



Licensed Mental Health Services Provider Education Program

Board of Psychology Overview

Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI)
February 13, 2026

Contents

Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI) Overview

- Licensed Mental Health Services Provider Education Program (LMH) Overview
- Eligible Professions
- Eligible Practice Sites
- Board of Psychology Fund Balance
- LMH Budget Overview
- FY 2025-26 LMH Awards Summary
- FY 2025-26 Board of Psychology Awards Summary
- Other HCAI Programs for Psychologists
- Application and How to Apply
- Contact Us

HCAI's Vision and Mission



Vision

A healthier California where all receive equitable, affordable, and quality health care.

Mission

HCAI expands equitable access to quality, affordable health care for all Californians through resilient facilities, actionable information, and the health workforce each community needs.

Licensed Mental Health Services Provider Education Program (LMH) Overview

- Established in 2007 to increase the supply of mental health professionals practicing in mental health professional shortage areas and qualified facilities.
- Grantees must commit to providing a 12-month service obligation at a qualifying facility in either an eligible facility type and/or geographic area where they will need to provide 32 hours or more per week of direct client care.
- The maximum award amount for LMH is \$15,000.00.

LMH Eligible Professions

LMH applicants must be currently licensed and/or certified, and practicing in one of the following professions:

- Associate or Licensed Clinical Social Worker
- Associate or Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist
- Associate or Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor
- Licensed or Waivered Psychologist
- Postdoctoral Psychological Assistant
- Postdoctoral Psychological Trainee

LMH Eligible Practice Sites

For a facility to be eligible, it must be in one of the following eligible geographic or site designations:

- Health Professional Shortage Area-Mental Health (HPSA-MH)
- A publicly funded facility
- A public mental health facility
- A non-profit private mental health facility that contracts with a county mental health entity
- Children's Hospital
- Correctional Facility
- County Health Facility
- Public School Facility
- State-Operated Health Facility
- Substance Use Disorder Facility
- Veteran's Facility
- Clinics providing reproductive health related services

Board of Psychology Fund Balance

- As of December 2025 we have approximately \$97,646.00 in licensure fees that have been deposited from the Board of Psychology into the Mental Health Practitioner Education Fund.
- Funds deposited into the Mental Health Practitioner Education Fund from Board of Psychology and Board of Behavioral Sciences are used to provide awards and to cover administrative costs.
- Eligible Licensed Mental Health professions may be awarded using funds from the Mental Health Practitioner Education Fund. Other eligible professions, **must** be awarded using other supplemental funds.

LMH Budget Overview

Program	Funding Source	Available Funding FY 2025-26	Available Funding FY 2026-27
Licensed Mental Health Services Provider Education Program (LMHSPEP)	Mental Health Practitioner Education Fund: \$20 licensing fee through Board of Psychology and Board of Behavioral Science	\$693,000.00	\$693,000.00

LMH Awards Summary FY 2025-26

Program	Number of Applications Received	Number of Awards	Available Funding	Amount Awarded
Licensed Mental Health Services Provider Education Program (LMHSPEP)	977*	46	\$ 693,000.00	\$ 690,918.00

*Of the total applications received, not all applicants were eligible.

Board of Psychology Awards Summary

Fiscal Year	Number of Applications Received	Number of Applications Awarded	Available Funding	Amount Awarded
FY 2024-25	29	16	\$204,540.00	\$204,540.00
FY 2025-26	49	17	\$234,040.00	\$234,040.00
Total	78	33	\$438,580.00	\$438,580.00

Other HCAI Programs for Psychologists

Loan Repayment Programs

- **State Loan Repayment Program (Application cycle is currently closed and will open in July 2026).**
 - Health Service Psychologist
- **Medi-Cal Behavioral Health Student Loan Repayment Program (Application cycle is scheduled to open in mid-2026)**
 - Licensed Clinical Psychologist
 - Psychology Associate

Scholarship Programs

- **Medi-Cal Behavioral Health Scholarship Program (Application cycle opens February 2, 2026 and closes March 16, 2026).**
 - Licensed Clinical Psychologist

LMH Application

During the application cycle, Applicants must:

- Complete an on-line application through the web-based eApp (<https://funding.hcai.ca.gov/>)
- Include the following documents
 - Employment Verification Form
 - Lender Statement
 - Conflict of Interest Letter (**if applicable**)
 - Proof of licensure and/or certification

QUESTIONS?

Please email: HWDD-LRP@hcai.ca.gov



Thank You!

For further questions, please contact:

HWDD-LRP@hcai.ca.gov

Interested in subscribing to our mailing list?

Please visit:

<https://hcai.ca.gov/mailing-list/>

Email; jonathan.burke@dca.ca.gov January 6, 2026

William D. Stevens

[REDACTED]
Fresno, California 93711

[REDACTED] (h) / [REDACTED] (c)
[REDACTED]

Re: EPPP/CPLÉE Requirements
California Board of Psychology
Time Restriction

Attention: Mr. Burke

I enjoyed our phone conversation on December 12th. I feel the issue concerning my Daughter-in-Law was well covered until I received further information. It seems that California has limited the years to pass the EPPP and the CPLÉE tests to 6 as opposed to 15 years elsewhere. Her deadline is February 15, 2026. She has been a registered psychological associate and doing therapy and assessments as such. She is currently having to hire her possible replacement, train that person, then oversee their work. Where is the blind stupidity in that? She is no IDiot and the chance that due to blind sight she is unable to pull the right levers to pass your Right of Passage exam is short sighted on the California Board of Psychology part. I know that to some of your Mentors who would say 'it's all relative'; you can dismiss this as a conundrum. But it is reality to the 62 plus percent that do not pass the tests in California. She graduated from Alliant International University. According to my research, it is well accredited by the APA.

I highly recommend you do away with the 6 year as well as a the 15 year process. If you are unable to digest the problem, the State has, as to percent passing rate, then give the no time limit to the passage. Some respectful Psychologist might say that family life, health and various other situations could interfere with the testing process. I know that your nose may not be beautiful and that it may be broken or continuously run. What you were born with, interfaced with or the environment around you has affected it. Don't cut off your noses despite your decision makers Egos. Hopefully shifting to their Superego.

Here is the hyperlink to open for my argument basis [EPPP Data](#)

Sincerely,

William D. Stevens

1972 Bachelor of Architecture

1979 Registered Architect, California

1981 NCARB Certified

Please confirm receipt via return email.

From: [Janet Farrell](#)
To: bopmail@DCA
Subject: Written Comment for Friday, Feb 13, 2026, Board of Psychology meeting, Agenda Item 11d - EPPP Update
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 12:55:55 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](#)

According to Jonathan Burke's written summary of his conversation with the Executive Officer of the Texas Board of Examiners of Psychologists, Texas's proposed timeline for the development of an alternative licensing examination in psychology is 2029. This timeline is not incompatible with a realistic timeline for the development and implementation of ASPPB's IEPPP. Although ASPPB initially proposed the end of 2027 as their goal, the myriad problems that have been exposed in the IEPPP make that timeline wholly unrealistic. This means that the California BoP will likely have the ability to compare the two proposed licensing examinations before deciding which one to adopt.

I am urging the California Board of Psychology not to be hasty in entering into a contractual agreement with either vendor. Time is on your side. You do not need to be reminded that, as the Psychology Board of one of the largest jurisdictions in North America, you hold the power to determine what licensing exam best serves the California consumers. Neither the ASPPB nor the developers of Texas's proposed licensing exam have that power or responsibility.

Janet Farrell, Ph.D.

From: [David Jimenez](#)
To: [DCA, BOPCE@DCA](mailto:DCA_BOPCE@DCA)
Subject: January 30, 2026 meeting comment.
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 11:49:15 AM

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](#)

Greetings:

An interesting meeting and I hope that someone actually reads this-

With regard to the 'Stakeholder' survey designed to educate the general public regarding roles of clinical psychologists, LMFTs, educational psychologists, life coaches: If the general public is confused it is because we/BOP have not been effective in communicating what we do vs. other 'helping' professions. We are obviously and for many years been losing 'market share' because of more aggressive and successful marketing by other professions. We further have been ineffective in defining what makes our profession unique in comparison to our competition, and of course insurance companies go to the lowest 'psychotherapy hour', thus LMFTs, without consideration of training, knowledge, etc. The continuing challenge/task is in protecting the public by requiring stringent licensing requirements, thereby reducing the population of licensed psychologists (and some applicants that are not suited). The irony remains the unanticipated impact in a reduction in market share for patients coupled with a more limited population of licensed psychologists, which may have been predicted, all competing for a declining professional hourly fee.

In another career in Indiana before my licensure in California in 1988, and my relocation in 1984, I was trained in formative evaluation by the head evaluator/Robert Wolfe at the Smithsonian during my doctoral years at Indiana University, Bloomington at The Center for Evaluation. One identifies first the ultimate goal one wishes to reach, and then works backwards to identify the data needed to inform that goal. A 13-item, or 8-item survey will be of limited use. Further a different survey for each of the stakeholders, BBS, etc. will lead to data collection that then will not be able to be collapsed between stakeholder groups into meaningful information because of how the question may have been asked. Just saying...

Dr. David J. Jimenez / PSY10629

Custody Care, Inc.