. She indicated that intent language is pretty common and provides context as  
500 to why the Board is taking action. She explained that intent language does not  
501 wind up in the statutory language, but is kept as a part of the record.  
502

503 Discussion ensued. Dr. Horn and Ms. Jones made comments regarding the  
504 Request for Approval of Proposed Legislation document that was provided for  
505 the Board’s review at its November 2016 Board meeting.  
506

507 Dr. Horn raised her concern about the Board addressing other boards in its intent  
508 language. Dr. Phillips reminded the Board that in his veto message of AB 2198,  
509 the Governor asked licensing boards to look at their own requirements with  
510 regard to training in suicide assessment and to take whatever actions are  
511 needed. He stated that it is not within the Board’s purview to encourage other  
512 licensing boards to address this issue.  
513

514 Ms. Jones suggested that the Board first review the bill itself and then return to  
515 its discussion regarding the intent language. Ms. Burns summarized the changes  
516 that the Board requested that have been made to the bill language. Ms. Sorrick  
517 suggested that if the Board is okay with the language that it be on record to be  
518 the sponsor of this bill.  
519

520 Ms. Burns presented the draft intent language and explained the structure of the  
521 document. She noted that the Board of Behavioral Sciences indicated that they  
522 performed an assessment on this issue and determined that they did not need to  
523 add any additional requirements and requested to be removed from the intent  
524 language.  
525

526 Ms. Jones indicated that she appreciates staff citing the sources in the draft  
527 language and once again thanked Dr. Harlem for his work on this issue.  
528

529 Dr. Horn requested that the year that the Centers for Disease Control came up  
530 with their statistics be added in section (a)(1). Ms. Jones also requested that the  
531 year be added for each citation made in the document. Ms. Sorrick also  
532 requested that “California” be changed to “the Department of Health Care  
533 Services Suicide Prevention Program” in section (a)(3).  
534

535 Dr. Horn requested that the statistics in section (a)(2) on the percentage of  
536 people who die by suicide that have seen a mental health professional prior to  
537 their death by highlighted as she feels that information is extremely important. Dr.  
538 Phillips questioned the relevancy of the information provided in section (a)(2) and  
539 asked if it needs to be included. Discussion ensued. Ms. Bernal recommended

540 adding California data along with the national data provided in section (a)(1). Dr.  
541 Horn stated that the issue may be with how the data is ordered. Dr. Erickson  
542 asked if the Board needed to approve the intent language in order to move  
543 forward with the bill. Ms. Burns replied that the bill can be moved forward without  
544 the intent language and that it is more important for the Board to decide if it  
545 wants to be the sponsor on the bill. Dr. Phillips suggested that the Board solely  
546 look at the issue of AB 89 and that the intent language be deferred to the Policy  
547 and Advocacy Committee for further review and consideration.  
548

549 Ms. Jones stated that the Board received written comments on this issue for  
550 consideration.  
551

552 Craig Lomax commented before the Board in support of AB 89 and indicated that  
553 he appreciates the Board's objectivity and transparency throughout the process.  
554 He stated that the coursework requirement is not burdensome or inappropriate  
555 and that the Board's efforts would not be in vain and that it will save lives. He  
556 commented that the Board Members are leaders not in just psychology but in  
557 other mental health professions and that this effort is an important statement for  
558 other professionals to look at and say that all mental health professionals need  
559 some foundation in suicide prevention. Mr. Lomax stated that he is hopeful that  
560 the Board will move forward today and not risk any further delays. He stated that  
561 he appreciates that the Board kept the requirement for students intact as well as  
562 for current licensees.  
563

564 Dr. Jo Linder-Crow, Chief Executive Officer of the California Psychological  
565 Association, stated that she recognizes the Board's intention in considering  
566 sponsoring this bill as suicide is a crippling issue in this society. She stated that  
567 when the Governor vetoed AB 2198 two years ago, that bill would have required  
568 all mental health professionals, including psychologists, to complete a continuing  
569 education course in suicide assessment treatment management. In the veto  
570 message, the Governor stated that California has an extensive regulatory  
571 scheme that aims to ensure that California physicians, psychologists and  
572 counselors are skilled in the healing arts to which they have committed their lives  
573 and that rather than further regulating this field, he asked licensing boards to  
574 evaluate the issues which this bill raises and take whatever actions are needed.  
575 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that this Board did an admirable job in fulfilling his request  
576 by conducting surveys and received a healthy response. She indicated that the  
577 Board's survey demonstrated that psychology students and trainees receive this  
578 training as required by their training programs and that 97% said suicide risk  
579 assessment is required as part of their training and 92% said it is a required part  
580 of a trainee's supervised experience. Additionally, she stated that the qualitative  
581 portion of Board's survey showed that it is not one course that is offered but a  
582 continuum of training woven throughout the training program.  
583

584 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that taking a single course will not suffice, but what will  
585 save lives is greater access to mental health care in our communities and on our  
586 campuses, access to a vast array of helpful, high-quality resources developed by  
587 organizations that have a sole focus on this issue. She stated that she agrees  
588 with Mr. Lomax in that that this Board has an opportunity to provide real,  
589 meaningful leadership on this issue. She suggested making this issue an area to  
590 focus on in the Board's outreach efforts and partner with CPA to make available  
591 resources even more available to clinicians and consumers. She stated that she  
592 urges the Board to redirect its resources and energy into a different effort that  
593 might actually save lives. She indicated that CPA cannot support this bill, but are  
594 willing and eager to shed a light on this issue and do some work that can  
595 hopefully reduce the level of suicide.  
596

597 Dr. Erickson thanked Dr. Linder-Crow for her comments and noted that the  
598 research the Board did focused on students who will be completing training  
599 programs and becoming psychologists. He indicated that in practical terms that is  
600 a very low number in terms of whether the field of psychologists have adequate  
601 suicide training and the Board has not spent much time surveying its  
602 approximate 20,000 licensees to see what their level of training is which he  
603 thinks is also very important. He stated that this bill invites the licensee to take an  
604 inventory of what they know about suicide prevention and whether they are up to  
605 date and does not see that this bill as requiring one six-hour course as people  
606 can obtain this requirement in other ways. Therefore, he indicated that taking a  
607 six-hour course is not the major thrust of this legislation. He stated that he thinks  
608 that moving forward on this bill shows that it is a very important area.  
609

610 Dr. Phillips stated that although psychologists may be the some of the best-  
611 trained clinicians in suicidality issues, he thinks the Board should aspire to  
612 ensure that all psychologists are properly trained in this area. He indicated that  
613 he has spoken to over 100 psychology students many of whom who have felt  
614 that they have received inadequate training in their graduate programs and  
615 training sites. He stated that he thinks that there are vast inconsistencies and that  
616 there is enough inconsistency that the Board needs to make certain that the  
617 training is being obtained and thinks that this bill is a great compromise. He also  
618 indicated that he does not think that the Legislature is in the best position to  
619 determine what type of specialized training needs to be done by trainees and  
620 licensees and that it is better left to the Board's discretion. He stated that the  
621 Board is exercising its discretion after reviewing the information gathered and  
622 determining that this is the best approach to take. He stated that his thinking on  
623 this issue has evolved over time after hearing and reading a lot of data and he  
624 feels that this is one way to ensure that people are aware of this training. He  
625 stated that he does not think that sponsoring this bill prevents the Board from  
626 engaging in outreach efforts in this area with CPA.  
627

628 Dr. Horn stated that she agreed with virtually everything Dr. Linder-Crow said,  
629 but she does not see things as mutually exclusive. She thinks it would be a great  
630 idea for the Board to partner with CPA in an outreach campaign. She stated that  
631 her thinking on this issue has evolved as well. She indicated that she was initially  
632 opposed and her thinking changed based upon the information received over the  
633 course of the discussions of this issue. She indicated that she thinks this will  
634 always be an area where people need more training because it is a complex  
635 issue, but she also recognizes that people are getting this training along the way  
636 and this has been addressed in the language. She indicated a six-hour course is  
637 not required; therefore, this bill is much different from the bill that was vetoed in  
638 2014. She acknowledged that psychologists are well trained but she wants to  
639 ensure that everyone is assessing if they have the skills and the knowledge in  
640 this area.

641  
642 Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo stated that the Board has evolved in its thinking given the  
643 additional information that has been provided over time. She stated that the  
644 Board is willing to take all information that it has been given and drill down to  
645 ensure that this bill will benefit everyone.

646  
647 Ms. Bernal stated that the Outreach and Education Committee would be more  
648 than thrilled to work with CPA on an outreach campaign.

649  
650 Ms. Jones said she appreciates the historical perspective of this issue. She  
651 stated that although the Board did oppose the original bill for various reasons,  
652 throughout the process, the Board has evolved in its way of looking at this and  
653 looked at its role as a regulatory body. She thanked Dr. Linder-Crow for her input  
654 and Mr. Leitzell for his hard work on the intent language.

655  
656 It was M(Phillips)/S(Erickson)/C to approve the proposed language of AB 89, for  
657 staff to continue working with Assembly Member Levine's office, and for the  
658 Board to be listed as the official sponsor of the bill.

659  
660 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

661  
662 The Board further discussed the draft intent language. Ms. Jones requested  
663 additional input and stated that the Policy and Advocacy Committee will be  
664 reviewing the intent language and recommended changes in March and it will be  
665 brought back to the April 2017 Board meeting.

666  
667 Dr. Erickson stated that section (a)(4) needs to be clearer about whether the  
668 training being discussed is only for psychologists versus other mental health  
669 professionals. Dr. Horn commented that she agrees with Dr. Erickson but also is  
670 not sure if the section needs to be there at all. She also addressed section (b)  
671 and noted that it is not stated strongly enough. She also recommended when



672 training is being discussed to put it in the order that it happens from graduate  
673 school, then internship, and then post-doctoral.  
674

675 Dr. Linder-Crow commented that section (b) makes sweeping statements that  
676 leave the impressions that perhaps psychologists are not trained very well. She  
677 stated that she is also concerned about section (c) which states that it is the  
678 intent of the Legislature which is stating that this document is speaking for the  
679 author of the bill. It states that this bill will ensure that all psychologists receive a  
680 minimum level of education or training in suicide risk assessment and  
681 intervention. To imply that this bill will establish a baseline for training for  
682 psychologists not accurate since the baseline for training for psychologists is  
683 established in their training programs and this language is misleading to the  
684 Legislature. Dr. Linder-Crow stated that based on Board Members' earlier  
685 comments, the intention of the bill is to create an environment where  
686 psychologists could do an assessment of their own training in this area.  
687

688 Dr. Erickson expressed his concern with section (d) and whether the Board  
689 wants to encourage other boards. He asked if this language is helpful or if it  
690 overreaching. Ms. Jones said the Board would be revisiting this issue.  
691

692 Dr. Horn noted that if section (c) was read alone, it sounds like psychologists are  
693 currently deficient in this training.  
694

695 Ms. Bernal recommended using the terminology "all health care professionals" in  
696 section (d) rather than naming specific boards.  
697

698 Ms. Jones stated that the Board will not going to be taking any action on this item  
699 because there are changes that need to be made by the Policy and Advocacy  
700 Committee and that the revised document will be reviewed again by the full  
701 Board at its April 2017 Board meeting.  
702

#### 703 b) Legislative Items for Future Meeting 704

705 Ms. Jones said the Board does not have any items at this time.  
706

#### 707 c) Update Regarding the California Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) 708 and Mandated Reporting – Penal Code Sections 261.5, 288, and 11165.1 709

710 Ms. Burns stated that the Board previously requested an opinion from the Attorney  
711 General but due to litigation on this issue, the request was withdrawn. On January 9, a  
712 decision was rendered by the Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second  
713 Appellate District which affirmed the judgment of the Los Angeles County Superior  
714 Court trial. Board staff is now working with the Opinions Unit of the Office of the  
715 Attorney General to determine whether the Board will need to submit a new request for  
716 a legal opinion.

717 Dr. Phillips commented that the court's decision seems to indicate that sexting among  
718 people under the age of 18 may constitute a reportable offense under CANRA.  
719

720 **Agenda Item #21: Regulatory Update and Review: Possible Action**

721  
722 **a) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10,**  
723 **1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants**  
724

725 Mr. Glasspiegel referred the Board Members to an updated memorandum dated  
726 February 3, 2017 that was provided as a hand-carry item. He stated that staff is  
727 currently working to create the Initial Statement of Reasons and Notice of Proposed  
728 Regulations with Informative Digest. He indicated that additional changes have been  
729 made to the proposed language, which are indicated in red font. Mr. Glasspiegel  
730 explained that the changes that were made were to address the Office of Administrative  
731 Law's requirements that we include form numbers in the regulatory language and  
732 explain the necessity and statutory authority for collecting the information requested on  
733 the form.  
734

735 Dr. Phillips asked if the Board was going to be requiring the form by referencing it in  
736 language to be in compliance with OAL. Mr. Glasspiegel explained that form names can  
737 be referenced in the language, or the specific information to be collected must be  
738 itemized out in the language. He further explained that minor changes could be made  
739 through section a section 100 change which is much easier than a full regulatory  
740 change. Ms. Marks clarified that the minor changes that could be made through a  
741 section 100 change would include non-substantive issues such as changing the name  
742 of the Governor or the Boards address, but if the Board decided to include a new data  
743 point for applicants or make more substantive changes, then it would need to go  
744 through the regulatory process.  
745

746 Mr. Glasspiegel stated that staff is requesting the Board to approve the changes in the  
747 proposed language.  
748

749 Ms. Marks asked if the Board wanted this matter set for hearing. Ms. Jones inquired  
750 regarding the necessity of a hearing. Ms. Marks clarified that either way, there must be  
751 a 45-day public comment period, and that the Board would have to adopt the language  
752 at the end of the public comment period. She noted that this Board usually does  
753 conduct a hearing.  
754

755 Discussion ensued. Mr. Glasspiegel explained that previously the Business, Consumer  
756 Services, and Housing Agency provided a waiver to DCA boards that allowed boards to  
757 notice proposed language before it went through a review from DCA, Agency and the  
758 Department of Finance, but the rulemaking file would have to reviewed and submitted to  
759 the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) within one year. He stated that the waivers no  
760 longer exist and that now the review process must be completed before the proposed

761 regulatory language is noticed. He also noted that with the new process, the review  
762 period no longer counts toward the one-year deadline to submit rulemaking files to OAL.  
763

764 Dr. Linder-Crow clarified that the proposed language will no longer reference an  
765 employer/employee relationship for psychological assistants. She stated that the  
766 guidance that CPA has been giving for years is that the psychological assistant  
767 relationship must be a W-2 relationship rather than a contractor relationship. She asked  
768 what impact this change would have on this guidance.  
769

770 Ms. Marks indicated that she does not see the change in 2913 which used to refer to a  
771 person who may be employed, which has since changed, as dispositive of the  
772 relationship between the supervisor and the trainee. She clarified that when determining  
773 if someone is an employee, many factors have to be considered such as who has  
774 control over the workplace and the work to be done, who sets the schedule and which  
775 clients are going to be seen by the person in question. She stated that the same factors  
776 would have to be considered for psychological assistants.  
777

778 Dr. Linder-Crow stated that she understands the relationship between supervisor and  
779 supervisee, but asked if this is going to create a separate relationship of  
780 employer/employee that will change the guidance that CPA gives to psychologists who  
781 are going to hiring psychological assistants. Ms. Marks indicated that it is her  
782 understanding that the changes to the statute and regulations changes the nature of  
783 who files the registration and the fact that the statute no longer refers to a person who  
784 may be employed, however, she indicated that it would not necessarily change the  
785 basic relationship that existed before or the nature of the analysis of who controls the  
786 aspects of the work to be done and that supervisors are responsible for seeking their  
787 own counsel.  
788

789 Discussion ensued. Dr. Erickson stated that it seems to him that the Board made a  
790 realization that identifying the employer/employee relationship in statute was not  
791 necessary since the Internal Revenue Service is clear that it must be an  
792 employer/employee relationship since there are guidelines that state that if the person  
793 doing the work doesn't have full control, which a psychological assistant does not, they  
794 must be considered an employee. Dr. Horn commented that section 1391.8 states that  
795 the supervisor or employer shall supply all provisions necessary to function as a  
796 psychological assistant and that independent contractors provide all their own  
797 provisions, but supervisors of psychological assistants must provide the provisions  
798 necessary to function as a psychological assistant. Dr. Phillips added that he thinks that  
799 the real distinction is the extent of control that the person who is paying for work being  
800 done has. He stated that if someone has control over how the work is done, which the  
801 supervisor of a psychological assistant has, that it would, as he understands it,  
802 constitute an employer/employee relationship regardless of what the Board calls it,  
803 therefore, the guidance that CPA has been giving would not change.  
804

805 It was M(Phillips)/S(Horn)/C approved the changes in the proposed language and give  
806 the Executive Officer the authority to proceed with the rulemaking file and set the matter  
807 for hearing.

808

809 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

810

811 b) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1387(b)(10)(11) and 1387.1 – Verification of Experience  
812 and Supervision Agreement Forms

813

814 Mr. Glasspiegel reported that the Rulemaking File as noticed for the initial 45-day  
815 comment period on April 1, 2016 and that the hearing took place at the May 2016 Board  
816 meeting. He indicated that the final regulatory package was approved by DCA and the  
817 Department of Finance, and it was delivered to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL)  
818 on December 22, 2016. He indicated that OAL advised staff on February 1, 2017 of the  
819 need for a 15-day notice of modified text to make non-substantive changes to the  
820 original language, and that staff noticed the text on February 7, 2017. He indicated that  
821 the comment period will end February 22, 2017. Ms. Jones inquired if the notice had  
822 been posted on social media. Mr. Glasspiegel stated that it had not yet been posted on  
823 social media, but that he would get it posted. Ms. Sorrick clarified that this is a follow-up  
824 to a bill by Assembly Member Levine from 2014 which allowed the Board to receive  
825 verification of experience forms directly from trainees along with their applications for  
826 licensure provided specific procedures are followed.

827

828 Mr. Glasspiegel noted that the word “may” has been changed to “shall” as suggested by  
829 OAL. Dr. Horn indicated that section 1387.1(c) indicates that primary supervisors shall  
830 be in compliance at all times with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law and  
831 the Medical Practice Act, whichever is applicable and inquired if it needs to be changes  
832 to read “or” the Medical Practice Act, whichever is applicable. Ms. Marks commented  
833 that if a supervisor is a psychiatrist, they would have to comply with the Psychology  
834 Licensing Law in addition to the Medical Practice Act. Dr. Horn stated that if that is the  
835 case, then the phrase “whichever if applicable” needs to be removed. Discussion  
836 ensued. Ms. Sorrick stated that the Board could address this change in the “pathways”  
837 language so it would not jeopardize or hold up this package. Dr. Horn stated that she  
838 does not believe people are currently confused as to which Practice Act they need to  
839 follow but thinks the language is still unclear. Dr. Phillips stated that there seems to be a  
840 consensus among Board members to address this issue under “pathways” rather than  
841 making any further modifications to the text of the current package.

842

843 It was M(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to approve the modified language as written and  
844 to give the authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the language at the end of the  
845 public comment period if no negative comments are received.

846

847 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

848

849

850 **Agenda Item #22: Telepsychology Committee Report and Consideration and**  
851 **Possible Action on Committee Recommendations**

852  
853 **a) Consideration and Possible Approval of Proposed Additions to California Code of**  
854 **Regulations, Title 16, to Address Standards of Practice for Telehealth**

855  
856 Dr. Erickson reported that the Telepsychology Committee met on February 3, 2017 to  
857 discuss and refine the proposed additions to the Board's regulations regarding the  
858 practice of telehealth services. He stated that the Committee considered a written letter  
859 from the Federal Trade Commission regarding the use of telehealth services for speech  
860 pathology and audiology services. Dr. Erickson noted that after consideration of the  
861 letter, the Committee felt the proposed language did not run afoul of the intent of the  
862 FTC to make available telehealth services by limitation on practice.

863  
864 Dr. Erickson referred to draft language that aims to accomplish guidelines for licensed  
865 California psychologists to provide telehealth to clients and patients of their services that  
866 was provided as a hand-carry item.

867  
868 Dr. Horn noted that the language makes it clear that we are talking about health care.  
869 Dr. Erickson agreed. Ms. Jones asked if there have been any additional feedback  
870 regarding the proposal since the November Board meeting. Ms. Sorrick indicated that  
871 the public comment received at the November Board meeting was taken into  
872 consideration during the February 3, 2017 Committee meeting.

873  
874 Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman, CPA, thanked the Board for allowing her to provide comment.  
875 She indicated that the language is complicated because it bases the rules on residency  
876 rather than based on the location of the patient and the provider. She indicated that  
877 there are two issues that are unclear and potentially restrictive. She stated that the  
878 language states that a licensee may also provide psychological health care services to  
879 a patient or client who initiates psychological health care services while in this state, but  
880 who may not be a resident of this state. She indicated that it sounds like it would  
881 exclude subsequent telehealth services since it omits the phrase "via telehealth." She  
882 indicated the second issue is that it seems to be implying that a non-resident cannot  
883 initiate services via telehealth from out of state.

884  
885 Dr. Phillips said that it would be clearer to add the phrase "via telehealth" to the  
886 proposed amendments in subsection (a) so that it reads "A licensee may also provide  
887 psychological health care services via telehealth to a patient or client who initiates  
888 psychological health care services while in this State, but who may not be a resident of  
889 this State." Dr. Phillips also commented that in terms of out of state people calling into  
890 the State to speak to a provider here, he stated that is something that should be up to  
891 the jurisdiction in which the person is located rather than the Board giving its licensees  
892 permission to do it.

893

894 Dr. Phillips also indicated that the first sentence of subsection (a) should be amended to  
895 read “A licensee is permitted to provide psychological health care services via telehealth  
896 to an originating site in this State, as defined in section 2290.5 of the Code, and to  
897 provide psychological health care services via telehealth to a patient or client who is a  
898 resident of California who is temporarily located outside of this State, subject to the laws  
899 and regulations of the other state where either the licensee or the patient is located.”  
900

901 Ms. Jones thanked former Board member Dr. Andrew Harlem for his work on this issue.  
902

903 It was M(Jones)/S(Bernal)/C to accept the language with amendments and proceed with  
904 the rulemaking file.  
905

906 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no  
907

908 Ms. Marks suggested adding this proposed new section to article 8: Rules of  
909 Professional Conduct and numbering it as section 1396.8. The Board agreed to allow  
910 staff to select the appropriate section.  
911

912 Dr. Phillips expressed his thanks to Dr. Winkelman and Dr. Melodie Schaeffer for  
913 providing their contributions to the language.  
914

### 915 **Agenda Item #23: Licensing Report**

916

917 Ms. Cheung referred to the Licensing Report that was provided in the Board Meeting  
918 packets. She indicated that the processing time for licensure applications as of January  
919 26, 2017 was 25 business days. She also referred to the Licensing Population Report  
920 indicating that as of January 26, 2017, there were 17,660 current licensed  
921 psychologists, 1,528 active psychological assistants and 279 active registered  
922 psychologists.  
923

924 Ms. Cheung also reported on licensing staffs' efforts regarding consolidating  
925 psychological assistant registrations for those individuals who currently hold multiple  
926 registrations since psychological assistants are now only required to hold one  
927 registration instead of registered to each separate employer.  
928

929 Ms. Cheung also indicated that the Licensing Committee will continue to discuss the  
930 Pathways to Licensure at its next meeting after which the Board will be conducting two  
931 stakeholder meetings, one in Northern California in May and another in Southern  
932 California in August, to solicit feedback regarding the proposed changes.  
933

934 Ms. Bernal asked why there was no data provided for 2013/2014 on the Licensing  
935 Report. Ms. Sorrick explained that this was the period during which we were  
936 transitioning to the new BreEZe system, therefore, data was not available.  
937  
938

939 **Agenda Item #24: Continuing Education Report**

940

941 Ms. Everhart presented the Continuing Education report that was provided in the Board  
942 meeting packets. She clarified that in the Continuing Education Audits report for  
943 January through April 2016, the information contained in the “Failed” column represents  
944 the number of licensees who failed once the audit had been completed which is also  
945 reflected in the CE Audit Overview: Pass vs. Fail report which indicates that 13% of  
946 licensees who were audited during this period failed the audit. She noted that the most  
947 common reason for failing an audit is that the licensee did not complete enough hours  
948 of continuing education. Ms. Everhart also reported that from October 28, 2016 through  
949 January 25, 2017, the Board issued a total of six citations for continuing education  
950 deficiencies of which four have come into compliance while two are still out of  
951 compliance.

952

953 Dr. Phillips announced that Ms. Everhart has accepted a new position as an Associate  
954 Governmental Program Analyst with the Department of Justice and will be leaving the  
955 Board of Psychology. He gave her a card from the Board members and thanked her for  
956 her contributions. Ms. Everhart stated that she has enjoyed working for the Board of  
957 Psychology.

958

959 **Agenda Item #25: Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda and**  
960 **Recommendation for Future Licensing Committee Meetings**

961

962 No comments or recommendations were received.

963

964 **Agenda Item #26: Review and Consider Amendments to Board Administrative**  
965 **Procedures Manual**

966

967 Mr. Glasspiegel indicated that there are three additions to be made to the Board  
968 Administrative Manual which were previously approved by the Board.

969

970 It was M(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Jones) to adopt the amendments to the Board  
971 Administrative Manual.

972

973 Vote: 6 aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Erickson, Jones, Phillips, Horn, Bernal) 0 no

974

975 **Agenda Item #27: President’s Report**

976

977 Dr. Phillips thanked Senator Steven Glazer for arranging the room for the Board  
978 meeting. He also announced that Deputy Attorney General Joshua Templet will be  
979 getting married in the next week and shared congratulations.

980

981 **a) 2017 Meeting Calendar and Locations**

982

983 Dr. Phillips referred to the 2017 Board Meeting/Event Calendar provided in the meeting  
984 packets.

985  
986 b) Committee Updates

987  
988 Dr. Phillips stated that there are still three vacancies on the Board, therefore, there are  
989 no Committee updates to provide at this time. He thanked the Board Members for  
990 pulling double-duty on committees during these vacancies.

991  
992 **Agenda Item #28: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings**

993  
994 Ms. Everhart provided the recommendations as made by the Board members  
995 throughout the meeting:

- 996  
997
- 998 • Process by which child custody evaluation complaints are processed and  
999 investigated by the Board
  - 1000 • Central Services staff to ascertain which pages of the Board's website are most  
1001 important to track by determining the types of questions received by staff instead  
1002 of solely reporting on the top five pages
  - 1003 • Add California statistics into the intent language for AB 89 and provide the  
1004 minutes from today's discussion to the Policy and Advocacy Committee for their  
1005 meeting to review the intent language
  - 1006 • Clarify language regarding Practice Acts in section 1387.1(c) in Pathways
  - 1007 • Possible use of probationary status

1008 **Adjournment**

1009  
1010 The Board adjourned at 2:46 p.m.  
1011