



1625 North Market Blvd.
Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830
TDD (916) 332-1700
Fax (916) 574-8625
www.bbs.ca.gov

MEETING NOTICE

Planning Committee October 24, 2007

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 North Market Blvd.
El Dorado Room N-220
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

- I. Introductions
- II. Accept Minutes as Submitted by Staff for the Communications Committee Meeting on January 10, 2007
- III. Budget Review
- IV. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Fee Reduction Alternatives and Funding for Loan Repayment Program
- V. Update on Board Outreach Activities
- VI. Strategic Plan Update
- VII. Draft Strategic Plan Objective 1.7 to Increase Board Member Effectiveness
- VIII. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda
- IX. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Public Comment on items of discussion will be taken during each item. The Chairperson will determine time limitations. Due to the convenience of the presenters, items may be heard out of the order listed on the Agenda. Times are approximate and subject to change. Action may be taken on any item listed on the Agenda.

THIS AGENDA AS WELL AS BOARD MEETING MINUTES CAN BE FOUND ON THE BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES WEBSITE AT www.bbs.ca.gov

NOTICE: The meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. Please make requests for accommodations to the attention of Christina Kitamura at the Board of Behavioral Sciences, 1625 N. Market Boulevard, Suite S-200, Sacramento, CA 95834, or by phone at 916-574-7835, no later than one week prior to the meeting. If you have any questions please contact the Board at (916) 574-7830.



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

State of California

State and Consumer
Services Agency

Department of
Consumer Affairs

Blank Page

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Mona Maggio
Board of Behavioral Sciences

Telephone: (916) 574-7863

Subject: Introductions

The Planning Committee was formed as part of a reorganization of the Board's committees. This committee was given express responsibility for overseeing the specific goals and objectives of the Board's strategic plan as well as a general jurisdiction over the Board's budget, communication and outreach efforts.

Committee Members:

Judy Johnson
D'Karla Leach

Blank Page

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Mona Maggio
Board of Behavioral Sciences

Telephone: (916) 574-7863

Subject: **Accept Minutes as Submitted by Staff for the Communications Committee Meeting on January 10, 2007**

The Committee is asked to review and accept the minutes of the former Communications Committee.

Blank Page

**Meeting Minutes
Communications Committee
January 10, 2007**

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 N Market Boulevard, El Dorado Room
Sacramento, CA 95834

Member Present

Joan Walmsley, Chair, LCSW Member
Victor Law, Public Member
D'Karla Leach, Public Member
Victor Perez, Public Member

Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Paul Riches, Executive Officer
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer
Stephen Sodergren, Program Manager
Sean O'Connor, Public Outreach Coordinator
Rosanna Webb-Flores, Enforcement Analyst
Lynne Stiles, IT Analyst
Christy Berger, Legislation Analyst
Justin Sotelo, Regulation Analyst
Kari Frank, Licensing and Exam Analyst
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant
George Ritter, Legal Counsel

Guest List

On File

The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:07 p.m. Christina Kitamura called the roll, and a quorum was established.

I. Introductions

Joan Walmsley, Committee Chair, welcomed guests to the meeting. Audience and staff introduced themselves.

II. Presentation by Lindle Hatton of Hatton Management Consultants Regarding Strategic Planning Process.

Lindle Hatton of Hatton Management Consultants introduced himself and gave a brief background. Dr. Hatton worked with the Board on its previous strategic plan, and is now working with the Board to update the strategic plan.

Dr. Hatton presented the strategic planning process to the Committee. He also reviewed the upcoming plan to meet with the staff in February and August, and gave his expectations of the Board members during this process.

Dr. Hatton explained that he uses an expanded approach using multiple constituencies, engaging as many internal and external stakeholders as possible. To do that, the model approach is to follow the state's strategic planning guidelines, consistent with the Governor's office and the Department of Finance. That model consists of four driving questions: (1) Where are we now? (2) Where do we want to go? (3) How do we want to get there? (4) How do we measure progress? We are now moving into the first phase of scanning the environment. Previous discussions with Mr. Riches and Ms. Maggio involved developing a list of key stakeholders who have an interest in the Board and with a working knowledge of the Board. Dr. Hatton received a list of 91 stakeholders, 52 of which are external.

Dr. Hatton stated that the strategic planning process was last performed 23 months ago, and there was a very nominal response from stakeholders. They are working to get a greater response by expanding the list and using the Internet. The survey is designed in two primary segments. The first is regarding the Board's organizational effectiveness, consisting of approximately 25 questions rated on a scale of one to five, then five open-ended questions, the first asking about the accomplishments of the Board over the past two years, the other four speak to the SWOT Analysis: strengths and weaknesses that may limit the Board's effectiveness, opportunities the Board should be prepared to pursue, and the threats that might limit the Board.

The survey will be sent out soon with a two-week response deadline. Dr. Hatton will be meeting with all Board staff on February 7th and 20th, where the survey responses will be reviewed. Management and Board members will initially review the responses and have the opportunity to provide feedback, then it will go to staff for prioritization of themes. Those themes should be able to fit into existing goals, or staff will need to create new goals. This is also an appropriate time to revisit the mission statement. In May, the Board will have a focused working session with Dr. Hatton to review the vision, mission and themes based upon data collected from the surveys and how they align with current goals, and will take new suggestions. The objectives this time are to have a more robust data and to have more staff involvement than last time.

Dr. Hatton explained that all information collected from stakeholders would be kept confidential. The Board has a two-year contract with him to allow training and assistance to staff for actualization and accountability on an ongoing basis, at least quarterly. He would have a more hands-on role in creating work action plans. As tasks are aligned with people responsible for those tasks, we will create a forum for them to return and report on progress. He would like to do that by having staff report personally to the Board, as he feels it is important to send a strong message to staff that the Board is interested in what they are doing. It also gives them an opportunity to interact with the Board in a more formal level, and for staff development purposes.

III. Strategic Plan Goal #1 – Communicate Effectively With the Public and Mental Health Professionals - Report on Progress

Mona Maggio provided Strategic Plan Objective updates.

Objective 1.1 - Provide Six Educational Opportunities for Stakeholders and Staff on BBS Budget by July 30, 2006. This objective has been met.

Objective 1.2 - Distribute a Handbook Outlining Licensing Requirements by December 31, 2006 to 100% of California Schools Offering Qualifying Degrees. Staff has completed the first draft of the Student Handbooks created for student in marriage and family therapy and social work programs. This item is covered in depth under agenda item VI.

Objective 1.3 – Distribute Consumer Publication Regarding Professions Licensed by the Board by June 30, 2007. As part of the continuing development of an Outreach Program, the Board contracted with BP Cubed, a public relations firm to assist in the development of brochures, handouts, PowerPoint presentations and restructuring of the Board's Web site, as well as identify the Board's primary constituency groups and their needs. BP Cubed is performing a communication audit of the Board's current materials that are distributed to the public and conducting a thorough review of the Board's Website to assist in its redesign.

BP Cubed meets on an ongoing basis with the Board's Outreach Coordinator, Sean O'Connor, and has made a presentation before the Communications Committee in September 2006 and before the Board at its November 2006 meeting.

Objective 1.4 – Achieve 60% on Customer Service Satisfaction Surveys by June 30, 2008. At the March 29, 2006 meeting, the Communications Committee reviewed and provided edits to the draft surveys. Each survey was designed to attain comment from the Board's various stakeholders. The survey can be accessed on the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS) web site. Since the survey became available on the web site, approximately 268 responses have been submitted. Beginning in September 2006 Licensing Evaluators began mailing out the licensing survey with all registration and initial license packets. Enforcement Analysts are mailing out an enforcement survey when a complaint reaches a conclusion. The General Survey is available for request by phone and at the front counter. Outreach surveys are also be available at schools and consumer outreach events.

Objective 1.5 – Participate Four Times Each Year in Mental Health Public Outreach Events Through June 30, 2010.

We're still trying to identify outreach events; however, staff has attended a number of events, including the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Conference, the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT) Conference, and the Board-hosted conference on diversity.

Events scheduled for 2007

- April 26–27, 2007 Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) Annual Conference in Mobile, Alabama
- May 4–5, 2007 NASW Annual Conference in San Francisco
- May 17-19, 2007 CAMFT Annual Conference in Santa Clara

Mr. O'Connor added that the 3rd Annual Consumer Protection Day will take place in March 2007, and BBS staff will participate in the event. This event is sponsored by the County of San Diego. It focuses on consumer protection and enforcement in the areas of fraud and identity theft.

Objective 1.6 – Review and Revise Website Content Four Times Per Year. the website is going through a major web revision. This will be discussed more in depth under agenda item VII.

Objective 1.7 – Student Outreach. Staff determined that the success of the Board's Student Outreach Program warranted consideration for the adoption of a new student outreach objective to the Strategic Plan. At its May 18, 2006 meeting, the Board adopted this new objective. Mr. O'Connor set a goal of 25 student presentations and has met that goal. Mr. O'Connor indicated that schools have been contacting him regarding their interests in the presentations. The challenge for the upcoming year is scheduling the presentations considering the high demand. This will be discussed under agenda item IX.

IV. Review of Pamphlet *A Consumer's Guide, What Can the Board Do For Me?*

Rosanna Webb-Flores, Enforcement Analyst, presented this item. The Committee previously discussed the development of a brochure for licensees and consumers explaining the complaint handling process, investigation, and disciplinary action. The Board currently has a consumer brochure, *A Consumer's Guide, What Can the Board Do For Me*, which it distributes upon receipt of inquiries from consumers and licensees regarding the complaint process. The brochure has not been updated. Staff took a look at the language and made some updates.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of CAMFT, provided some editorial revisions. Fourth paragraph under *How Do I File a Complaint?*, she suggested changing "Authorization Release" to "Authorization for Release." She also suggested under Investigations to strike the word "more." On the last sentence under Referral to the Attorney General, Ms. Riemersma suggested changing language to "administrative hearing to be scheduled." On the second to last sentence under Administrative Hearings, she suggested changing the language to "you will receive."

Mr. O'Connor suggested omitting "MFT and LCSW Corporations" from the first paragraph.

V. BP Cubed Deliverables Update

Mr. O'Connor reported BP Cubed is a public relations firm located in Sacramento, California. The BBS contracts with BP Cubed for communications and public relations services. BP Cubed is currently developing a second batch of logos for Board Member approval. Upon approval of the Board, the BBS logo will be used to develop branding. The logo will be used on the BBS website, on letterhead, and on BBS publications. Staff is requesting the Committee to review the sample logo designs and make a recommendation to take forward to the Board or return to BP Cubed for further logo options.

BP Cubed is currently working with BBS staff on revising the BBS website. The project's goal is to make the website more "user friendly." The revision encompasses both the content and organization of the website.

On January 29, 2007, Jairo Moncada, a BP Cubed account representative, will accompany Mr. O'Connor for a presentation on the BBS licensure process to MSW students at UC Berkeley. The purpose of Mr. Moncada's visit is to review Mr. O'Connor's presentation and offer suggestions for improvement.

BP Cubed created a draft layout for the new BBS Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) and Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) Student Handbooks.

Ms. Maggio shared staff's top two choices of logo designs. After brief discussion, the Committee agreed with staff's choices. The Committee agreed to bring the two logo designs forward to the Board.

Mr. O'Connor presented the Communications Plan. He spoke on the "Recruitment / Branding" term used in the document, stating that the Board had concerns about the "recruitment" terminology. The term is not representative of what was included in the Communications Plan, and chose to omit that terminology. Another change throughout the document was the term "patients" to "clients." Mr. O'Connor added that this is a living document and can be updated as needed.

Mr. Riches stated that the next step is to bring this forward to the Board for adoption.

VI. Review Student Handbook Drafts

Mr. O'Connor reported on the student handbook drafts. As part of the Board's Strategic Plan Goal #1, Communicate Effectively With the Public and Mental Health Professionals, the Board identified a need to provide students and educators with an outline of examination and licensing requirements to assist students in their education and career development.

Staff has drafted two handbooks, one for students in marriage and family therapy programs and the other for students in social work programs. A handbook for educational psychology students is currently being researched. The basis for the handbooks comes from the Board's "Frequently Asked Questions" information and the questions and comments received during student presentations.

The handbooks give the students detailed information as well as "quick tips" to guide them along their way to licensure.

Ms. Walmsley suggested clarification on client contact hours, with explanation and examples provided.

Ms. Riemersma will provide Mr. O'Connor with additional edits.

VII. Website Redesign Update

Lynne Stiles presented an update on the website design and gave a visual presentation of the new design and layout. She reported that the web site will be going through a re-design. The revision of the BBS website will serve two functions. The first, will allow the BBS to meet the needs identified in the Board's customer satisfaction survey. The second will allow the BBS to comply with the mandatory website standards. Currently the State of California is implementing new state standards for all state governmental websites. The standards involve new backend programming, a requirement to meet accessibility standards under Government Code Section 508, as well as making usability, content and organization of state agency website's consistent.

Staff and BP Cubed have been meeting to discuss this project. The group has discussed website organization, color schemes, and key themes for the project.

Mr. Riches stated that the changes to the website will make the website easier to manage, and easier for the target audience to access information easily.

VIII. Review Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Mr. O'Connor reported that in June 2006, the BBS implemented a customer satisfaction survey accessible from the BBS website. Since August 2006, licensing evaluators have been sending out a Licensing Survey to all new registrants and exam candidates, and Enforcement analysts have been sending out a survey to all newly closed cases. Objective 1.4 of the BBS Strategic Plan sets a goal of 60% customer satisfaction by June 30, 2008. A satisfied customer is a person who indicates a rating of either Excellent or Good in his or her survey response.

Since implementation, website survey responses have indicated an overall satisfaction level either at or exceeding 60%. The goal has been met.

In recent months, responses to the website survey indicate an increased level of satisfaction with customer service. For the month of November, overall customer satisfaction was 75%.

When factoring in all responses to the website survey since implementation in June 2006, the overall satisfaction is 61%.

Accessibility statistics have risen from 54% for June 12, 2006 – August 31, 2006, to 68% for November 1, 2006 – November 30, 2006. Responsiveness satisfaction has also risen from 57% for June 12, 2006 – August 31, 2006 to 66% for November 1, 2006 – November 30, 2006. Satisfaction with staff knowledge and courtesy has consistently hovered between the high 60 to low 70 percentiles since implementation of the survey.

Overall satisfaction on the Licensing Survey as of October 31, 2006 is 82%.

The BBS has received only 20 responses to the Enforcement Survey. Due to the aforementioned personnel changes, the Enforcement statistical data is not available at this time.

Ms. Walmsley requested to see the comments on the surveys in the future.

IX. Review Board of Behavioral Sciences Outreach Program

Mr. O'Connor reported that outreach program experienced its first full year of operation in 2006, which was a successful first year. The goal was to visit 30 schools, and staff has exceeded that goal. Staff and Board Members attended a variety of events throughout the year. The upcoming challenge will be scheduling time for future presentations and not excluding any schools from the outreach events. Mr. O'Connor encouraged Board member participation in the presentations.

Victor Law stated that he will attend the presentation at the University of Southern California.

X. Review Examination Unit Statistics

Kari Frank, Licensing Analyst, briefly presented the examination unit statistics provided.

XI. Discuss Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Topics

Ms. Maggio reported that in the interest of easing scheduling for both Committee members and public participants, it would be useful to set future meeting dates for the Committee. Meetings should occur approximately halfway between regularly scheduled Board meetings. This allows staff to work on items to bring forward to the Committee for review and make recommendations to forward those items to the Board or send them back to staff for additional revision or further research.

Ms. Maggio suggested scheduling this Committee on the same days as the Consumer Protection Committee. The following dates and locations were suggested:

- Wednesday, April 11, 2007 in Orange County
- Wednesday, June 27, 2007 in Sacramento
- Wednesday, September 26, 2007 in the Los Angeles or San Diego area.

The Committee agreed to the proposed dates and locations.

Ms. Maggio requested suggestions for future agenda items. No suggestions for future agenda items were presented.

The Committee adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

Blank Page

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Paula Gershon
Budget Analyst

Telephone: (916) 574-7838

Subject: Budget Reports

Attached are the budget reports for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 2008:

- The 2007/2008 Expenditure Report
- The 2007/2008 Fund Condition

These reports will be discussed at the Planning Committee Meeting on October 24, 2007.

Blank Page

BBS EXPENDITURE REPORT FY 2007/2008

OBJECT DESCRIPTION	FY 2007/08				
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES	BUDGET ALLOTMENT	CURRENT AS OF 08/31/07	PROJECTIONS TO YEAR END	UNENCUMBERED BALANCE
PERSONAL SERVICES					
Salary & Wages (Civ Svc Perm)	1,186,425	1,447,786	210,829	1,367,000	80,786
Salary & Wages (Stat Exempt)	90,530	88,349	15,188	95,000	(6,651)
Temp Help (907)(Seasonals)	65,333	14,105	6,328	75,478	(61,373)
Temp Help (915)(Proctors)	0	19,444	0	0	19,444
Board Memb (Per Diem)	13,800	12,900	600	14,000	(1,100)
Overtime	6,796	7,533	831	6,500	1,033
Totals Staff Benefits	518,584	604,919	92,994	587,875	17,044
Salary Savings		(62,556)			(62,556)
TOTALS, PERSONAL SERVICES	1,881,468	2,132,480	326,770	2,145,853	(13,373)
OPERATING EXP & EQUIP					
Fingerprint Reports	4,204	36,954	956	4,204	32,750
General Expense	57,136	24,629	4,260	56,000	(31,371)
Printing	95,790	96,393	271	95,790	603
Communication	8,797	24,329	101	8,800	15,529
Postage	143,640	110,435	13,398	125,000	(14,565)
Travel, In State	110,103	61,255	1,004	110,000	(48,745)
Travel, Out-of-State	2,141	2,700	0	2,700	0
Training	10,796	18,082	5,041	11,000	7,082
Facilities Operations	168,954	201,808	26,536	190,000	11,808
C&P Services - Interdept.	0	13,863	0	0	13,863
C&P Services-External Contracts	42,511	10,188	14,500	155,355	(145,167)
DEPARTMENTAL PRORATA					
DP Billing	277,890	403,908	0	403,908	0
Indirect Distribution Costs	268,389	296,635	0	296,635	0
Communication/Educ. Division	10,447	14,929	0	14,929	0
D of I Prorata	7,154	13,056	0	13,056	0
Consumer Relations Division	10,918	11,886	0	11,886	0
OPP Support Services	448	0	0	450	(450)
Interagency Services (OER IACs)	269,368	227,419	0	260,018	(32,599)
Consolidated Data Services	2,385	22,626	0	2,500	20,126
Data Proc (Maint,Supplies,Cont)	11,231	4,897	2,798	4,897	0
Statewide Pro Rata	141,971	193,601	0	193,601	0
EXAM EXPENSES					
Exam Site Rental	89,604	92,456	17,562	92,000	456
Exam Contract (PSI) (404.00)	401,668	416,947	0	350,000	66,947
Expert Examiners (404.01)	248,673	274,000	116,919	250,000	24,000
ENFORCEMENT					
Attorney General	475,170	443,542	130,268	443,542	0
Office of Admin. Hearing	91,140	100,951	5,033	90,000	10,951
Court Reporters	22,842		97	22,000	(22,000)
Evidence/Witness Fees	30,785	66,198	5,986	35,000	31,198
Division of Investigation	70,028	392,654	0	392,654	0
Minor Equipment (226)	21,866	14,000	2,658	10,000	4,000
Equipment (Replace/Addit)	14,069	16,000	0	10,000	6,000
TOTAL, OE&E	3,110,118	3,606,341	347,388	3,655,925	(49,584)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	4,991,586	\$5,738,821	\$674,158	\$5,801,778	-\$62,957
Fingerprints	(3,762)	(24,000)	3,762	(3,762)	(20,238)
Other Reimbursements	(20,050)	(26,000)	20,050	(20,050)	(5,950)
Unscheduled Reimbursements	(24,820)	0	24,820	(24,820)	24,820
Total Reimbursements	(48,632)	(50,000)	49,592	(48,632)	(1,368)
NET APPROPRIATION	4,942,954	\$5,688,821	\$674,158	\$5,753,146	-\$64,325

CONTRACTS
- Hatton Mgmt.
\$10,218
- BPCubed
\$73,337
- COMIRA
\$48,800
- Applied Mgmt Svcs
\$23,000
TOTAL C&P CONTRACT
\$155,355

BLUE PRINT INDICATES THE ITEMS ARE SOMEWHAT DISCRETIONARY.

RED PRINT INDICATES AMOUNTS ARE UNKNOWN AT THIS TIME.

Blank Page

BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Analysis of Fund Condition

(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTE: \$6.0 Million General Fund Repayment Outstanding

	Actual 2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$ 5,368	\$ 6,273	\$ 6,250	\$ 5,488	\$ 4,760
Prior Year Adjustment	\$ 136	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL ADJUSTED RESERVES	\$ 5,504	\$ 6,273	\$ 6,250	\$ 5,488	\$ 4,760
REVENUES AND TRANSFERS					
Revenues:					
Fees	\$ 5,389	\$ 5,435	\$ 5,467	\$ 5,576	\$ 5,688
Interest	\$ 320	\$ 123	\$ 108	\$ 91	\$ 95
Totals, Revenues	\$ 5,709	\$ 5,558	\$ 5,575	\$ 5,667	\$ 5,783
Transfers from Other Funds					
F00683 Teale Data Center	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS	\$ 5,709	\$ 5,558	\$ 5,575	\$ 5,667	\$ 5,783
TOTAL RESOURCES	\$ 11,213	\$ 11,831	\$ 11,825	\$ 11,155	\$ 10,543
EXPENDITURES					
Disbursements:					
State Controller (State Operations)	\$ 3	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Program Expenditures (State Operations)	\$ 4,937	\$ 5,577	\$ 5,689	\$ 5,802	\$ 5,918
Projected Expenses			\$ 648	\$ 593	\$ 285
TOTA	\$ 4,940	\$ 5,581	\$ 6,337	\$ 6,395	\$ 6,203
FUND BALANCE					
Reserve for economic uncertainties	\$ 6,273	\$ 6,250	\$ 5,488	\$ 4,760	\$ 4,340
Months in Reserve	13.5	11.8	10.3	9.2	8.2

NOTES:

ASSUMES WORKLOAD AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS ARE REALIZED
EXPENDITURE GROWTH PROJECTED AT 2% BEGINNING FY 2008-09

Blank Page

**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FEE DECREASE**

at CURRENT fee level

REVENUE CATEGORIES	FEES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
MFT													
Initial License - MFT	\$130.00	945	964	983	1,003	1,023	1,043	1,064	1,086	1,107	1,129	1,152	1,175
Biennial Renewal	\$130.00	10,594	10,806	11,022	11,242	11,467	11,697	11,931	12,169	12,413	12,661	12,914	13,172
Inactive Renewal	\$65.00	2,348	2,395	2,443	2,492	2,542	2,592	2,644	2,697	2,751	2,806	2,862	2,919
LCSW													
Initial License - LCS	\$100.00	507	517	527	538	549	560	571	582	594	606	618	630
Biennial Renewal	\$100.00	6,255	6,380	6,508	6,638	6,771	6,906	7,044	7,185	7,329	7,475	7,625	7,777
Inactive Renewal	\$50.00	1,218	1,242	1,267	1,293	1,318	1,345	1,372	1,399	1,427	1,456	1,485	1,514
LEP													
Initial License - LEP	\$80.00	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	59	60	61	62	63
Biennial Renewal	\$80.00	749	764	779	795	811	827	843	860	878	895	913	931
Inactive Renewal	\$40.00	118	120	123	125	128	130	133	136	138	141	144	147

Note: Assumes a 2% increase in Workload.

at CURRENT fees

REVENUE CATEGORIES	FEES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
MFT													
Initial License - MFT		\$ 122,850	\$ 125,307	\$ 127,813	\$ 130,369	\$ 132,977	\$ 135,636	\$ 138,349	\$ 141,116	\$ 143,938	\$ 146,817	\$ 149,753	\$ 152,749
Biennial Renewal		\$ 1,377,220	\$ 1,404,764	\$ 1,432,860	\$ 1,461,517	\$ 1,490,747	\$ 1,520,562	\$ 1,550,973	\$ 1,581,993	\$ 1,613,633	\$ 1,645,905	\$ 1,678,823	\$ 1,712,400
Inactive Renewal		\$ 152,620	\$ 155,672	\$ 158,786	\$ 161,962	\$ 165,201	\$ 168,505	\$ 171,875	\$ 175,312	\$ 178,819	\$ 182,395	\$ 186,043	\$ 189,764
LCSW													
Initial License - LCS		\$ 50,700	\$ 51,714	\$ 52,748	\$ 53,803	\$ 54,879	\$ 55,977	\$ 57,096	\$ 58,238	\$ 59,403	\$ 60,591	\$ 61,803	\$ 63,039
Biennial Renewal		\$ 625,500	\$ 638,010	\$ 650,770	\$ 663,786	\$ 677,061	\$ 690,603	\$ 704,415	\$ 718,503	\$ 732,873	\$ 747,530	\$ 762,481	\$ 777,731
Inactive Renewal		\$ 60,900	\$ 62,118	\$ 63,360	\$ 64,628	\$ 65,920	\$ 67,239	\$ 68,583	\$ 69,955	\$ 71,354	\$ 72,781	\$ 74,237	\$ 75,721
LEP													
Initial License - LEP		\$ 4,080	\$ 4,162	\$ 4,245	\$ 4,330	\$ 4,416	\$ 4,505	\$ 4,595	\$ 4,687	\$ 4,780	\$ 4,876	\$ 4,973	\$ 5,073
Biennial Renewal		\$ 59,920	\$ 61,118	\$ 62,341	\$ 63,588	\$ 64,859	\$ 66,157	\$ 67,480	\$ 68,829	\$ 70,206	\$ 71,610	\$ 73,042	\$ 74,503
Inactive Renewal		\$ 4,720	\$ 4,814	\$ 4,911	\$ 5,009	\$ 5,109	\$ 5,211	\$ 5,315	\$ 5,422	\$ 5,530	\$ 5,641	\$ 5,754	\$ 5,869
REVENUE		\$ 2,458,510	\$ 2,507,680	\$ 2,557,834	\$ 2,608,990	\$ 2,661,170	\$ 2,714,394	\$ 2,768,682	\$ 2,824,055	\$ 2,880,536	\$ 2,938,147	\$ 2,996,910	\$ 3,056,848

BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
Analysis of Fund Condition (w/Current Fees)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Actual 2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
BEGIN. RESERVE, JULY 1	5,368	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,760	4,340	5,907	7,500	9,121	8,769	8,404
PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS	136										
TOTAL ADJUSTED RESERVES	5,504	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,760	4,340	5,907	7,500	9,121	8,769	8,404
REVENUE											
Fees	5,389	5,435	5,467	5,576	5,688	5,802	5,918	6,036	6,157	6,280	6,405
Interest	320	123	108	91	95	87	118	150	182	175	168
General Fund Payback						2,000	2,000	2,000			
TOTAL REV. AND TRANSFERS	5,709	5,558	5,575	5,667	5,783	7,888	8,036	8,186	6,339	6,455	6,574
TOTAL RESOURCES	11,213	11,831	11,825	11,156	10,544	12,229	13,943	15,686	15,460	15,224	14,978
EXPENDITURES											
Program Expenditures	4,937	5,577	5,689	5,802	5,918	6,037	6,157	6,281	6,406	6,534	6,665
Equity Claims (State Operations)	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Projected Expenses			648	593	285	285	285	285	285	285	285
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	4,940	5,581	6,337	6,395	6,203	6,322	6,442	6,566	6,691	6,819	6,950
RESERVE, JUNE 30	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,760	4,340	5,907	7,500	9,121	8,769	8,404	8,028
MONTHS IN RESERVE	13.5	11.8	10.3	9.2	8.2	11.0	13.7	16.4	15.4	14.5	14.2

NOTES:

A. WORKLOAD AND REVENUE PROJECTED AT 2%

B. EXPENDITURE GROWTH PROJECTED AT 2% BEGINNING 08/09

Fee Reduction - 10-year gradual \$20

REVENUE CATEGORIES	FEES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17
<u>MFT</u>													
Initial License - MFT	\$110.00	945	964	983	1,003	1,023	1,043	1,064	1,086	1,107	1,129	1,152	1,175
Biennial Renewal	\$110.00	10,594	10,806	11,022	11,242	11,467	11,697	11,931	12,169	12,413	12,661	12,914	13,172
Inactive Renewal	\$45.00	2,348	2,395	2,443	2,492	2,542	2,592	2,644	2,697	2,751	2,806	2,862	2,919
<u>LCSW</u>													
Initial License - LCS	\$80.00	507	517	527	538	549	560	571	582	594	606	618	630
Biennial Renewal	\$70.00	6,255	6,380	6,508	6,638	6,771	6,906	7,044	7,185	7,329	7,475	7,625	7,777
Inactive Renewal	\$30.00	1,218	1,242	1,267	1,293	1,318	1,345	1,372	1,399	1,427	1,456	1,485	1,514
<u>LEP</u>													
Initial License - LEP	\$60.00	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	59	60	61	62	63
Biennial Renewal	\$60.00	749	764	779	795	811	827	843	860	878	895	913	931
Inactive Renewal	\$20.00	118	120	123	125	128	130	133	136	138	141	144	147

Note: Assumes a 2% increase in Workload.

Fee Reduction - 10 year gradual \$20

Fee Reduction estimated to start 2009-10

REVENUE CATEGORIES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17
<u>MFT</u>												
Initial License - MFT			\$ 108,150	\$ 110,313	\$ 112,519	\$ 114,769	\$ 117,065	\$ 119,406	\$ 121,794	\$ 124,230	\$ 126,714	\$ 129,249
Biennial Renewal			\$ 1,212,420	\$ 1,236,668	\$ 1,261,401	\$ 1,286,630	\$ 1,312,362	\$ 1,338,609	\$ 1,365,382	\$ 1,392,689	\$ 1,420,543	\$ 1,448,954
Inactive Renewal			\$ 109,929	\$ 112,127	\$ 114,370	\$ 116,657	\$ 118,990	\$ 121,370	\$ 123,798	\$ 126,273	\$ 128,799	\$ 131,375
<u>LCSW</u>												
Initial License - LCS			\$ 42,199	\$ 43,043	\$ 43,903	\$ 44,782	\$ 45,677	\$ 46,591	\$ 47,523	\$ 48,473	\$ 49,442	\$ 50,431
Biennial Renewal			\$ 455,539	\$ 464,650	\$ 473,943	\$ 483,422	\$ 493,090	\$ 502,952	\$ 513,011	\$ 523,271	\$ 533,737	\$ 544,411
Inactive Renewal			\$ 38,016	\$ 38,777	\$ 39,552	\$ 40,343	\$ 41,150	\$ 41,973	\$ 42,812	\$ 43,669	\$ 44,542	\$ 45,433
<u>LEP</u>												
Initial License - LEP			\$ 3,184	\$ 3,247	\$ 3,312	\$ 3,378	\$ 3,446	\$ 3,515	\$ 3,585	\$ 3,657	\$ 3,730	\$ 3,805
Biennial Renewal			\$ 46,756	\$ 47,691	\$ 48,645	\$ 49,617	\$ 50,610	\$ 51,622	\$ 52,654	\$ 53,707	\$ 54,782	\$ 55,877
Inactive Renewal			\$ 2,455	\$ 2,504	\$ 2,555	\$ 2,606	\$ 2,658	\$ 2,711	\$ 2,765	\$ 2,820	\$ 2,877	\$ 2,934
REVENUE			\$2,018,647	\$2,059,019	\$2,100,200	\$2,142,204	\$2,185,048	\$2,228,749	\$2,273,324	\$2,318,790	\$2,365,166	\$2,412,469

Estimated Annual Revenue Decrease

\$ 539,187 \$ 549,971 \$ 560,970 \$ 572,190 \$ 583,634 \$ 595,306 \$ 607,212 \$ 619,357 \$ 631,744 \$ 644,379

Total Reduction \$ 5,903,951

BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

Analysis of Fund Condition (10- Year Gradual \$20 Fee Reduction)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Actual 2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
BEGIN. RESERVE, JULY 1	5,368	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,240	3,260	4,244	5,232	6,223	5,218	4,176
PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS	136										
TOTAL ADJUSTED RESERVES	5,504	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,240	3,260	4,244	5,232	6,223	5,218	4,176
REVENUE											
Fees	5,389	5,435	5,467	5,576	5,688	5,802	5,918	6,036	6,157	6,280	6,405
Proposed Fee Reduction				-539	-550	-561	-572	-584	-595	-607	-619
Interest	320	123	108	110	85	65	85	105	124	104	84
General Fund Payback						2,000	2,000	2,000			
TOTAL REV. AND TRANSFERS	5,709	5,558	5,575	5,147	5,223	7,306	7,431	7,557	5,686	5,777	5,870
TOTAL RESOURCES	11,213	11,831	11,825	10,636	9,463	10,565	11,674	12,788	11,909	10,995	10,046
EXPENDITURES											
Program Expenditures	4,937	5,577	5,689	5,802	5,918	6,037	6,157	6,281	6,406	6,534	6,665
Equity Claims (State Operations)	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Projected Expenses			648	593	285	285	285	285	285	285	285
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	4,940	5,581	6,337	6,395	6,203	6,322	6,442	6,566	6,691	6,819	6,950
RESERVE, JUNE 30	6,273	6,250	5,488	4,240	3,260	4,244	5,232	6,223	5,218	4,176	3,096
MONTHS IN RESERVE	13.5	11.8	10.3	8.2	6.2	7.9	9.6	11.2	9.2	7.2	5.5

NOTES:

A. WORKLOAD AND REVENUE PROJECTED AT 2%

B. EXPENDITURE GROWTH PROJECTED AT 2% BEGINNING 08/09

Fee Reduction - 10-year gradual \$40

REVENUE CATEGORIES	FEES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
MFT													
Initial License - MFT	\$90.00		1,050	1,071	1,092	1,114	1,137	1,159	1,182	1,206	1,230	1,255	1,280
Biennial Renewal	\$90.00		10,875	11,093	11,314	11,541	11,771	12,007	12,247	12,492	12,742	12,997	13,257
Inactive Renewal	\$25.00		2,155	2,198	2,242	2,287	2,333	2,379	2,427	2,475	2,525	2,575	2,627
LCSW													
Initial License - LCS	\$60.00		465	474	484	493	503	513	524	534	545	556	567
Biennial Renewal	\$60.00		6,035	6,156	6,279	6,404	6,532	6,663	6,796	6,932	7,071	7,212	7,357
Inactive Renewal	\$10.00		1,200	1,224	1,248	1,273	1,299	1,325	1,351	1,378	1,406	1,434	1,463
LEP													
Initial License - LEP	\$40.00		59	60	61	63	64	65	66	68	69	71	72
Biennial Renewal	\$40.00		685	699	713	727	741	756	771	787	803	819	835
Inactive Renewal	\$0.00		105	107	109	111	114	116	118	121	123	125	128

Note: Assumes a 2% increase in Workload.

Fee Reduction - 10 year gradual \$40

Fee Reduction estimated to start 2009-10

REVENUE CATEGORIES	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
MFT												
Initial License - MFT			\$96,390	\$98,318	\$100,284	\$102,290	\$104,336	\$106,422	\$108,551	\$110,722	\$112,936	\$115,195
Biennial Renewal			\$998,325	\$1,018,292	\$1,038,657	\$1,059,430	\$1,080,619	\$1,102,231	\$1,124,276	\$1,146,762	\$1,169,697	\$1,193,091
Inactive Renewal			\$54,953	\$56,052	\$57,173	\$58,316	\$59,482	\$60,672	\$61,885	\$63,123	\$64,386	\$65,673
LCSW												
Initial License - LCS			\$ 28,458	\$ 29,027	\$ 29,608	\$ 30,200	\$ 30,804	\$ 31,420	\$ 32,048	\$ 32,689	\$ 33,343	\$ 34,010
Biennial Renewal			\$ 369,342	\$ 376,729	\$ 384,263	\$ 391,949	\$ 399,788	\$ 407,783	\$ 415,939	\$ 424,258	\$ 432,743	\$ 441,398
Inactive Renewal			\$ 12,240	\$ 12,485	\$ 12,734	\$ 12,989	\$ 13,249	\$ 13,514	\$ 13,784	\$ 14,060	\$ 14,341	\$ 14,628
LEP												
Initial License - LEP			\$ 2,407	\$ 2,455	\$ 2,504	\$ 2,555	\$ 2,606	\$ 2,658	\$ 2,711	\$ 2,765	\$ 2,820	\$ 2,877
Biennial Renewal			\$ 27,948	\$ 28,507	\$ 29,077	\$ 29,659	\$ 30,252	\$ 30,857	\$ 31,474	\$ 32,103	\$ 32,746	\$ 33,400
Inactive Renewal			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
REVENUE			\$1,590,063	\$1,621,864	\$1,654,301	\$1,687,387	\$1,721,135	\$1,755,558	\$1,790,669	\$1,826,482	\$1,863,012	\$1,900,272

Estimated Annual Revenue Decrease

\$ 967,771 \$ 987,127 \$ 1,006,869 \$ 1,027,006 \$ 1,047,547 \$ 1,068,497 \$ 1,089,867 \$ 1,111,665 \$ 1,133,898 \$ 1,156,576

Total Reduction \$ 10,596,824

BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

Analysis of Fund Condition (10- Year Gradual \$40 Fee Reduction) with \$6M General Fund Loan Payback

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Actual 2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
BEGIN. RESERVE, JULY 1	5,368	6,273	6,250	5,488	3,792	2,365	2,885	3,391	3,880	2,355	772
PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS	136										
TOTAL ADJUSTED RESERVES	5,504	6,273	6,250	5,488	3,792	2,365	2,885	3,391	3,880	2,355	772
REVENUE											
Fees	5,389	5,435	5,467	5,576	5,688	5,801	5,917	6,036	6,156	6,279	6,405
Proposed Fee Reduction				-968	-987	-1,007	-1,027	-1,048	-1,068	-1,090	-1,112
Interest	320	123	108	91	76	47	58	68	78	47	15
General Fund Payback						2,000	2,000	2,000			
TOTAL REV. AND TRANSFERS	5,709	5,558	5,575	4,699	4,776	6,842	6,948	7,055	5,166	5,237	5,309
TOTAL RESOURCES	11,213	11,831	11,825	10,187	8,569	9,207	9,833	10,446	9,046	7,592	6,081
EXPENDITURES											
Program Expenditures	4,937	5,577	5,689	5,802	5,918	6,037	6,157	6,281	6,406	6,534	6,665
Equity Claims (State Operations)	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Projected Expenses			648	593	285	285	285	285	285	285	285
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	4,940	5,581	6,337	6,395	6,203	6,322	6,442	6,566	6,691	6,819	6,950
RESERVE, JUNE 30	6,273	6,250	5,488	3,792	2,365	2,885	3,391	3,880	2,355	772	(869)
MONTHS IN RESERVE	13.5	11.8	10.3	7.3	4.5	5.4	6.2	7.0	4.1	1.4	(1.6)

NOTES:

A. WORKLOAD AND REVENUE PROJECTED AT 2%

B. EXPENDITURE GROWTH PROJECTED AT 2% BEGINNING 08/09

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Sean O'Connor
Board of Behavioral Sciences

Telephone: (916) 574-7863

Subject: Update on Board Outreach Activities

The goal of the Board of Behavioral Sciences' outreach program is to provide information to consumers, licensees, registrants, and students. The Board's Outreach Coordinator, Sean O'Connor, and other staff attend conferences, create brochures, and offer presentations to various audiences.

Several Board members also participated in outreach events, including Joan Walmsley, Judy Johnson, Victor Law, and Ian Russ.

Summary of Student Outreach

As of September 24, 2007, Board staff has participated in 34 student outreach presentations. Based on satisfaction surveys completed at the conclusion of each presentation, over 500 marriage and family therapy and clinical social work students attended outreach presentations this year.

The feedback received on the satisfaction indicated, overwhelmingly, that students and school faculty appreciate this level of service. All responses indicated a level of satisfaction of either "Excellent" or "Good." Comments on the forms praised the Board staff's demeanor, tone, and ability to answer questions concisely.

Summary of Agency Outreach

As of September 24, 2007, Board staff has participated in five (5) presentations at mental health agencies in the state. These presentations target supervisors and licensure candidates who are further along in the licensing process. Board staff received positive feedback from those in attendance.

Summary of Conference Participation

Board staff participated in six (6) conferences in 2007. Participation in these conferences usually involves Board staff answering questions and passing out literature at a booth.

Several Board members participated at these conferences, including Judy Johnson, Joan Walmsley, and Ian Russ.

Outreach in 2008

Objective 1.6 of the Board's strategic plan requires participation in 45 outreach events per year. The Board easily met that goal this year.

Considering the positive response to the Board's outreach program, staff anticipates meeting that objective in 2008. Most campuses express an interest in having an event every year. Sean O'Connor is training additional Board staff members to prepare them for participation in the Board's outreach program.

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Mona Maggio
Board of Behavioral Sciences

Telephone: (916) 574-7841

Subject: Strategic Plan Update

The Board initialized its strategic planning process in early 2007 when the Board contracted with Hatton and Associates for a two-year period to guide the planning process and to serve as a resource throughout the plan's implementation.

Initial steps included the staff's review of the Board's 2005 Strategic Plan to determine the objectives that had been met. A Strategic Initiative Survey was sent to internal and external stakeholders, who identified what they perceive to be the Board's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).

Staff reviewed the results of this survey to assist them in updating the Board's vision, mission and value statements and in developing new goals and objectives, guided by Dr. Hatton. At its June 1, 2007 meeting, the Board reviewed, revised and approved the new vision and mission statements and the goals and objectives developed by staff. The Board directed staff to add two additional objectives, one regarding co-occurring disorders and the other regarding emergency planning.

Staff has participated in ongoing training in development of Work Action Plans (WAPs). A WAP includes the major steps to achieve the objectives, the person responsible for each step, the deadline date and the resources needed.

In June 2007, management created the 10-member Strategic Planning Council (SPC), composed of staff and management. The Council members are:

Christy Berger
Michelle Eernisse
Paula Gershon
Cheree Lasley

Mona Maggio
Julie McAuliffe
Sean O'Connor
Paul Riches

Steve Sodergren
Sandra Wright

The role of the SPC is to serve as a staff-driven internal board of directors who will shepherd the Strategic Plan; serve as an accountability mechanism; act as a stepping stone for building a visionary organization; provide guidance and leadership to staff; and, model the BBS Way. Christy Berger was elected to serve as Chair of the SPC.

Staff has been recruited to serve as “champions” for each objective. A champion serves as a team leader, spearheading the coordination for achieving an objective and has direct responsibility for implementing and achieving an objective. Management and the SPC chair met with the champions and provided guidance regarding their responsibilities, the selection of team members, and formulation of WAPs. The champions have selected their teams and received guidance regarding development of the WAP and a status report document. The teams met with Dr. Hatton on October 3, 2007 to review the draft WAPs and to receive additional training and guidance in developing the WAPs and identifying next steps.

The teams are continuing to meet to work on drafting the WAPs. The SPC and management are encouraging the teams to take time to listen, conduct research, to ask questions, and to remember that this is a five-year plan.

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7830, (916) 574-8625 Fax
www.bbs.ca.gov

To: Planning Committee

Date: October 19, 2007

From: Mona Maggio
Board of Behavioral Sciences

Telephone: (916) 574-7841

Subject: Draft Strategic Plan Objective 1.7 to Increase Board Member Effectiveness

The strategic planning cycle initiated in 2007 resulted in a strategic goal to “Be a model state licensing board.” To accomplish this goal, the board must improve every aspect of its performance. Draft objectives are in place to increase overall board staff productivity, customer satisfaction, staff communication, outreach, etc. However, the goal cannot be accomplished without highly effective governance which is provided by the board appointees.

The management team met in May to brainstorm about how to describe and assess board member effectiveness. Describing effectiveness quickly became a values exercise based on the team’s prior experiences with effective board members and what the team wanted to see from board members. The values of participation, commitment and engagement underpin all elements identified by the team. A draft objective was developed with the intent of having the board appointees commit to improving their effectiveness to match the commitment of board staff to increase productivity 10% over the five year planning horizon.

The management team’s draft objective was presented to the Board at the August 2007 Board Meeting. The Board discussed how to define board appointees’ effectiveness and how effectiveness is measured. There was consensus among the board members about the key elements and measures of board member effectiveness as presented by staff; however the Board wanted further discussion about including a measurement of how well each member has worked toward their personal goal. When a person applies to be a board member they typically state their reasons for wanting to serve on the board. There was discussion about adding this element to the self-assessment piece regarding whether a member has taken the steps to achieve those goals. The Board tasked the Committee to work with staff in drafting this objective and methodology and bring its recommendation to the November 2007 Board Meeting.

Current Challenges

The objective presents two fundamental challenges:

1. There is no concrete articulation of what it means to be an “effective” board. When appointed, board members are presented with a broad range of prohibitions and warnings regarding their roles (conflict of interest, ex parte communications, etc.) and California law provides extensive guidance regarding board procedures for major functions (Bagley Keene Open Meetings Act, Administrative Procedures Act, etc.). Both the confirmation process and Sunset Review processes have historically focused on the negative conduct of appointees. However, “effectiveness” is not satisfactorily defined as the absence of negative conduct or performance.

2. How effectiveness is measured. Board appointees have relatively little “work product” in the traditional sense which present significant challenges in developing measurements of their effectiveness. Governance issues tend to focus on sound policy judgments, oversight of staff, enforcing organizational integrity, commitment to open processes, and effective communication. None of these areas are easy subjects for traditional measurements, but measurement is essential to satisfy expectations from control agencies and to provide feedback that is necessary to any strategic management initiative.

Significance

This objective is central to becoming a model state licensing board. The board’s performance will always be limited by the quality of its governance, but this objective has impact beyond this particular goal. There is a notable vacuum of thought and writing about what constitutes an effective licensing board from the appointees’ perspective. This objective has the potential to establish a standard, or at least an available methodology, for assessing the performance of a board in an affirmative sense rather than the negative assessments that have prevailed in years past.

We should recognize that this objective does present potential hazards as well. It necessarily establishes an explicit expectation of performance of political appointees. It is easy to envision a situation where the inability of the board appointees to satisfy the objective is used against the board in a political arena. There is ample precedent for boards becoming captive to external political struggles. However, there is significant potential gain to successfully implementing this objective in terms of furthering the board’s reputation and establishing a critical methodology for assessing the performance of governance activity.

Requested Action

Review the presented draft objective 1.7, identify additional key elements and measures that should be included to measure board member effectiveness. Provide staff with direction on preparing recommendation for presentation at the November 2007 Board Meeting.

Attachments

1. Draft Objective 1.7
2. Sample - Board Member Effectiveness Index Factors drafted by staff.
3. CAMFT - Board Member Evaluation of Board Performance Instrument—2008
4. CLEAR – Description Role of a Board Member

Additional Resources

Charity Channel website has a wealth of materials relating to performance assessment for non-profits. There is little written on performance assessment of governmental boards but non-profit ideas may have some applicability. www.charitychannel.com

Model Code of Conduct published by the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards. A copy of this document has been requested by staff. This document may add additional insight into defining effective boards. www.farb.org

Sample Methodology & Discussion As Drafted by Staff

Attendance – Attending scheduled board meetings (both committee and full board meetings) for the entire meeting.

Formula – ***Actual Attendance / Possible Attendance***

Actual Attendance = # of appointed members in attendance for full duration of each meeting * # of days of each meeting

Possible Attendance = # of appointed members * # of days of each meeting

Self Assessment – At the completion of each board meeting each board member completes a self assessment of the group's performance at both board and committee meetings that quarter. The self assessment measures board member performance against the BBS Way (Integrity, Professionalism, Dedication, Service, Excellence) on a five item scale.

Formula -- ***(Each self assessment returns a value between 5 - 25 (five dimensions on a five point scale) * # of board members / number of responses) * 4 (establishes % result)***

Community Assessment – Community members who attend 2 or more board/committee meetings per year are invited to complete the board member assessment on the same instrument in Factor 2.

Enforcement Votes – Timely response to mail ballots.

Formula – ***# of mail ballots returned within 2 week response period / # of mail ballots sent***

Community Engagement – Board members engaging in the mental health community (either locally or statewide) outside scheduled board activity or regular course of practice. A draft expectation of such engagement on average of one day per month.

Formula – ***# of board member days of community engagement / (# of board members) * 12***

Outreach Participation – Board members participating in regular board outreach events.

Formula – ***# of board member outreach days / # of possible outreach days***

The management team included a weighting in the draft index as well. A judgment was made that some elements of effectiveness are foundational and therefore should be given more weight when calculating the index. The draft index is constructed as follows:

Attendance	25%	0
Self Assessment	15%	0
Community Assessment	15%	0
Enforcement	10%	0
Community Engagement	15%	0
Outreach	20%	0
	<hr/>	
total	0	0.0
possible	600	

Blank Page

Board Member Effectiveness Index Factors

Factor 1 -- Attendance

Attending scheduled board meetings (both committee and full board meetings) for the entire meeting.

Formula -- Actual Attendance / Possible Attendance

Actual Attendance = # of appointed members in attendance for full duration of each meeting * # of days of each meeting

Possible Attendance = # of appointed members * # of days of each meeting

example:	2007/08 FY	# of Meetings	# of appointees	# of days	possible attendance	actual attendance
	P& A Committee	4	4	4	64	60
	Consumer Protection Committee	4	5	4	80	65
	Planning Committee	2	2	2	8	6
	Board Meetings	4	11	8	352	250
					504	381
		Attendance %			76%	

Factor 2 -- Self Assessment

At the completion of each board meeting each board member completes a self assessment of the group's performance at both board and committee meetings that quarter.

The self assessment measures board member performance against the BBS Way (Integrity, Professionalism, Dedication, Service, Excellence) on a five item scale.

Formula -- (Each self assessment returns a value between 5 - 25 (five dimensions on a five point scale) * # of board members / number of responses) * 4 (establishes % result)

example:	2007/2008 FY	# of Board Meetings	# of Responses	Total Score	Avg Response	%
		4	40	800	20	80%

Factor 3 -- Community Assessment

Community members who attend 2 or more board/committee meetings per year are invited to complete the board member assessment on the same instrument in Factor 2.

example	2007/08 FY	# of Responses	Total Score	Avg Response	%
		65	1235	19	76%

Factor 4 -- Enforcement Votes

Timely response to mail ballots.

Formula -- # of mail ballots returned within 2 week response period / # of mail ballots sent

example	2007/08 FY	# of Mail Ballots Sent	# of Timely Responses	%
		330	300	91%

Factor 5 -- Community Engagement

Board members engaging in the mental health community (either locally or statewide) outside scheduled board activity or regular course of practice.

Expectation of such engagement on average of one day per month

Formula -- # of board member days of community engagement / (# of board members) * 12

example	2007/08 FY	# of Board member days	Expectation	%
		22	132	17%

Factor 6 -- Outreach Participation

Formula -- total number of board member outreach days / total number of possible outreach days

example	2007/2008	# of outreach event days	# of board member outreach days	%
		75	30	40%

Blank Page

CAMFT Board Member Evaluation of Board Performance **Instrument—2008**

The Board of Directors of CAMFT will annually conduct a self-evaluation of Board operations. This self-evaluation will be completed each year before newly elected/appointed Board Members take office.

The Evaluation will include, but not be limited to: meetings, committees, Board Member commitment, planning efforts, teamwork, policy formulation, monitoring and evaluating procedures, relationship with staff and Executive; and it will be compatible with CAMFT's Strategic Plan.

The Evaluation will be in written form and all Board Members will be asked to participate. At the same time as each Board Member is completing the evaluation, the Board Member shall individually evaluate his/her performance as well as evaluate the Board's performance as a whole. Upon completion of the evaluation, the Board will set goals for correcting noted deficiencies.

The President will initiate this process each year.

Members are to rate each item from **“did not achieve” (1)**, to **“achieved” (2)**, to **“exemplary performance” (3)**, or **“don't know” (DK)** if the item seems inapplicable to the Member's experience. Members should not insert ratings other than those indicated. Members are expected to provide a written response when the selected response is a (1) in the space(s) provided.

The instrument will be distributed at the Spring Board Meeting, completed and returned to the Executive Director by the conclusion of that meeting. The Executive Director will compile the results for use in the Board Orientation at the June Board Meeting.

Thoughts to consider as you respond to the self-evaluation instrument:

- A diligent self-evaluation will contribute to Board effectiveness
- Constructive criticism or suggestions will contribute to Board effectiveness
- Finding fault with or criticizing individual Board Members will not contribute to board effectiveness
- Outside criticism is inevitable
- Expectations of perfection are unrealistic
- A primary goal of self-evaluation is to provide useful feedback to the Board

Board Evaluation

1 = Did Not Achieve (a written explanation to serve as instruction for improvement must be provided if “did not achieve” is selected)

2 = Achieved

3 = Exemplary Performance (only certain items)

DK = Don’t Know

Strategic Plan Goal I—Professional Competency

Professionalism

The Association will maintain and promote high standards of professionalism, competence, accountability, inclusivity, and ethics.

Objectives:

- The Association will develop and enforce ethical standards consistent with the evolving profession.
- The Association will develop and advocate for legal standards consistent with the evolving profession.
- The Association will create and administer certification programs and quality educational opportunities beneficial to the profession.
- The Association will be an inclusive and accessible organization by proactively attracting and retaining diverse members and leaders.
- The Association will be proactive, sensitive, and responsive to the needs of a diverse and changing population.
- The Association will be accountable to the welfare of the public’s mental health by attending to the current professional research and promoting best practices.

	1	2	3	DK
1. The Board respects the confidentiality of Board meetings.				
2. Board Members speak for the Board or Association only when authorized to do so.		1		

3. The Board ensures that any communication with staff other than the Executive Director does not undermine the relationship between the Executive Director and his or her staff.				
4. The Board avoids, in fact and in perception, conflicts of interest that might embarrass the Board or Association, and discloses to the Board in a timely manner any possible conflicts.				
5. The Board represents and encourages diversity and a wide variety of perspectives.				
6. Board Members understand and demonstrate that they represent all the people of the Association serves, not just a special segment.				

Strategic Plan Goal II—Advocacy

Advocacy

The Association will advocate for the advancement of mental health professionals.

Objectives:

- The Association will influence the future of the mental health profession.
- The Association will seek parity for and increased utilization of its members in the public and private sectors.
- The Association will coordinate and collaborate with other organizations for common purposes.
- The Association will be involved in the legislative process at the local, state, and federal levels.
- The Association will encourage member participation in governmental and advocacy efforts that impact the profession.

	1	2	3	DK
1. The Board actively promotes and supports the Association's PAC efforts.				
2. The Board actively participates in contacting legislators at federal, state and local levels.				
3. The Board actively participates in local chapter outreach and development.				

Strategic Plan Goal III—Public Relations and Marketing

Public Relations and Marketing

The Association will be the definitive source of information regarding mental health issues and services.

Objectives:

- The Association will increase public awareness that therapy works.
- The Association will increase its recognizability and professional visibility through branding and other marketing.
- The Association will provide, in a timely manner, current, thorough, and accurate information.
- The Association will be the source of relevant information for prospective practitioners.
- The Association will increase its membership.

	1	2	3	DK
1. The Board takes advantage of opportunities to enhance the Association's public image.				

Strategic Plan Goal IV—Leadership

Leadership

The Association will be led and administered by exemplary, visionary, accountable, dedicated, and ethical individuals.

Objectives:

- The Association staff and volunteer leadership will be held accountable to the Strategic Plan.
- The Association will provide opportunities for training and development to staff and volunteer leadership.
- The Association will recruit, retain, and provide for succession of staff and volunteer leadership.
- The Association will create and implement policies and procedures to ensure an effective operation.
- The Association will remain fiscally sound and technologically sophisticated.

	1	2	3	DK
1. The Board effectively directs the Executive Director with the intent to achieve organizational excellence.				
2. The Board collaborates with the Executive Director to enhance the Association’s and profession’s image.				
3. New Board policies grow out of study and research, not crisis situations.				
4. The Board understands the Association’s Strategic Plan				

5. The Board supports the Strategic Plan.				
6. Board Members have good working relationships with other Board Members and with the Executive Director.				
7. The Board is knowledgeable about the Association's major programs and member services.				
8. The Board stays abreast of relevant trends in the field and society at large and responds appropriately.				
9. The Board reads and understands the Association's financial statements and annual budget before it is approved.				
10. The Board assures that an outside accounting firm audits the Association's finances.				

11. The Board acts knowledgeably and prudently when making recommendations about how the Association's funds should be invested or spent.				
12. The Board focuses attention on long-term and significant policy issues rather than short-term matters.				
13. The Board recommends qualified individuals with relevant skills and experience as possible nominees for the Board.				
14. Board Members prepare for and participate at Board and committee meetings, as well as other activities of the Association.				
15. Board Members willingly volunteer and use their special skills to further the Association's Strategic Plan.				
16. Board Members feel comfortable suggesting agenda items for future Board and committee meetings.				

17. Board Members are heard and respected when giving their opinions at Board Meetings.				
18. Board Members find serving on the Board to be a satisfying and rewarding experience.				
19. The Board conducts a thorough orientation for all new Board Members.				
20. Opportunities for Board development are provided regularly.				
21. The Board takes appropriate corrective action to address Board Member's nonperformance or inappropriate performance.				
22. The Board has a policy and plan for annually evaluating the Executive Director.				

23. Board Members are familiar with the current Board Policy Manual.				
24. The Board ensures sound risk management policies for the Association.				
25. The Board ensures that there is a written job description for the Executive Director.				
26. The Board includes the Executive Director in all deliberations except in the final stages of evaluation of executive performance.				
27. The Board, and not individual Board Members, gives direction to the Executive Director.				
28. Meetings begin and end on schedule.				

29. Meetings are substantive, relevant, and timely in content and effective and appropriate in process.				
---	--	--	--	--

--

Comments:

Role Of A Person On The Governing Body Of A Regulatory Entity

by Barbara Smith

Governing bodies of regulatory entities are referred to in numerous ways in various jurisdictions. Some of the most common terms are "boards" and "councils." The regulatory entity itself may be referred to as an "agency", "board", or "commission". In the United States, most regulatory entities for professions are called "boards" while in Canada, they are usually referred to as "colleges." For the purposes of this chapter, the governing bodies of regulatory entities are referred to as "boards." "Board member" has a corresponding meaning.

Boards may be arms-length from government or directly operated by it. Board members may be full or part-time. They may be public members or profession/industry members or elected by the members of the regulated profession, occupation, or industry. Regardless of the terms used to describe the aspects of these regulatory entities/boards and their members and irrespective of the jurisdictions in which they exist, they have a number of common characteristics:

- Boards are mandated to regulate the practice of a given profession/occupation or industry in the public interest. The most fundamental role for a board member is that of participating in the public interest. While different boards may use different models of governance, the basic role remains that of setting the policy direction of the regulatory body and overseeing its functioning. Board members fulfill this role by attending regular board meetings. This role involves considerable time in preparation for these meetings. For many entities, board meetings take place in the public arena, subject to the scrutiny of both practitioners and the general public. These meetings tend to be more formal in nature and follow conventionally accepted parliamentary procedures such as Robert's Rules of Order. Many boards also use a committee structure model to carry out the work of the board. An individual board member may sit on one or more of these committees. Committees may be required by the statute (e.g. discipline committee) or may be working committees (e.g. finance) established by the board itself. It is often at the committee level where board members most actively carry out their roles. Committee meetings are usually not conducted in public and tend to be more informal in nature. Committees are responsible to the board for the work that they do. The committee does not set policy itself; rather it makes recommendations to the board, which may or may not be adopted.
- Boards set the standards for entry into a profession and assure the public that the practitioners offering services meet those standards. Individual board members contribute to this by assisting with the development of these standards in working group or committee meetings. Boards may engage in ongoing education and communication strategies to acquaint the public with these standards. Many entities have quality assurance programs and methods of assuring that practitioners meet the standards of the profession on an ongoing basis. This may or may not involve random or targeted testing on a periodic basis. There is usually some expectation that practitioners will meet a certain standard of participation in continuing education.
- They register those who are qualified. This registration usually involves issuing a certificate or license without which a person may not practice in the jurisdiction of the regulatory body. Certain information as to the status of the practitioner is available to the public. Board members may participate in the registration function by assessing prospective registrants/ licensees, determining terms and conditions, if any, to be placed on an individual's certificate/license, and deciding appeals from individual applicants.

- Boards deal with practitioners who fail to meet the standards of practice and/or who are accused of misconduct, incompetence or incapacity. Board members may perform adjudicative functions in determining guilt and penalties with respect to practitioners and form an essential part of the system of administrative justice in a given jurisdiction. Board members serve on panels or tribunals which have the mandate to make decisions which may affect a practitioner's ability to make a living. Their decisions may also affect the care the public can expect to receive from the profession. The seriousness of these matters makes it prudent for board members to participate in their own ongoing education with respect to the principals and practices related to the administrative justice system.

Responsibilities of Board Members

Board members have a responsibility to at least three constituencies:

1. **The general public.** People expect that licensees/registrants will be qualified to perform properly and safely and that they will maintain a level of competence throughout their career. They have a right to expect a fair method of dealing with disputes that may arise with the practitioner. They have a right to know what's going on within the regulatory entity.
2. **Potential licensees/registrants.** Individuals who wish to earn their living in an occupation/profession/industry should not be denied access unreasonably. That person should have easy access to all information about entering the profession, including testing and/or practical training requirements and/or moving from another jurisdiction. There should be no unfair barriers for such persons.
3. **Other board members.** There is a responsibility to listen to them and to respect their views and contributions. There is also a responsibility for helping to determine good policy and helpful procedures, for contributing to fair determination of problems and for helping the regulatory entity to operate most effectively and efficiently.

Consumer Rights and the Public Interest

Since the 1960's much has been written in most democratic nations about "consumer rights." Among them are the right to safety--to be protected against harm; the right to be informed--to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts needed to make informed choices; to choose--to have available a variety of products and services at competitive prices; to be heard--to be assured that the public interest will receive full and sympathetic consideration in making government policy, both through laws passed by legislatures and through regulations passed by administrative entities; to education--the right to programs and information that help the public make better decisions; to redress--to work with established mechanisms to have problems corrected. Board members should keep these rights in mind when making decisions.

People often equate "the consumer interest" with the public interest. But there is a difference. Every regulatory entity has its reason for being: "To protect the health, safety, and well-being of the public." Therefore, all board members have as their primary goal the public's interest. Just as practitioner groups are a special interest, the consumer perspective is a special interest that must be considered along with other factors when decisions are made. Working in the public interest means looking at the issues before the regulatory entity from the point of view of public protection, rather than from the point of view of the profession or of any one of the special interest groups. This means examining procedures and decisions to ensure that they encourage openness and accountability, increase the public's safety, and do not restrict choices available to consumers. It also means being aware of the consequences of over-regulating a profession and of the need for fees for the practitioners to be reasonable. Useful information about the profession and how the public can lodge complaints and seek redress should be published in brochures and in other publications as appropriate. An aggrieved consumer needs and deserves assistance from the regulatory agency. In many instances, a suggestion of alternate dispute resolution might

prove satisfactory. In more extreme instances, revocation of a license/certificate may be necessary.

Suggested Requirements for Service on Regulatory Entities

The following are suggested requirements:

1. **A demonstrated interest in public service.** Positions on regulatory entities involve considerable work and commitment with little or no compensation.
2. **Common sense and a willingness to ask questions.** Do the policies, procedures, and decisions of the regulatory entity seem sensible? If not, say so and ask for clarification. You are responsible for what goes on with your regulatory entity. You are expected to use good judgment in handling problems and making decisions.
3. **A commitment to attendance.** Consistent attendance is essential to keeping informed about what is going on and to providing direction and support. An individual who accepts an appointment/election to the governing body of a regulatory entity and does not take seriously the duty to be there regularly and actively, does a disservice to the entity and to the public he/she is supposed to serve. This applies to committee meetings as well.
4. **Assertiveness.** Respect your own rights and needs as well as those of others.
5. **A willingness to become informed about the structure and resources of the regulatory entity.** Find out how government works in relation to your entity and investigate other available resources. You are expected to apply the profession's statutes, rules, and regulations in a fair, unbiased manner.

Characteristics of Effective Board Members

Effective board members have these characteristics in common:

1. They demonstrate good team skills in order to make decisions.
2. They understand and follow democratic processes.
3. They are willing to devote time and effort to the work of the governing board.
4. They work to find alternative solutions to problems whenever necessary.
5. They have good communication skills.
6. They recognize that the goal of the regulatory entity is service to and the protection of the public.
7. They are aware that authority is granted by the law to the governing body of the regulatory entity as a whole, not to any member individually. Consequently, they respect the vote of the majority of the governing members.
8. They avoid becoming involved in the day-to-day administrative functions of the regulatory entity and its staff.
9. They delay making judgments until adequate evidence is in and has been fully discussed.
10. They don't let personal feelings toward others affect their decisions.

Participation of Public Members in Regulatory Entities

Every board member has the responsibility to regulate in the public interest rather than the interest of the profession/occupation/industry being regulated. However, public members have this as their sole purpose. Public members are not expected to be, indeed are not supposed to be technically expert or experienced in the specific occupation/profession. They are not expected to have a conflict of interest such as may be assumed for those who practice the profession. They bring their own perspectives to the deliberations of the regulatory entity.

Some possible advantages of public members on regulatory boards:

1. Reduces the potential for decisions that favor the regulated occupation/profession over the public.

2. Reduces the potential for decisions which illegitimately favor one faction of the regulated industry/profession over another.
3. Institutionalizes public participation in government decision-making.
4. Decreases public suspicion and thereby augments public confidence and trust in the regulatory entity.
5. Expands the range of skills, talent, training, and perspectives available for higher quality and more creative action.
6. Achieves a balanced discussion, including re-examination of the "givens" in any industry/occupation/profession.
7. Enables "the average citizen" to address the regulatory entity.
8. Enhances credibility respecting decisions and public advocacy.

Some possible disadvantages of public members on regulatory boards:

1. Public members may be intimidated by industry/occupation/profession members' experience in the field.
2. Public members may impede governing activity if technical issues are not understood by lay members.
3. Split public/profession votes or conflict may polarize decision making to the detriment of the entity.
4. There may be fewer motives for participation because professional self-interest motives are lacking. Public members must be purely interested in doing "public service".

Advice to Board Members

The following are suggested responsibilities:

1. Inquiries regarding matters within the regulatory entity's jurisdiction should be directed to the staff so that they can be processed appropriately in accordance with the policies and procedures of the entity.
2. No details of governing body activity should be released by an individual board member unless and until they become part of the public record. Details of investigations as well as informal hearings or conferences, may not be part of the public record and board members must keep such matters confidential. Where doubt exists, disclosure of such information should be made only after consultation with staff and/or legal counsel.
3. Board members are generally prohibited from conducting private meetings outside of scheduled meetings of the governing body. This means, for example, that they cannot discuss the details of a disciplinary action with the subject of the complaint or with any other members of the public or with other board members, except at a duly constituted meeting.
4. It should be remembered that board members are seen as representatives of the regulatory entity when they appear at industry or professional gatherings. They should not appear to speak for the entity unless specifically authorized to do so.
5. Board members should always be aware that actions taken individually by the member and collectively by the board are subject to scrutiny by members of the profession, the public, and the government and that actions taken, to be valid and enforceable, must be based on relevant statutes and regulations.

Resources

Sections of the "Role of the Board Member" were adapted from **Effective Consumer Representation: An Orientation Manual for Board Members** published by the Maryland Consumer Council, and from the **Handbook for Board Members** published by the Montana Dept. Of Commerce and the **Board Orientation Training Manual** published by the Washington Dept. Of Licensing.