

MEMORANDUM

DATE	February 4, 2026
TO	Psychology Board Members
FROM	Jonathan Burke, Executive Officer
SUBJECT	Executive Officer's Report: Agenda Item 6

Background:

The following items are included in the memo below or attached.

- 1) Personnel Update
- 2) Communications with Other Jurisdictions Regarding Examination Development

Personnel Update

Authorized Positions: 27.30

Temp Help: 1.0

Staff Vacancies: 2.0

Board Member Vacancy: 1.0 Licensed Member, Governor Appointee

The Enforcement Unit has two vacant positions, one Analyst II position and one Analyst I position. The Analyst II position is pending interviews, which will be scheduled after the February board meeting. The Analyst I position is pending posting.

The Licensing Unit is fully staffed with two Office Technicians, one Retired Annuitant, four Analyst I positions, and two Analyst II positions.

The Central Services Unit is fully staffed with three Analyst II positions, one Analyst I, and two Office Technicians.

Communications with Other Jurisdictions Regarding Examination Development

The California Board's Executive Officer has had discussions with his counterpart at the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists regarding their examination development efforts:

- The matter of developing a new examination will be discussed at the Texas Board's May and June meetings.
- They are developing a Request for Proposal for examination development companies to better understand what development of a new competency exam would require.
- After these discussions they will invite companies to bid to develop a proposal with costs which would be brought to the Texas Legislature in 2027 (the Texas Legislature meets once every two years).

- Throughout this process Texas will be asking stakeholders what the new examination should look like: What is entry level practice?, Can remote proctoring be considered?, What languages should the examination be translated into? How do you test for competency? What are other states requirements?
- Texas intends to continue accepting the IEPPP but wishes to offer their own different examination as an alternate pathway to licensure.
- The development of the examination will still require approval of the Texas Legislature and is not guaranteed.
- The examination, if approved for development, would not be available until 2029 at the earliest.

Action Requested:

This item is for informational purposes only.

MEMORANDUM

DATE	February 4, 2026
TO	Licensing Committee Members
FROM	Jonathan Burke Executive Officer
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 11d) EPPP Update

Updates

At the January 2026 Licensure Committee meeting recent updates relating the integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (IEPPP) were discussed. Concerns were raised regarding the current passage rate of the existing EPPP. Committee member Nystrom requested that when the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) present to the Board at the February meeting alternative ways to take the examination be discussed as well what steps are taken to ensure the examination is not biased and a diverse group of subject matter experts are used in its development.

Background

The Board drafted a letter of concern on May 20, 2025, relating to the IEPPP and sent it to the ASPPB on June 2, 2025 (see Attachment A).

ASPPB hosted the second virtual town hall meeting for the Education and Training Community on June 25, 2025. The Board attended this second virtual town hall.

ASPPB hosted a third virtual town hall meeting for students and license/certification candidates on September 18, 2025. The Board attended this virtual town hall. Additionally, the Board launched an outreach campaign to our licensees and interested parties. Through social media and distribution lists the Board was able to expand awareness and encourage participation in this virtual town hall.

Additionally, ASPPB conducted a Job Task Analysis of the Practice of Psychology (JTA) to be completed by licensed psychologists which closed on September 29, 2025. The JTA process happens once every 7 to 10 years and directly shapes the examination specifications and content used to evaluate the knowledge and skills required for licensure. The Board sent multiple emails and alerts on our social media platforms. ASPPB reported at their Annual Meeting that 25% of all responses were from California licensees.

At the November 2025 Board meeting Board members requested a draft implementation plan be developed by staff to better prepare for implementation and prepare for potential issues. In January 2026 the Executive Officer spoke with ASPPB's

Executive Director Dr. Mariann Burnetti-Atwell. At this meeting Dr. Burnetti-Atwell shared:

- A Blueprint based on the JTA will be made public in the first two weeks of February 2026. The slight delay on the previously reported date February 1, 2026, is due to the blueprint being translated into French. The Blueprint will show what entry level practice areas and domains should be included in the exam. This information will be shared with the training and education community and applicants preparing for licensure.
- The projected cost of the examination should be shared in the first half of 2026.
- Item writing will be conducted in 2026.
- In the first quarter of 2027 beta testing of a sample exam will begin with a committee determining the passing score.
- The IEPPP should launch in the fourth quarter of 2027.

The Board's questions regarding the eligibility to sit for the examination (once coursework has been completed or after coursework and practice hours completed) are still being discussed by ASPPB.

The California Board's Executive Officer has had discussions with his counterpart at the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists regarding their examination development efforts: This discussion reported on under the the Executive Officer's Report at the February Board meeting (Agenda Item 6b).

Dr. Hao Song, PhD, ICE-CCP, Associate Executive Officer of Examination Services at ASPPB will be present at the February 2026 Board meeting and will give a presentation on IEPPP development and answer any questions the Board and public may have (Agenda Item 15).

Timelines of Events in 2025

Dr. Harb Sheets, Chairperson of the of the Licensure Committee, and Ms. Susan Hansen, Examinations Coordinator, attended a virtual town hall meeting organized by ASPPB on April 3, 2025. At that meeting, the Board heard that the proposed implementation date of the new integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) will be in 2027. A survey will be sent out to member Boards later this year and we will be invited to comment on the proposals. The Board has expressed concerns regarding the likely increased cost of the examination to applicants and a desire by ASPPB to require the examination be taken as the final step of the application process. This would contradict the changes made to California law by AB 282 (Chapter 425, Statutes of 2023) which allows applicants to take the examination after they have completed their coursework. The Board supported this change as it will likely increase the passage rate of the EPPP.

Dr. Hao Song, PhD, ICE-CCP, Associate Executive Officer of Examination Services at ASPPB, attended the May 9, 2025 Board meeting to present on the timeline and development of the integrated EPPP. At the same meeting, the Board discussed the

concerns regarding the integrated EPPP and implementation timeline and voted to send a letter to ASPPB to express these concerns as discussed.

Attachments:

- A. Letter to ASPPB
- B. Draft Implementation Plan

Action Requested:

This is an informational item.

History of Board Consideration of the EPPP2

In 2017, the Board determined that there was a need for stakeholder input regarding possible implementation of the ASPPB Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology Part 2 (EPPP2). A Task Force with representatives from various stakeholders was created to provide input to the Board regarding consideration and possible implementation of the EPPP Part 2.

The Task Force's role was to consider the pros and cons of the proposed examination to the Board's prospective licensees and consumers, eligibility criteria, the application process, and the impact on the Board's process for licensure. The Task Force met on April 5th and June 29th, 2018 at the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA's) Headquarters in Sacramento. This Task Force was chaired by Board Member Dr. Sheryll Casuga.

The Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology, currently known as the EPPP Part 1 (Knowledge), is a computer-based examination developed and administered by ASPPB. This exam is one of two examinations required for licensure in California. The cost of the exam to the applicant is \$600.00.

EPPP Part 2 (Skills exam), per ASPPB, will provide an independent, standardized, reliable, and valid assessment of the skills necessary for independent practice and enhance consumer protection. The cost of this exam was initially set at \$600.00. ASPPB, at the time of the initial Task Force meeting, announced the plan to make this exam mandatory for all jurisdictions.

After several discussions, the Task Force did not believe the EPPP Part 2 was in the best interests of California consumers for the following reasons:

- Lack of a proven necessity for the examination;
- Concerns related to the exam's ability to assess skills resulting in negligible consumer protections;
- Costs and burden on prospective licensees, and especially on historically underrepresented and socioeconomically disadvantaged students;
- New barriers to licensure and potentially detrimental impact on access to psychological services to California consumers; and

- Clarification on whether the optional Enhanced EPPP is an indefinite alternative or ASPPB is simply postponing the deadline for mandatory adoption. If the implementation date is merely being delayed, the Board would appreciate clarification on the anticipated date for mandatory implementation.

The Task Force also had significant concerns with the loss of license portability with other States if ASPPB decided to mandate the EPPP Part 2. Due to this concern, the Task Force recommended (should part 2 become mandatory) that the Board continue participation in the EPPP and not create its own version of a national examination.

In August 2018, ASPPB retracted its decision and made the EPPP Part 2 an optional exam for all state boards and proposed incentives for early adopters. Although ASPPB's announcement clarified that the EPPP Part 2 was now an optional component, it raised concerns regarding whether ASPPB would eventually make the examination mandatory.

These concerns were addressed in the letter dated December 2018 which stated as follows:

“The Board of Psychology supports a competency-based examination but feels that certainty is required as to its mandatory implementation, and that a date certain for all member jurisdictions is necessary. Uncertainty as to implementation results in a current inability to move forward with the required statutory and regulatory changes.

ASPPB would aid its member jurisdictions if it were to identify all statutory and regulatory changes needed to implement the new examination (drafting and supporting statutory and regulatory changes through advocacy, etc.) over a set period of time calibrated to the expected implementation date and the time necessary to effect needed changes.

ASPPB should continue to evaluate the total cost of both examinations and establish a uniform lower total cost as to all jurisdictions, as of the mandatory effective date of the Enhanced EPPP.

In addition, the Board also requests that ASPPB make available to the Board and the Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Professional Examination Services the following information as it becomes available:

- *Data from Beta testing from participating jurisdictions to evaluate the validity of the Enhanced EPPP.*
- *Evidence of external validity that substantiates the need for the Enhanced EPPP. This information would help further clarify the need for and validity of the Enhanced EPPP and inform the Board's discussion regarding the prospect for adoption of the Enhanced EPPP.”*

ASPPB's response was noted in a letter dated January 29, 2019. Summarily, ASPPB Board of Directors (BOD) had determined that the jurisdictional use of the Enhanced

EPPP would not be mandated during the initial implementation process. The BOD, however, would revisit the implementation process of the examination and determine whether or not to continue delivering the EPPP 1 as a stand-alone option or only to deliver the Enhanced EPPP. They would take into consideration the time it takes for California to develop and implement regulation changes and factor that into their decision.

ASPPB also reduced the exam fee for the EPPP2 from \$600.00 to \$450.00 and to allow the Board access to beta testing information from participating jurisdictions to enable the Department of Consumer Affairs, Office for Professional Examination Services (OPES) to conduct an audit of the EPPP.

This audit was completed in April 2021. Summary of the audit is as follows:

“Overall, the SMEs concluded that the content of the EPPP Part 1 assesses general knowledge required for entry level psychologist practice in California, with the exception of California law and ethics. This general knowledge should continue to be tested on the California Psychology Law and Ethics Examination.

The SMEs were impressed by the EPPP Part 2, both by the concept of measuring skills and by the design of the scenario-based items. Additionally, the SMEs favored the EPPP Part 2 over the EPPP Part 1 as a single-examination option. However, the SMEs concluded that while the EPPP Part 2 assesses a deeper measure of skills than those measured by the EPPP Part 1, that alone may not support adoption of the EPPP Part 2. The SMEs further concluded that the skills measured by the EPPP Part 2 may be adequately assessed during supervised clinical experience, and that the EPPP Part 2 could possibly be an unnecessary barrier to licensure. OPES recommends that the Board continue to monitor the beta testing results of the EPPP Part 2 as part of their decision-making process for adopting the EPPP Part 2 as a requirement for licensure in California in the future.”

This audit was presented at the EPPP AdHoc Committee meeting held on October 21, 2021. However further discussion could not be made until the ASPPB Board of Directors decided on their plan for the EPPP2.

In October 2022, the ASPPB Board of Directors announced the implementation of the Enhanced EPPP two-part exam to become effective January 1, 2026, to all member jurisdictions. ASPPB does not believe that the EPPP2 will create a barrier to practice and promises to smooth the road to licensure amidst a national mental health crisis. ASPPB's core value is to develop a fair, equitable and accessible exam and that the two-part exam ensures a thorough assessment of competence and promote consumer protection. They will be mindful of the cost and confirmed a 25% reduction in the EPPP2 fee with no current plans to increase the fee.

After the announcement, the Board received several letters of opposition and one in favor of implementing the EPPP2.

The EPPP Ad Hoc Committee met on April 28, 2023, to discuss the EPPP part 2 and make recommendations to the Board. Implementation of the EPPP part 2 meant that

statutory and regulatory changes were necessary to continue to conduct business and license portability remains. If the Board decides not to implement the EPPP part 2, this will require the creation of California's own practice base exam which would add additional cost to the Board's examination development process, and it would also eliminate license portability for California licensees.

Committee Recommendations were as follows:

- 1) To adopt the two-part EPPP exam for licensure for the State of California effective January 1, 2026, to avoid any interruption of service.
- 2) To have staff conduct an analysis of developing a California practice exam to be reported at the Board's Q3 2024 meeting.
- 3) Direct the executive officer to continue to work with ASPPB and communicate any barriers to licensure concerns from the Board.

The Committee also reviewed the proposed statutory and regulatory language that would enable Board staff to implement the two-part EPPP exam.

In May 2023, the Board accepted the committee's recommendation and agreed to adopt the two-part EPPP exam on January 1, 2026.

In August 2024 the Board provided the process, workload, and cost to develop a California practice exam in lieu of adopting the EPPP 2.

The Texas Behavioral Health Executive Council expressed opposition to the mandated EPPP two-part exam and proposed amending the ASPPB's bylaws. As a response, ASPPB made announcement to the member jurisdictions that a vote would be taken at the annual meeting October 30-November 3, 2024, regarding ASPPB's bylaws amendments. (Attachment H)

In October 2024, the California Psychological Association (CPA) wrote a letter opposing the implementation of the EPPP two-part exam. CPA has requested that the Board do the following at its November 2024 meeting:

1. Reverse its adoption of the EPPP-2 starting January 1, 2026.
2. Cease development of laws and/or regulations relating to EPPP-2.

On October 22, 2024, ASPPB issued a letter to member jurisdictions that they are pausing the 1/1/2026 EPPP 2-part exam mandate. They will explore the feasibility of a single EPPP exam that test on both knowledge and skills.

Board staff have stopped drafting the regulatory package that was going to implement the EPPP2 examination by January 1, 2026. The same package was going to implement AB 282 and staff will present modified text for Board approval at the February 2025 meeting.

AB 282 allows applicants to take the EPPP or CPLEE, or both exams as soon as they have completed all academic coursework required for a qualifying doctoral degree.

The law also states, “If a national licensing examination entity approved by the board imposes additional eligibility requirements beyond the completion of academic coursework, the board shall implement a process to verify that an applicant has satisfied those additional eligibility requirements.”

Additional reference can be found on the [Informational Page](#) for EPPP Part 2 on the Board’s website.

May 20, 2025

Dr. Mariann Burnetti-Atwell, PsyD
Chief Executive Officer
Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB)
215 Market Road
Tyrone, GA 30290

Dear Dr. Burnetti-Atwell,

The California Board of Psychology (Board) met on May 9, 2025, to discuss updates regarding the implementation of the integrated Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), the anticipated 2027 launch of the skills assessment component, and concerns about the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in exam development and administration. Hao Song, PhD, ICE-CCP, ASPPB's Associate Executive Officer of Examination Services, provided a presentation on the integrated EPPP and answered questions posed by the Board members.

The Board acknowledges ASPPB's efforts to improve the licensing examination and ensure it reflects the evolving competencies required for safe and effective psychological practice. As one of the largest licensing jurisdictions in the United States, California will require sufficient time and jurisdiction-specific planning to align its regulatory frameworks and operational procedures with these significant changes. Additionally, the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 282 (Chapter 425, Statutes of 2023), which requires regulatory amendments already underway, will intersect with ASPPB's current proposed timeline to launch the integrated EPPP in Q4 of 2027. This further underscores the need for extended preparation time and close coordination.

To ensure a smooth and equitable transition, the Board respectfully raises the following considerations:

1. Jurisdictional Coordination and Regulatory Impact

The transition to an integrated EPPP with a skills component represents a fundamental change that will require comprehensive planning and revisions to the Board's regulations. California's multi-stakeholder rulemaking process necessitates thorough evaluation and coordination, making sufficient preparation time essential. A well-structured and phased implementation plan with a minimum of 36 months of lead time will be critical to ensuring regulatory alignment and system updates.

2. Implementation Timeline and Resource Planning

Given the complexity of adopting a dual-component EPPP, the Board urges ASPPB to provide jurisdictions with a detailed rollout timeline, training resources, and technical specifications as early as possible. Additionally, a more definitive and realistic implementation timeline is essential, as the current proposal to launch the integrated EPPP in Q4 of 2027 is not feasible. Providing sufficient lead time will allow the Board to initiate the necessary regulatory changes, fiscal planning, and

stakeholder education campaigns to ensure a seamless transition for applicants and licensees.

3. Transparency in Content Validity and Test Design

Content validity remains a concern in the skills assessment component of the EPPP. The Board seeks clarity on how ASPPB establishes content validity in the integrated EPPP and requests ongoing updates on its development. Additionally, a sample exam question on assessment presented at the ASPPB Townhall on April 3, 2025, lacked sufficient context for a clear response. The Board encourages ASPPB to take the necessary steps to improve the quality of newly developed questions for the skills assessment component to ensure clarity, relevance, and fairness for all candidates.

4. Eligibility and Pass Rate Concerns

Business Professions Code (BPC) 2914 allows candidates to take the EPPP after completing all academic coursework required for a qualifying doctoral degree, excluding internship, with the goal of improving pass rates. However, the eligibility requirements in terms of supervised professional experience for the integrated EPPP remain unclear, and restrictions on early testing could inadvertently counteract this legislative intent. The Board requests that ASPPB clarify both the specific eligibility criteria and the process for determining eligibility under the new exam structure to support fair access and alignment with California's licensure framework.

5. Transition Period for the Integrated EPPP

The current proposal lacks details regarding a transition period for existing EPPP candidates. The Board requests that ASPPB provide clear guidance on the duration and structure of this transition to ensure exam candidates and training programs have sufficient time to prepare.

6. Artificial Intelligence (AI) Integration

The growing use of AI in exam development, scoring, and quality control introduces both innovation and risks. The Board requests detailed information on how AI is being integrated into the EPPP, including safeguards to prevent algorithmic bias, preserve data integrity, and ensure psychometric fairness across diverse candidate populations.

7. Accessibility and Accommodations

If AI-enabled testing platforms are introduced, they must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and related provisions. Accessibility should remain a core design feature, ensuring equitable support for candidates with disabilities rather than a secondary consideration.

8. Cost Considerations and Transparency

A potential exam fee increase was announced at the Townhall on April 3, 2025, by ASPPB, yet details remain unclear. Any increase in exam costs could create

Dr. Burnetti-Atwell

May 20, 2025

Page 3

financial barriers for candidates. The Board urges ASPPB to provide transparent cost projections and a clear justification for any fee adjustments to ensure affordability and equitable access for all candidates.

9. Stakeholder Engagement and Communication

The Board strongly encourages ASPPB to engage in ongoing dialogue with its member jurisdictions by providing timely updates, facilitating two-way communication, and sharing implementation plans well in advance of any formal rollout. Clear guidance and transparency will be critical for state boards to adjust statutes, regulations, and infrastructure accordingly.

The Board appreciates ASPPB's commitment to upholding examination standards that reflect modern psychological practice and safeguard public welfare. We are eager to collaborate closely with ASPPB and our peer jurisdictions to ensure that the transition to the integrated EPPP is equitable, transparent, and logistically sound.

We thank you for your attention to these matters and remain available to participate in any implementation workgroups, jurisdictional briefings, or public comment opportunities that may support the success of this initiative.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the Board's Executive Officer, Jonathan Burke, at (916) 574-8072 or jonathan.burke@dca.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Lea Tate, PsyD
President, Board of Psychology

cc: Shacunda Rodgers, Vice President
Members of the Board

Potential Changes Needed for California to Implement the Integrated EPPP

1. Regulatory Updates

- **Review eligibility requirements:** The Board would need to review its eligibility requirements to determine when candidates can take the integrated EPPP. ASPPB has indicated that the exam is intended to be taken after internship and before postdoctoral training at one of their Townhall meetings. If the Board chooses to align with this approach, regulatory changes will be required, and regulatory changes typically take two to three years to complete.
- **Transition period:** A transition plan may be needed for applicants who remain eligible for the current EPPP. The Board will need to determine both the grace period and the final cutoff date for accepting applications under the current exam structure. The timing may depend on how long ASPPB continues offering both exams to California candidates.
- **Regulatory package requirements:** The Board will need to update current regulations. It could be a Section 100 to clarify nonsubstantive changes or a full regulatory package. If the EPPP's name is changed to the integrated EPPP, then we would need to make Section 100 changes to reflect new name. Depending on changes to the registration and eligibility for the integrated EPPP, we may need to update our regulations for initial applications.

2. ASPPB Contract

- **New contract:** Implementing the integrated EPPP will require a new contract with ASPPB. The Board's current contract expires on June 30, 2027, and future contract planning may need to remain flexible until ASPPB provides clearer implementation timelines. Changes to contract would need to be submitted to the Department prior to its expiration and its review process could take up to 60 days.

3. BreEZe System Updates

- **Online system changes:** The BreEZe system would require updates to incorporate the new exam and eligibility requirements. This may include modifying application questions, adjusting internal processing workflows, updating system configurations, and revising interfaces, depending on the final structure of the integrated EPPP.

4. Review by the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)

- **Pending evaluation:** OPES must review and evaluate components of the integrated EPPP to fulfill its statutory mandate for periodic examination evaluation. According to OPES, the Occupational Analysis (OA) of psychology

practice in California is currently underway. Once the OA is completed, OPES will conduct the National Review during Fiscal Year 2026–2027, comparing the OA-derived description of California psychology practice with the content of the EPPP. This analysis will determine whether the EPPP adequately reflects California practice.

The National Review requires a separate contract between OPES and the Board. OPES anticipates completing the National Review by the end of Fiscal Year 2026-2027, assuming ASPPB provides the necessary information to OPES on schedule. If timelines are met, implementation of the integrated EPPP could begin in Fiscal Year 2027-2028.

5. License Verification/File Transfers Applications

- **Increase in Workload:** There is a likelihood that we may see an increase in License Verification or File Transfer Applications. In the event this addition exam causes a barrier to licensure, Psychological Associates may seek licensure in another state that may not have adopted the new examination requirements.

6. Statutory Changes:

- **Clean Up:** A review of statutes will be needed to see if any changes are needed, an example would be amendments to language surrounding exam eligibility.

7. Outreach Activity:

- The board will need to educate potential applicants of any changes to the licensure requirements. Various ways we provide outreach include advisories, listserv notices, newsletter articles, social media posts (Facebook, X, and LinkedIn), website updates, FAQ's, etc.

MEMORANDUM

DATE	February 2, 2026
TO	Board Members
FROM	Stephanie Cheung Licensing Manager
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 11(e) Stakeholder Meeting Preparation: Update

Background:

At the Board meeting on October 4, 2019, the Board voted to co-host a stakeholder meeting in the future with the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS), the Commission on Teachers Credentialing, and other relevant stakeholders to gather input on how to best inform consumers regarding the respective roles of licensed psychologists, licensed educational psychologists (LEPs), and pupil personnel services (PPS) credential holders. This plan was postponed due to the COVID-19 State of Emergency.

The Licensure Committee met in January and July of 2024 and recommended that the Board convene this stakeholder meeting in the afternoon session of the Committee's July 2025 meeting. The Board voted to adopt this recommendation at their August 2024 meeting. In preparation, the Committee and Board identified the Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA) and unions representing school personnel as stakeholders. Due to both Boards were going through Sunset review in 2025, the meeting was postponed to July 2026 accordingly.

Stakeholder Meeting Preparation Focus

To support planning for the stakeholder meeting, Board staff requested direction from the Committee regarding the focus of stakeholder engagement efforts. Staff recommend centering this engagement on identifying how to best inform consumers about the roles and distinctions among licensed psychologists, LEPs, and PPS credential holders.

Board staff also developed a draft survey to assist with this work. The goal of the survey is to gather preliminary input that will help the Board better understand how consumers and stakeholders perceive the roles of licensed psychologists, LEPs, and PPS credential holders. As an initial information-gathering tool, the survey will help identify areas of confusion, gaps in public understanding, and preferred methods of communication, supporting more focused and productive discussions in subsequent stakeholder engagement.

The survey is intended to gather input from consumers, licensees, credential holders, and other stakeholders on:

- How clearly the public understands the roles of these three professions
- Where confusion most commonly occurs
- What types of consumer-centered information materials would be most helpful

- Where consumers typically seek information
- Whether additional engagement (e.g., working groups or stakeholder meetings) would be beneficial

The Committee provided feedback at its January 2026 meeting. Staff have prepared an updated draft survey in the meeting materials for the Board's review and input. (See Attachment)

Survey Distribution Plan

If the use of survey is approved, Board staff plan to utilize an electronic survey platform to finalize the survey and share the survey link through the Board's listserv, social media platforms, and the stakeholder groups identified by the Committee and the Board. These groups include ARCA, unions representing school personnel, and the California Psychological Association. Stakeholder groups will be asked to further share the survey within their networks.

The survey will also be shared with the BBS, with a request that they share it to their respective stakeholder communities.

To ensure outreach to PPS credential holders and their relevant stakeholders, Board staff plan to reach out to the California Association of School Psychologists and request their assistance in sharing the survey with their members and affiliated stakeholders.

Attachment:

Draft Survey

Action Requested:

Review and approve the use of the survey as an initial information-gathering tool to support planning for further stakeholder engagement efforts.

Survey Introduction

This survey is intended to assess whether publicly available information clearly explains the roles of licensed psychologists, licensed educational psychologists (LEPs), and pupil personnel services (PPS) credential holders in California, and to identify what additional consumer-centered resources may be helpful.

Consumers, parents/guardians, licensed professionals, credential holders, and others familiar with these roles are welcome to complete this survey. Respondents located in California or familiar with California's education or mental health systems are especially encouraged to complete this survey.

This survey is for informational purposes only and does not address policy, licensure authority, or scope of practice. Please do not include any personally identifiable information in your responses.

1. Which best describes you?

(Multiple Choice, Single Answer)

- Consumer/client (including parent/guardian)
- Licensed psychologist
- Licensed educational psychologist
- Pupil personnel services (PPS) credential holder
- Other mental health or educational professional (please specify)
- Other (please specify)

2. Are you currently located in California or familiar with California's education or mental health systems?

(Multiple Choice, Single Answer)

- Yes
- No

3. In what context are you most familiar with licensed psychologists, licensed educational psychologists (LEPs), or pupil personnel services (PPS) credential holders?

(Multiple Choice, Single Answer)

- Seeking services
- Providing services
- School setting
- Clinical or private practice setting
- Community mental health setting
- Other (please specify)

4. Based on your experience or the questions you hear from others, how clear do you think the differences are between licensed psychologists, LEPs, or PPS credential holders?

(Multiple Choice, Single Answer)

- Very clear

- Somewhat clear
- Somewhat unclear
- Very unclear
- Unsure

5. Based on your experience, which aspects of these roles or credentials seem most confusing?

(Multiple Choice, Multiple Answer)

- What each title means (e.g., psychologist, LEP, PPS)
- Titles or credentials that are mistaken for one another
- Differences between a license and a credential
- Differences in training or qualifications
- Types of services offered
- Practice settings (schools vs. private practice)
- Who is qualified to provide certain services
- How to verify a license or credential
- I have not observed confusion

6. Where do people most often look for information about these professionals?

(Multiple Choice, Multiple Answer)

- Board or agency websites
- School or school district websites
- Health care provider or clinic websites
- Internet search (e.g., search engines)
- Social media (e.g., YouTube, Facebook groups)
- Referrals (school, doctor, employer)
- Directly from the provider
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure

7. What questions do you or others most often ask about these licenses or credentials?

(Open Text — general responses only; no case-specific examples)

8. Which types of consumer-centered resources or additional engagement opportunities would be most helpful in explaining these roles?

(Multiple Choice, Multiple Answer)

- Plain-language explanations
- FAQs
- Side-by-side comparison charts
- Short explainer videos
- Flowcharts (“Who does what”)
- Examples or scenarios illustrating when to seek each type of provider
- Working groups or stakeholder meetings
- Other (please specify)

From: [Tyler Rinde](#)
To: [Burke, Jonathan@DCA](mailto:Burke,Jonathan@DCA); [Mancilla, Jacklyn@DCA](mailto:Mancilla,Jacklyn@DCA)
Subject: SB 903 (Padilla) AI
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 3:06:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Jon and Jacklyn,

Hope this email finds you well. I just saw that SB 903 (Padilla) is on the agenda for the Board meeting on February 13th. CPA is a cosponsor of the bill alongside the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists and the California Behavioral Health Association. We would really appreciate the Board's support on the bill and will be at the meeting urging the Board to take a support position. Let me know if you have any questions as you are reading the bill, the background of it, and anything I can do to help as you prepare your analysis for the Board.

Sincerely,

Tyler Rinde (he/him)

Director of Government Affairs | California Psychological Association
1231 I St, Suite 204 | Sacramento, CA 95814
trinde@cpapsych.org | www.cpapsych.org | facebook.com/cpapsych

CPA – The Voice of Psychology in California



Register by February 27th! It's FREE!

CPA's 2026 Lobby Day
March 17-18, 2026 | Sacramento, CA

www.cpapsych.org/event/2026LobbyDay

 CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CPA is the voice of psychology at the Capitol!

The banner features a photograph of the California State Capitol building on the left. The main text is in white and green on a dark blue background. A yellow starburst graphic on the right contains the slogan 'CPA is the voice of psychology at the Capitol!'.

From: [Ashley Rodriguez](#)
To: bopmail@DCA
Subject: Public Comment for Board Meeting 2/13/26
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 6:51:01 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello,

I would like to make a public comment for inclusion in the 2/13/26 Board Meeting in relation to the Integrated EPPP.

As an advanced graduate student currently studying for the existing EPPP and not set to take the exam until early 2028 I have significant concerns about the exam changing and me studying for the wrong exam at this time. I hope the state of California Psychology Board will stand up for its stakeholders and push back on the implementation timeline for the "Integrated EPPP." Areas in which I am concerned and are unaddressed by ASPPB:

- 1) Cost - nobody can tell us how much this test will cost. Budgeting is a serious concern for graduate students and any increase in cost will take months to account for. Finding out the cost a year before the exam goes live is unacceptable.
- 2) Timing - My hope and expectation was to take this exam when I finished up my coursework. The new exam format suggests it will not be able to be taken until postdoc at the earliest. This is highly concerning.
- 3) Content - There is not sufficient time to study for this exam. The exam is being written now and there are no materials to study for an exam that doesn't exist. While ASPPB may be able to put together a test in a year, students cannot be expected to adequately prepare for the test when all of our mentors, professors, and colleagues can only advise on the existing exam. We need more time to prepare than ASPPB is set to allow.
- 4) Validity of the exam. As far as we know zero questions have been written and this is supposed to be launched next year??? It's insane. Please please push back on this. In the past any exam changes were rolled out over several years, with longer Beta Test periods and opportunities for re-evaluating the exam content. The proposed timeline does not allow for this needed revision process.
- 5) Lack of transparency - ASPPB moved to screening their Town Halls for students and providers. Instead of allowing public questions they screened their chat, cherry picked easy questions to answer and refused to allow individuals to speak or see the comments of others as they steamrolled ahead with these changes. This was not an opportunity for feedback and we have serious concerns the JTA will be enacted similarly. This organization has stopped working for the public or state boards which is why it has authority in the first place.

Myself and my colleagues have been watching previous board meetings and it is clear that you

all share these beliefs from a regulatory and practical standpoint. ASPPB has a history of bulldozing state boards in their pursuit of arbitrary timelines and only back down from them when state boards stand up for the general public and their future Psychologists (e.g., EPPP Part-2). Please continue to stand up for those of us that are anxious and angry about these changes and feel powerless to impact change. We need your help.

You represent 25% of licensed psychologists in this country. **If you say "No" to the proposed timeline, ASPPB will have no choice but to listen and other states will follow.** You can enact change and I hope that you do.

Thank you for your support and consideration of this public comment.

Sincerely,
Ashley Rodriguez

From: [Connie Johnshoy-Currie](#)
To: bopmail@DCA
Subject: BOP meeting 2/13/26
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 3:35:01 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Jonathan Burke,

I appreciate receiving a copy of the agenda for the meeting. I am in a training all day, and will not be able to listen in via webcast. However, I would like to learn how to do that in the future.

I would like to speak up and make my preference known that I would greatly appreciate it if California would join PSYPACT.

There are humanitarian concerns happening in various states that I have a strong desire to support and provide emergency humanitarian services. If we were a member, as a licensed psychologist in California, I would be able to participate in these humanitarian efforts.

My message to the board, is to please consider a positive decision of joining PSYPACT, so that licensed psychologists in California are able to assist clients with humanitarian crises in other member states.

Sincerely yours,

Connie

A licensed psychologist in California since 1986

Connie Johnshoy-Currie, Psy.D.

Licensed Psychologist PSY9530

A developmental holistic psychologist

Brainspotting certified, Brainspotting subcortical brain- and body-based psychotherapy,

Brainspotting Approved Consultant, and Approved Brainspotting Specialty Workshop Presenter

EMDR Certified, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing, EMDRIA Approved Consultant

DBR Deep Brain Reorienting Level 1 and 2

Core Gift Discovery Master Facilitator

EFT Emotional Freedom Technique Level 1 and 2



The documents accompanying this email are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that law strictly prohibits any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of

these documents. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately.