



BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
 400 R Street, Suite 3150, Sacramento, CA 95814-6240
 Telephone (916) 445-4933
 TDD (916) 322-1700
 Website Address: <http://www.bbs.ca.gov>



**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
 FULL BOARD**

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 16, 2006

**AYRES HOTEL & SUITES
 325 BRISTOL STREET
 COSTA MESA, CA 92626**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Gordonna DiGiorgio, Public Member
 Robert Gerst, Vice Chair, Public Member
 Judy Johnson, LEP Member
 Victor Law, Public Member
 Peter Manoleas, Chair, LCSW Member
 Karen Pines, MFT Member
 Dr. Ian Russ, MFT Member
 Howard Stein, Public Member
 Joan Walmsley, LCSW Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Paul Riches, Executive Officer
 Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer
 George Ritter, Legal Counsel
 Sal Reyes, Administrative Analyst

GUEST LIST ON FILE

CALL TO ORDER AND ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Mr. Reyes called the roll and a quorum was established.

I. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

A. Introduction of New Board Members

Mr. Manoleas introduced George Ritter, the Board's new legal counsel. Mr. Ritter gave us a brief background on his experience in state service. He has been with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) since 1998.

Mr. Manoleas reported on his and Mr. Riches' meeting with the California Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work. They provided a brief report on some of the things the Board is doing.

II. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

A. Licensing Statistics

Mr. Riches reported that the Board has improved on the processing time for licensing applications. This was achieved even with the recent office move, and missing one Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) evaluator to jury duty. Mr. Riches explained how deficiencies severely impact the processing of applications. Staff are analyzing issues and are reviewing the Board's forms and instructions to applicants to determine what can be done to reduce the deficiency rate. This will help improve processing time.

Mr. Manoleas asked for examples of a deficiency. Mr. Riches stated that it typically is a deficiency in hours of experience, and sometimes in coursework. Staff is working to make the standards clearer to the applicants so that they don't submit their applications until they meet all of the qualifications. The school visits will help provide future applicants with a better understanding of what is required.

B. Enforcement Statistics

Mr. Riches reported a steady increase in the number of complaints received. There was slight increase in some enforcement activity, such as citation and fines. This is largely a result of continuing education audits, which make up the overwhelming majority of cite and fine activity. Dr. Russ asked about the process of a citation, whether it is decided in the Board's office, and whether that is the lowest level of action. Mr. Riches explained that the lowest level of action is a cease and desist letter for minor deviations. The next step up is a citation and fine, and the next level is actual disciplinary action. The investigative process happens in our office and at the Division of Investigation (DOI), and when that is complete, and we believe there are grounds for discipline, the case is forwarded to the Attorney General's (AG) office for prosecution. Dr. Russ asked whether the AG's office could say whether the evidence is enough. Mr. Riches replied that they can advise us, but ultimately the Board makes the decision. We do listen very carefully if the AG has questions about the sufficiency of our evidence.

Dr. Russ asked about the statistics regarding custody complaints, whether they are brought up in the context of a custody evaluation. Mr. Riches replied that it varies, sometimes it is the result of an evaluation, but sometimes the therapist is involved not as an evaluator but is seeing an involved family member and oversteps a line.

Ms. Walmsley asked who is filing complaints about supervision. Mr. Riches explained that when a supervisor has refused to sign off on hours, or supervised when they didn't have a current license, these come from the supervisee. Dr. Russ asked whether conviction of a crime is reported to the Board. Mr. Riches stated that when our applicants are fingerprinted, they are placed in a database that provides us with reports of arrest from the Department of Justice. Also, when a person renews a license, they must report any convictions. If the conviction is substantially related, we pursue disciplinary action.

Mr. Gerst asked whether probation recovery has been effective because we do not seem to be recouping the costs. Mr. Riches stated that the program is working, it just takes time to recover the costs. He explained that there is a large gap between the total recovery due

the Board and the amount of payments received because probationers do not pay a lump sum, they make monthly payments. Ms. Johnson asked for a clarification between the incompetent/negligence category vs. unprofessional conduct. Mr. Riches stated that there are ways to be incompetent that are not negligent, and unprofessional conduct is not related to competence. Most of our discipline is not related to competence.

Mr. Manoleas noticed that the number of complaints received versus the number of investigations opened is increasing over the last few cycles. Mr. Riches explained that this is due to a combination of factors. One is that we have had a steady increase in the number of complaints, and inevitably a certain percentage of those complaints are going to be referred to investigation. Some of it is staff is doing better at sorting out the complaints. There are other ways to process a complaint without referring it to investigation.

Dr. Russ asked if a complaint had been received against a licensee for sexual misconduct, would they still be able to practice for a year before charges are filed. Mr. Riches said yes, probably longer than that due to all of the processes involved. Dr. Russ asked whether we should look at establishing a priority list for emergency situations. Mr. Riches said we do have a prioritization scheme with DOI, but they have other clients who may also have high priority. Mr. Gerst asked if we have any emergency options when the allegations are very serious. Mr. Riches explained that when a licensee is brought up on criminal charges, we can seek a suspension of the license depending on the outcome of that proceeding.

C. Budget Update

Mr. Riches reported that the Board's finances are sound. One thing that could change this is that the new exam contract will likely increase significantly. The current contract is \$400,000 a year, so a reasonable percentage increase would be significant. Mr. Manoleas asked about the Office of Examination Resource's (OER) \$194,000 budget expense, and whether it was unexpected. Mr. Riches explained that it was not unexpected, and we have been working with the Department to realign our internal costs so that we have a dedicated line item for this OER cost in 06/07.

D. Legislative Update

Mr. Riches reported that staff is reviewing bills that have been introduced, and there is nothing pressing at this time. At the next Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting we will have the pertinent bills and analyses to make recommendations for the next Board meeting. As far as sponsored legislation, we have submitted the reorganization proposal to the Business and Professions Committee and that includes the Licensed Educational Psychologist (LEP) revisions. The committee bills work on a different timeline than other bills, so we probably won't see this bill introduced until March. We have some regulations that have been noticed, and the citation and fine regulations that would increase the maximum fine to \$5,000 in certain circumstances has been filed with the Department.

E. Personnel Update

Mr. Riches reported that two new employees were hired, Victoria Gaines as the Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) evaluator and Tricia Soares as a MFT evaluator. Both are new to state service and are taking to their jobs quickly.

F. Initial Results of Supervision Survey

Mr. Riches stated that we have received enough responses from MFT Interns, and we are continuing to send the surveys to Associate Clinical Social Workers (ASW) until we receive at least 300 back. We have been entering the data and have some very preliminary results. We have been able to look at the data response by response, but haven't had a chance to look at the range of responses.

Mr. Riches reported that the response rate has been very strong. People seem to be happy with their supervision experience, as the average rating is a 4 out of 5, and this assessment of their experience is encouraging. There were a number of places in the survey that have unstructured responses, which we have not yet analyzed. More analysis needs to be done to look at relationships between some of the questions.

G. Miscellaneous Matters

Mr. Riches reported on the Board's diversity conference, scheduled for April 28th in Sacramento. A demographer from the Public Policy Institute of California will report on demographic change in California, and Rachel Guerrero, Chief of Multicultural Services at the Department of Mental Health who oversees efforts in the area of culturally competent practice and services, will speak. There will be breakout sessions in the afternoon to focus on the board's position regarding initial training and practice, and where the Board fits in. Staff will bring this information back to the Board.

Mr. Riches spoke with Jose Luis-Flores of the Southern California Consortium. They talked about ideas for the MFT educator's meeting on June 19th at Phillips Graduate Institute. All Board members are invited to attend. They are still looking at dates for the Northern California Consortium. Ms. Pines stated that she has frequent contact with Orange County schools that informed her about their consortium. She recommended that the Board communicate with them.

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Manoleas stated that officers need to be elected for the positions of Board Chair and Vice Chair before March 1, 2006, to comply with the law. Mr. Manoleas asked for nominations. Mr. Stein nominated Judy Johnson as Board Chair. Ms. Johnson declined her nomination until she has more experience and has more time to dedicate to the position. Ms. Pines nominated Joan Walmsley as Board Chair. Ms. Walmsley also declined her nomination, as she wants to get more experience on the Board. Ms. Johnson nominated Dr. Ian Russ as Board Chair. Dr. Russ declined this nomination, stating he would prefer to serve as Vice Chair.

Ms. Pines stated that in the past we have had a public member and a professional member as Chair and Vice Chair, which she believes is a good thing. Mr. Gerst stated that it is okay for two professionals to be Chair and Vice Chair, he feels comfortable with that.

Mr. Law stated that it would be helpful for Mr. Manoleas and Mr. Gerst to remain in their positions as a number of Board members are new and have a lot to learn, and it would provide stability. Mr. Gerst stated it would be good to have someone who is going to be on the Board for some time to come to be Vice Chair.

Mr. Gerst nominated Peter Manoleas as Chair, and Ms. Walmsley nominated Dr. Ian Russ as Vice Chair.

ROBERT GERST MOVED, KAREN PINES SECONDED AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO NOMINATE PETER MANOLEAS AS BOARD CHAIR.

Mr. Manoleas accepted the Board Chair position.

PETER MANOLEAS MOVED, DONNA DIGIORGIO SECONDED AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO NOMINATE DR. IAN RUSS AS VICE CHAIR.

Dr. Russ accepted the Vice Chair position.

IV. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 17-18, 2005 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Manoleas inquired whether all Board members have reviewed the November 17-18, 2005 Board meeting minutes and if they approve. Mr. Gerst asked who prepared the minutes and that they should be commended on a job well done.

KAREN PINES MOVED, HOWARD STEIN SECONDED AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 17-18, 2005 BOARD MEETING MINUTES. (Mr. Law abstained)

V. PRESENTATION ON AND DISCUSSION OF BOARD'S LICENSING EXAMINATION PROGRAM LINDA HOOPER, PH.D., ACTING CHIEF OF THE OFFICE OF EXAMINATION RESOURCES

Mr. Manoleas introduced Linda Hooper, Acting Chief of the Office of Examination Resources (OER). She will be presenting information regarding the Board's examination programs and their development. Ms. Hooper explained that the LEP, LCSW, and MFT programs are handled by different staff members within OER. Ms. Hooper has worked directly with the MFT examination program. She noted that OER is much like an internal consulting firm, providing exam-related services that range from general consulting to full examination development for approximately 30 of the Boards and Bureaus within Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA).

Ms. Hooper explained that OER's work is guided by legal, professional and technical standards. These standards are not unique to DCA or California; many are national testing standards that are applied by courts when deciding case law. The first standard is California Business and Professions Code Section 139. This statute requires all Boards and Bureaus to submit exam related information to OER to allow preparation of an annual report regarding the methods used to ensure quality examinations. This law was designed to reinforce national testing standards, helps to ensure adherence to legal and professional standards, and establishes a schedule for conducting exam validation and occupational analyses.

Ms. Hooper explained that Section 12944 of the California Fair Employment & Housing Act requires all licensing programs to establish the job-relatedness of their examinations. The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* say basically the same thing, that exams must be related to the profession. To ensure job-relatedness, OER uses a content-related strategy. OER also follows the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1991, and the Federal Uniform Guidelines for Employee Selection Procedures.

Ms. Hooper explained that all licensure exams must be based on an occupational analysis. The results of an occupational analysis determine the examination outline. An occupational analysis begins with interviews of licensees who help to create a list of tasks or duties that are performed by licensees in the profession, and the knowledge required to perform those tasks. Several focus groups with subject matter experts (SME) helps to refine that information. A survey is then created based on the interviews and focus groups. The survey is sent to licensees throughout the state. Those who are newly licensed are oversampled since the exam is based on minimum competency. The end result is the exam outline, which represents the questions to be asked in each content area. The occupational analysis and exam outline is completed every five years for each profession.

Ms. Hooper stated that the MFT occupational analysis was last done in 2002, and is due to be initiated soon so that it is complete by 2007. The LEP was completed in June of 2003, and is due by 2008. The LCSW was just completed in January 2005, so it is not due to be updated until 2010. She explained that examination development is always a work in progress, and includes developing new test questions and revising questions that aren't performing like they should. Different groups of SMEs are involved at each step. OER is constantly monitoring the performance of the exams.

OER would like to begin pretesting six clinical vignette items for each profession, beginning in June 2006 for the LCSW, and in July 2006 for the MFT. The test time will be increased from 90 minutes to two hours. Candidates will not be informed which items are being pre-tested, and such items are not scoreable. Because this exam can be confusing at times, OER is looking at a variety of issues, such as test-taker fatigue. OER hopes that adding more time and allowing some pretesting will help establish better statistics.

Final proposals for a new contract for computer based testing are due from vendors by March 21, 2006, though this date is subject to change. DCA is on track to implement and award the contract to a vendor to begin services November 1, 2006. Thomson Prometric is one of the bidders.

Mary Riemersma of CAMFT asked what could be done about the pass rate fluctuation for the MFT written clinical vignette exam. Ms. Hooper stated that there was a learning curve upon implementation of the exam, so that may have impacted the pass rate of the first cycle. Ms. Riemersma asked what could be done to make sure the exams are scored correctly. She is concerned whether the test is accurately distinguishing minimum competency, and also has concerns about the validity and reliability of the items, which are reportedly convoluted and confusing.

Mr. Manoleas asked whether is it possible that there is some variability in the candidate pool. Ms. Riemersma stated that this is a possibility. Mr. Riches stated that the sample size, or number of candidates that take the examination during a cycle could impact the pass rate. A smaller sample results in greater volatility in statistics.

Ms. Riemersma stated that she is also concerned about the high pass rate of second-time takers, which may indicate that there are people who should have passed the first time. Dr. Russ noted that on retake exams applicants usually do less well and less well; there is going to be a higher fail rate on retake exams. Ms. Riemersma stated that the pass rate of second-time takers was higher than it should be. Mr. Riches mentioned that a learning curve still exists during the second cycle of administration.

Dr. Russ asked Ms. Hooper for a brief overview of how questions are formulated. Ms. Hooper explained that an exam outline is created based on the results of an occupational analysis. The SMEs involved are from a variety of locations and specialty areas, and are often supervisors. Each test question is written by a SME, is related to a specific task and knowledge within a content area of the exam outline, and is also based on reference texts. The new items are reviewed by a different group of SMEs as well as OER's editor. The best items for a new version of the exam are selected by another group of SMEs, and yet another group reviews the questions and determines the passing score by determining the difficulty of each item. Every 10 working days, OER looks at item statistics. If an item is questionable, the item is brought to SMEs for review.

Ms. Johnson stated that as an LEP, the reliability and validity of the examinations are excellent. Every single item that is developed has a reliability and validity coefficient that is related to the internal reliability of that question and to construct validity as far as content. She explained that looking at the statistics is a very scientific process.

Mr. Manoleas stated that the exam is doing its job because the pass rates declined for second, third and subsequent takers. Mr. Riches stated that a lot of the variation in pass rate lies in the first two administrations. Being a new exam, it is going to have volatility. Over time, the stability is increasing, which is what you would expect to see.

Ms. Riemersma stated that at a previous Board meeting, Tracy Montez of OER made the comment that she and her staff lie awake at night thinking about what caused that variability. If Ms. Montez is concerned about that Ms. Riemersma is also going to be concerned. Ms. Hooper commented that OER staff takes their jobs very seriously. They constantly investigate and review the items to make the exam better. Mr. Riches states that Ms. Montez's comments should be taken not an expression of a lack of confidence, but a statement of their commitment to always make these exams better.

Dr. Russ encouraged the school coalitions to determine whether there are schools whose students consistently perform well, year by year. He asked whether there are agencies that seem to have better pass rates and lower pass rates. There are many different variables that need to be looked at. Mr. Gerst asked whether exam preparation courses hurt or help the applicants. There are things outside the control of OER that affect the exam outcome. Ms. Walmsley stated that candidates are provided with a tremendous amount of information about the exam in the candidate handbook.

Gerry Grossman of Gerry Grossman Seminars expressed concerns about the language used in the exam. He believes it can be difficult, especially for people from diverse backgrounds. Ms. Walmsley responded that a minimally competent applicant who has 3200 postgraduate hours with effective supervision and with appropriate exam preparation should be able to pass this exam. She does not believe the language impedes the exam process. Ms. Hooper explained that the exam is edited four or five times throughout its development. Part of the process involves ensuring that the SMEs understand the questions and the language used in the questions.

Ms. Riemersma stated that Mr. Riches once commented about the removal of language indicative of a particular theoretical orientation, making the language generic so as not to guide the examinee to answer the question a certain way. She believes that by removing the reference to a specific theoretical orientation, it tends to make the wording a little more complex. It would be good to inform the applicants of that process. Mr. Riches explained that every profession has its own jargon, which is great in terms of providing verbal shorthand, but jargon should not be part of a professional licensing exam. What is important is to test the understanding of the concepts, and more words have to be used without that verbal shorthand.

Ms. Johnson explained that in terms of test construction, the questions are not simple recall, they are based on analysis and synthesis and problem-solving. Regardless of verbiage used, a question asks a candidate to problem-solve a situation.

Dr. Russ asked Mr. Grossman to clarify his question. Mr. Grossman responded that the questions regarding treatment are distracting and hard to understand. Mr. Manoleas stated that the concerns have been noted.

VI. REPORT OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. Stein reported that the Consumer Protection Committee met on January 17, 2006 in Los Angeles. Mona Maggio, the Board's Assistant Executive Officer, reported on the items the Committee is working on.

1. Staff is reviewing review continuing education (CE) laws to determine a way to identify quality standards and measures of CE.

2. Staff is working on training sessions to assist DOI. The Deputy Attorney General's (DAG) office is investigating and prosecuting our enforcement cases. The Board's cases are being held up for a different reasons, one being that DOI is lacking investigators due to vacancies. Training is scheduled for late November.
3. The Committee discussed the feasibility of tiered, multiple or specialty social work licensure as practiced in other states. Four areas were considered including child welfare, macro level social work, aging, and alcohol and drug counselors. The Committee directed staff to perform further research on child welfare and elder care social work.

Mr. Manoleas stated that at the Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work meeting he and Mr. Riches attended, the topic of multi level social work licensure came up. There was discussion with Dean Flynn of USC and years ago there had been a Board-sponsored work group. He encouraged a look back at previous Board minutes to find out the outcome and what was done. Mr. Manoleas stated that he and Mr. Riches met with Kathy Jett with Alcohol and Drug Programs regarding alcohol and drug counselors to see if there was a possibility of coordinating our efforts. Mr. Riches is in the process of scheduling another meeting with Ms. Jett.

4. The Committee discussed allowing MFT supervision to take place via videoconferencing. This was brought forward by CAMFT, who received a letter from a member who is aware that there are areas where interns and trainees are having difficulty finding supervision. The Committee directed staff to investigate this proposal for use in remote locations and specialty areas, for both ASWs and MFT interns.
5. The Committee discussed whether the Board should sponsor legislation regarding fictitious business names for LCSWs, in line with the MFT statute. This issue arose when staff had difficulty identifying the social worker named in a complaint because the individual works under a fictitious name. The Committee recommended to the Board to pursue such legislation. This proposal will be forwarded to the Policy and Advocacy Committee to approve the language before it goes before the Board.

PETER MANOLEAS MOVED, DR. IAN RUSS SECONDED, AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO SPONSOR LEGISLATION FOR A LCSW STATUTE THAT PARALLELS THE MFT STATUTE FOR FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAMES.

VII. REPORT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Ms. Pines reported on the development of the Board's new outreach program, which will give the Board greater visibility. Sean O'Connor is heading this program, it is a new position, and will allow the Board to have more visibility and to be involved in more professional activities.

Ms. Pines explained that staff plans to provide information at outreach events about the Board's budget, including how the budget is formed and what goes in it. Other outreach opportunities will include ethnic-focused professional groups. Ms. Walmsley stated this will be an opportunity to recruit subject matter experts which will increase the diversity of the exam.

We have received feedback that students and educators would like outlines of the exams and of the licensing requirements. Staff is revising the candidate handbook, due to be in June, and will speak to legal counsel about what can be included in the handbook about managing test anxiety and supervision recommendations. Ms. Maggio stated that staff will likely be developing two separate documents, one for students and one for those ready to take the examinations.

Ms. Pines stated she feels that Board members should attend some outreach events when possible. She reported that the Board is working to hire a public relations firm to develop publications and PowerPoint presentations for outreach events. Mr. Riches stated that the Board is working on the contracting process for the PR firm.

The Committee is working with DCA to be a part of the upcoming Senior Summit. The Committee also plans to work with Board of Psychology and the Department of Mental Health on outreach. The Board will be participating in the upcoming CAMFT and National Association of Social Worker (NASW) conferences. Ms. Pines stated that the upcoming MFT regional consortia meetings will be good venues for discussion and questions about diversity issues, proposition 63 workforce development and curriculum issues.

Heather Halperin of the USC School of Social Work thanked the Board for the outreach event Sean O'Connor held at their campus. Ms. Halperin said it was very well received.

Marci Siegel of the San Diego State School of Social Work commended the Board on their communication with consumers and practitioners. It is very helpful for their students.

Ms. Pines asked the public to let the Board know when there is an event we should attend, as we have not been in the loop in the past.

Jose Luis-Flores representing Phillips Graduate Institute and also representing the Southern California consortium thanked the Board for their attendance at the consortium. When the schools and representatives know of the Board's attendance, they are more likely to attend the meetings. He mentioned that Orange County schools do attend their meetings.

Irene Mellick from the Ventura County Mental Health board, offered to provide information on what is happening with the counties and proposition 63.

Ms. Siegel of San Diego State stated that the Board might want to consider meeting with field directors and field faculty for the different schools, as they would be connecting with thousands of professionals that way.

VIII. REPORT OF THE POLICY AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE

A. Advocate for Implementation of AB 938 Loan Repayment/Scholarship Program Implementation

Mr. Gerst reported that this program was initiated in 2004, funds have been accumulating, but nothing has been done to implement the program. The Committee recommends to the Board that staff draft a letter to the appropriate authority asking for implementation of the law at the earliest possible date. Mr. Riches stated that he also plans to contact the office of Assemblyman Yee, the sponsor of the initial legislation.

Dr. Russ stated that the Board has a surplus of money, and continues to take in more than it is using. He asked whether a portion of this surplus could go to this fund. Mr. Riches stated that staff is looking at our overall fiscal situation to be brought to the budget committee. We will be addressing the reserve and exploring options about how to do that.

Mr. Manoleas asked who the letters would be sent to. Mr. Riches responded that the letter would be addressed to the head of the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD), the entity that administers this program. The Health Professions Education Foundation will also be involved in this communication, as well as Assemblyman Yee's office.

DR. RUSS MOVED AND MS. PINES SECONDED AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO HAVE STAFF DRAFT A LETTER TO OSHPD ASKING FOR THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM STATUTE.

B. Possible Action to Conduct a Demographic Survey of Board Licensees

Mr. Gerst reported that the Committee discussed the survey, which would be strictly voluntary and not individually identifiable. Counsel has written an opinion, the Committee had a very intense discussion about it, and the decision was that conducting this survey is legal and appropriate. The Committee recommends that Board direct staff to develop and conduct the survey. It would be submitted to the appropriate committee to work with staff before it is finalized. Mr. Riches explained that we want to gather data in a way that is comparable to other significant data sets, such as the U.S. Census, so that we can make comparisons on the results.

DR. RUSS MOVED, MS. PINES SECONDED, AND THE BOARD CONCURRED TO HAVE STAFF DEVELOP AND CONDUCT A VOLUNTARY AND ANONYMOUS DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF BOARD LICENSEES.

Mr. Gerst reported that the Committee also looked at three proposed regulations. The first was regarding delegation of authority to the Executive Officer to order a psychiatric evaluation of a licensee during an investigation. The Committee agreed to go forward with this regulation. The Committee also took input regarding the citation and fine of CE providers. This issue was discussed extensively, and Committee agreed to go forward with this regulation. The third was regarding the qualifications of supervisors. The Board chair asked to hold off on this proposal until the results of the supervision survey were available.

Mr. Gerst reported that they also discussed taking a look at the statutory definition of unprofessional conduct, as some areas are not covered. Staff will be reviewing and determining whether other items should be included in the definition.

IX. REPORT OF THE BUDGET AND EFFICIENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Law reported that the Committee discussed future technology, such as accepting digital signatures, online payments and online applications for the licensees. Such technology would help to reduce application processing time. Additionally, DCA is looking for new vendors for the iLicensing project. Ms. DiGiorgio stated that we are trying to make the licensing process more user-friendly to the applicant as far as providing the ability to check where they are in the process and trying to expedite the process.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was no comment from the public.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m.