The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:46 p.m.

1. **ACCEPTANCE OF MAY 20, 2005 MINUTES**

   There was not a quorum present to approve the minutes. The minutes will be approved at the November Board Meeting

2. **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON CONTINUING EDUCATION PROPOSAL FOR LCSWs AND MFTs**

   Mr. Riches explained what the Board could do to increase the standards for continuing education (CE). Option one is to expand enforcement. The board currently does not have staff resources devoted to auditing CE providers. Expanding enforcement would require either new staff resources or a redirection of existing staff from other duties. Option two is to restrict CE to Psychotherapy. The board could restrict the subject matter of CE courses to those subjects required by statute or regulation and courses directly related to psychotherapy. This could eliminate some of the courses that are regarded as more exotic or frivolous. Option three is to establish content outlines for CE.
Janlee Wong, National Association of Social Workers, explained that every ethical code in this profession requires CE; so everyone in the human services profession cannot say they are good professionals unless they have CE, which this Board requires. Mr. Wong always thought the Board would perform option 1. As for option 2 and 3, Mr. Wong believes that the graduates and professionals should be able to choose courses that compliment their career focus, rather than having a Board determine which courses they should take.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, explained that the way the law was initially established that created the mandatory continuing education, at that time, didn’t give the Board the authority to evaluate courses, only the authority to say who would provide the courses. Mr. Riemersma was opposed to option one and two.

Carole Bender, LCSW, UCLA, CA Society for Clinical Social Work, discussed from an educational point of view: that the model the Board has described for mandated trainings that people have to take that get legislated to them, takes away the choice regarding which courses to take. In addition, if people knew they could call the Board after they go to a class and explain their opinion on the class, it would be more beneficial. Mr. Riches informed Ms. Bender that the Board does not receive complaints, people rarely complain about the quality of the CE courses.

3. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE CORRECTIVE ACTION REGARDING CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR FIRST RENEWALS

Mr. Riches explained that MFTs and LCSWs renewing their license for the first time are required to have completed 18 hours of CE. Specific course content requirements for those hours are also specified. The content-specific requirements add up to 23 hours rather than 18. Mr. Riches began a discussion regarding the number of hours that should be required prior to the licensee renewing their license.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, stated that most licensees that are entering the field now have already had spousal abuse assessment training in their program. Because the course was taken prior to this year, arguably, there was no hour specification when they took it so a fewer number than 7 hours would suffice for those licensees.

Mr. Gerst and Mr. Riches will work on a draft and bring the draft to the November meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:15 p.m.