

**CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
EXAMINATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

February 3, 2000
(Approved August 25, 2000)

**HYATT REGENCY LONG BEACH
200 SOUTH PINE AVENUE
LONG BEACH, CA**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marsena Buck, LCSW Member, Committee Chair
Selma Fields, MFT Member
Lorie Rice, Public Member
Karen Pines, MFT Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Sherry Mehl, Executive Officer
Denise Johnson, Assistant Executive Officer
Don Chang, Legal Counsel
Kari Frank, Licensing Analyst

GUEST LIST ON FILE

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

Ms. Pines introduced Lynn Morris, Deputy Director of Board Relations. Ms. Morris outlined the department's goals and mission statement.

1. STRATEGIC PLANNING UPDATE

The current Strategic Plan was included in the meeting binder. Ms. Fields requested that the words "policies regarding" be added to objective number 3. Ms. Rice would like a chart showing goals that were met. Ms. Fields would like to add objective number 6, "To maintain communication with all stakeholders in regards to examination issues", a. "Provide information regarding examinations to licensees, associations, and interested public", b. "Receive and direct comments appropriately". Ms. Fields would like to add objective number 7, "To keep current with technical changes in communication that could effect policies regarding examinations." Ms. Pines would like more information about examination process and she would like to receive the packet of materials a licensee would receive when applying for the examination. Ms. Buck requested a report at the end of the year on how they are doing with meeting their objectives.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND ADOPTING THE STRATEGIC PLAN AS AMENDED.

2. EXAMINATION STATISTICS

The statistics were included in the meeting binder. Ms. Rice would like statistics for each exam over a 5-year period. Ms. Fields stated she thought it was very interesting to have statistics in regards to each school.

3. DISCUSSION REGARDING LIMITING THE NUMBER OF TIMES TO PARTICIPATE IN AN EXAMINATION

Other board policies in regards to the number of times applicants could take the examinations were included in the meeting binder. Ms. Rice discussed requiring additional course work, more experience in dealing with clients, find a way to evaluate those who continue to fail the exam, or require additional supervised hours of experience. After discussing this issue further, the Board decided they would like input from professional associations and other organizations sent to the Board for review. They want this item on the next meeting agenda. David Fox, MFT, doesn't believe there is enough evidence of an existing problem. He thinks the Board should do a study on those who took the oral exam more than three times to see if they are more likely to violate the law. Geraldine Esposito, Executive Director of the California Society for Clinical Social Workers, stated that she believes the problem lies in the fact that very few associates/interns are working in a clinical setting and receiving the appropriate experience they need to pass the examination. Ms. Fields questioned whether the associations would advocate for another license, less clinical. Ms. Esposito responded they would as long as the license was in no way viewed as a lesser license. Ms. Buck concluded that this is a problem that the committee needs to discuss further.

4. AASSWB POLICY REGARDING EXAMINATION SCORE TRANSFER

A copy of the American Association of Social Work Board's policy presented to the delegate assembly at their annual meeting in December was included in the meeting binder. Ms. Buck reviewed the policy.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Officer of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, brought up the issue of examiner recognition at exam site and possible bias towards examinees. Ms. Mehl stated that there is currently a problem with examinees stating that they recognize an examiner in order to be reassigned to another panel. Ms. Mehl further stated that there has been someone at the exam sites taking pictures of the examiners, showing them to groups of examinees, and informing them to say that they recognize the examiner. Ms. Mehl stated that they are looking at the current policy to determine how best to handle a situation where an examinee states that they recognize one of their examiners.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.