

(approved May 20, 2004)

**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES  
LICENSING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 20, 2004**

**DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
400 R STREET, SUITE 1030  
SACRAMENTO, CA**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Susan Ulevitch, LCSW Member, Committee Chair  
Mark Burdick, LEP Member

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Catherine Kay, Public Member  
Jane Nathanson, MFT Member

**STAFF PRESENT**

Sherry Mehl, Executive Officer  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Julie McAuliffe, Administrative Analyst

**GUEST LIST ON FILE**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:05 a.m.

Ms. McAuliffe called the roll and a quorum was not established. Ms. Mehl informed the Committee members that they were able to discuss items on the agenda but could not make any final determinations due to lack of a Committee quorum.

**1. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS TO AMEND THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS AND LICENSED CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS**

Ms. Ulevitch discussed the issues regarding carrying over continuing education credits to the next renewal cycle and the required law and ethics course. The meeting materials included a comparison of the board's continuing education requirements. Ms. Ulevitch had really thought about the issue of continuing education and would like to review the continuing education requirements in a comprehensive manner and determine if changes are needed throughout.

Ms. Mehl indicated that since the six hours of law and ethics was mandated, there has been a direct correlation between this required course and enforcement cases. The amounts of cases that relate to legal and ethical violations have decreased.

Dr. Burdick stated that continuing education courses allow a professional the opportunity to ask questions and participate in a peer group discussion about the profession.

Ms. Ulevitch stated that part of the comprehensive study on continuing education should include the mandated requirements and the hour requirements. She thought that possibly the timeframes or course hours required may need to be amended.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, stated that generally the Association opposes any type of piecemeal continuing education but did agree that if there are to be mandates, it should be in law and ethics. She then indicated that the association would support retention of the course.

Geraldine Esposito, Executive Director of the California Society for Clinical Social Work, stated that the Society receives numerous complaints about the law and ethics course indicating that the materials are repetitive and the six-hour requirement is excessive. She suggested that this requirement be for every other renewal.

Ms. Ulevitch suggested separating the requirements for each profession.

Ms. Mehl explained that the Board approves providers but does not approve the courses. She suggested that the Committee could review the regulations and propose course requirements.

Ms. Riemersma did not think that the coursework should be specified and should be left open to allow licensees the opportunity to select courses that they feel are appropriate for their specific practice.

Jan Lee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers, indicated that generally the Association is opposed to specific continuing education requirements. Having these requirements mandated by the Legislature is too chaotic for a profession. He hoped that there could be a compromise between the profession and the Legislature. He suggested voluntary certification to allow a professional the opportunity of obtaining specified training in areas that are beneficial to their practice. He then stated that the Association has seen a dramatic drop in ethical violations since the implementation of requiring law and ethics continuing education. He indicated that ethics is a life long learning process changing as society changes. Mr. Wong then stated that carrying over continuing education was impractical given the current budget situation and the need for additional tracking.

Ms. Esposito stated that vastly fewer people are in private practice therefore this may be the reason for fewer ethical violations.

Ms. Ulevitch asked that this issue be brought back to the Committee at the May meeting. She then asked that the requirements for each profession be delineated. She asked that the professional associations provide their recommendations in writing for the next Committee meeting.

**2. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS TO AMEND BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 4986.10 REGARDING THE LICENSED EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST SCOPE OF PRACTICE**

Dr. Burdick stated that the Committee will begin focusing on and reviewing the Licensed Educational Psychologist law and determine if amendments are needed.

Licensed Educational Psychologists typically work outside of a school setting, independently in a private practice providing counseling, testing, research, and evaluation.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 a.m.