



**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**  
1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S200, Sacramento, CA 95834  
Telephone (916) 574-7830  
TDD (916) 322-1700  
Website Address: <http://www.bbs.ca.gov>



## Meeting Minutes

Consumer Protection Committee  
September 20, 2006

Ayres Hotel and Suites  
325 Bristol Street  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

### I. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:38 a.m. Judy Johnson, Chair welcomed the Committee Members, staff and members of the audience. Ms. Johnson explained that the Board lost three board members due to the expiration of their appointments; therefore, the Communications Committee was realigned with the Consumer Protection Committee. Once additional board members are appointed to the Board, the Communications Committee will be reappointed.

Mona Maggio called roll and a quorum was established.

#### Committee Members Present

Judy Johnson, Chair  
Howard Stein  
Joan Walmsley

#### Committee Member Absent

D'Karla Leach

#### Staff Present:

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
George Ritter, Legal Counsel  
Christy Berger  
Justin Sotelo  
Sean O'Connor

### II. Review and Approve April 17, 2006 Consumer Protection Committee Meeting Minutes

Joan Walmsley commented that the minutes were thorough. Howard Stein requested that future meeting agendas include the telephone number of the meeting location.

*Joan Walmsley moved and Howard Stein seconded, for the Committee to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2006 Committee Meeting. Approval was unanimous.*

### III. Strategic Plan Goal #3 – Promote Higher Professional Standards Through Rigorous Enforcement and Public Policy Changes - Report on Progress

The Committee reviewed the progress on the following strategic plan objectives; however no comments were received.

Objective 3.1 -- Complete Draft Revisions for Continuing Education Laws by December 31, 2006.

Objective 3.2 -- Establish a Standard to Measure Quality of Continuing Education by June 30, 2007.

Objective 3.3 -- Complete 12 Substantive Changes in Laws and Regulations by January 1, 2008.

Objective 3.4 -- Advocate for Five Laws that Protect the Privacy of Client/Therapist Relationships by December 31, 2010.

Objective 3.5 – Provide Four Educational Opportunities for Division of Investigation (DOI) and The Office of the Attorney General (AG) Regarding the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS) and Its Licensees by June 30, 2008.

Objective 3.6 – Reduce time in which BBS cases are investigated and processed by DOI and AG by 30% by June 30, 2010.

Objective 3.7 – Complete Annual Review of Examination Program and Report the Results at a Public Meeting

#### **IV. Discuss Letter from the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) Inviting California Participation in the National Examination for Social Workers**

Christy Berger explained that in February 2006, the Board received a letter from Roger A. Kryzanek, MSW, LCSW, and President of the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB). The purpose of Mr. Kryzanek's letter is to ask the Board to consider rejoining the ASWB and to require candidates for clinical social work licensure to take the ASWB's national examination. Mr. Kryzanek extended an offer to come to a Board meeting to give a presentation on the ASWB and the examination process.

Ms. Berger provided the following historical background on the Board's relationship with ASWB. She explained that the Board was a member of ASWB from October 1991 through March 1999, and required the ASWB Clinical Level Examination, along with a state-constructed oral examination for licensure of clinical social workers in California. Ms. Berger explained that around 1998 the Board and the Department of Consumer Affairs, Office of Examination Resources (OER) began having concerns regarding the ASWB examination. The concerns included: 1) The practice analysis conducted by ASWB did not include a representative number of licensees in California, just 16 participants; 2) The sampling of participants in the practice analysis did not include demographics representative of California's population; and 3) The pass rate for California's first time examination participants was high at 89%. Based on these concerns, and the results of a new California occupational analysis, the Board determined that there was a need for a state constructed written examination. The new California written examination was administered beginning in late Spring of 1999.

Ms. Berger reported that presently, ASWB is comprised of social work regulatory boards in 49 states, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and seven Canadian provinces. Currently, California is the only state that is not a member of ASWB and not participating in its examination program. ASWB contracts with ACT, Inc. to administer its examinations at test centers on or near college campuses, and also for psychometric and other support services. ASWB conducted its last occupational analysis in 2003, which included 75 surveys returned by California social workers, 2.1% of the total responses.

ASWB has five examination categories for social work, each consisting of 170 items (including 20 pre-test items). All examinations are administered over a four-hour period and cost the candidate \$175:

- *Associate* – Appropriate for paraprofessional social workers. This level uses the Bachelor's examination with a lower pass point.
- *Bachelors* – Appropriate for those who hold a Bachelor's degree in Social Work.
- *Masters* – Appropriate for those who hold a Master's degree in Social Work (MSW).
- *Advanced Generalist* – Appropriate for those who hold a MSW with a minimum of two years of post-degree experience in non-clinical practice.
- *Clinical* – Appropriate for those who hold an MSW with a minimum of two years of post-degree experience in clinical practice. This would be the examination evaluated for possible use in California for LCSWs.

Ms. Berger stated that before considering whether or not to rejoin ASWB and requiring candidates for clinical social work licensure to take ASWB's national examination, an in-depth comparison and analysis of the examinations as well as examination policies and procedures would need to be conducted to determine if the ASWB examination meets California standards for examination development.

Ms. Berger pointed out that participation in the national examination would increase license portability both in and out of California and membership in ASWB would give California a vote and voice on national social work issues.

Ms. Walmsley reported that she met Mr. Kryzanek in Washington D.C., while attending the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Conference in September 2006. Ms. Walmsley expressed her concerns regarding confidentiality and examination security. She explained that subject matter experts/examination item writers develop examination questions at home and then mail the questions back to ASWB, unlike the Board's examination development process, which is done at OER in the confines of a secure environment with the guidance of a psychometrician. No examination development is done outside the confines of OER.

Mr. Riches further defined the thorough audit that would be necessary before considering joining ASWB. He also noted that anyone licensed in another state that wished to practice in California would need to take and pass the clinical vignette (CV) examination prior to obtaining a license. Ms. Walmsley believes a qualified clinician would not have a problem passing the CV examination.

Ms. Walmsley voiced she is concerned that the selection of exam item writers might be too lax. She expressed an interest in reviewing the criteria used by ASWB for selecting item writers and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs).

Ms. Johnson believes further investigation is necessary. With the passage of Proposition 63 more social workers will be coming to California to work. There is also the benefit of networking between professionals.

Dr. Howard Stein commented that the Board should take a hard look at the exam process used by ASWB.

Mr. Janlee Wong, Executive Director of NASW California, commented that the ASWB examination and the pass rate have changed since the Board was a member. Mr. Wong believes it is important for the Board to analyze the exam. He explained that other services such as continuing education are included in the ASWB. The ASWB has legal litigation services, a resource to gain information in case of a lawsuit. Mr. Wong supports the idea of inviting Mr. Kryzanek to present to the Board.

Ms. Walmsley commented that there is a large difference in how boards function in different states. Mr. Riches concurred stating that boards are sometimes very different than BBS. Ms.

Walmsley and Ms. Johnson both commented that looking at other state boards' licensing requirements could help all parties involved.

Mr. Wong commented that licensure portability would be beneficial in natural disasters that require mental health services. He cited Hurricane Katrina as an example.

Ms. Walmsley requested staff to investigate what happens when a licensee moves to another state. She asked if other states accept California's license as direct reciprocal.

Mr. Wong responded that ASWB might already have such information.

Ms. Johnson stated she is interested in seeing what ASWB requires in terms of candidates for whom English is a second language.

Ms. Walmsley questioned if the Board were to offer the licensing examinations in languages other than English, how many languages would we consider?

Mr. Riches indicated that staff is currently looking at our English as a Second Language (ESL) policy. Ensuring the exam is the "same" across all languages is a concern.

Dr. Stein mentioned that people go to school in English speaking institutions. If the candidates are receiving their education and degrees in English then they should take the examination in English.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director for the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT), commented that 160 languages are spoken in California. This creates problems for anyone trying to develop exams compatible across different languages.

*Joan Walmsley moved and Howard Stein seconded, to invite Roger A. Kryzanek to come and give a presentation at a future Board meeting. Approval was unanimous.*

## **V. Multi-Level Licensure of Social Workers**

At its January 2006 meeting, the Consumer Protection Committee explored the different types of social work licensure offered in other states. After discussion and input from stakeholders, the Committee directed staff to conduct more research specifically in the areas of child welfare and elder care with reference to other states' activities and report back at a future meeting.

Ms. Berger explained that staff did investigate child welfare and elder care services. She explained the findings of the research revealed that many jobs in social work do not involve psychotherapy. Thirty-two states offer multi-level licensure and each level of licensure requires a different type of examination. (See Agenda Item IV for additional information on the ASWB examinations). Ms. Berger stated staff is continuing to research and obtain duty statements for county workers who work in the areas of child welfare and elder care to determine their current scope of work, and is researching the scopes of practice for different levels of licensure in other states and will report on the findings at a future meeting of the Committee. Staff also plans to have the ASWB provide information on the different types of social work examinations available.

Ms. Walmsley stated that other states do not allow social workers to call themselves such without having a license.

Mr. Wong explained that title protection could be tied together with multi-level licensure.

Ms. Walmsley commented that some employers require an LCSW even though the job (scope of work) does not require the license.

Mr. Wong commended the Committee for looking at the broader scope of social work. He referenced that 44 children died in foster care last year in Los Angeles County. So to think only people seeking psychotherapy need protection is wrong.

Stephanie Gonzales stated she does not think having a tiered system will change the hiring practices of employers who require the LCSW, even though the job might not involve direct psychotherapy. She commented that title protection is an issue near to her. She is astounded that certain people can call themselves social workers based on the knowledge they possess.

Mr. Riches explained that defining a scope of practice is the first step, next is determining a public protection need. He stated we are not at step one yet.

Ms. Riemersma stated that Marriage and Family Therapists (MFTs) are often hired to function as social workers and could be a casualty to any legislation that secures title protection.

## **VI. Discuss and Compare Exempt Settings Across the Practice Acts**

The LCSW and MFT statutes specify certain types of organizations, referred to as “exempt settings” whose employees are not required to have a license or a registration in order to perform clinical social work or marriage and family therapy within the scope of their employment. When comparing the LCSW and MFT statutes, they have some exempt settings in common, but there are some differences. The MFT statute lists few exemptions and is narrower than the LCSW statute. The Licensed Educational Psychologist (LEP) statute does not specify any exempt settings.

Ms. Berger explained that both MFTs and LCSWs have exempt settings in common, but not all. Concerns include the inconsistency between exempt settings in respect to the different license types.

Ms. Johnson said that for the most part LEPs work in schools and not in institutional settings, and LEPs do not bill insurance companies. Therefore it makes sense not to have exempt settings for LEPs.

Ms. Riemersma commented that perhaps a motion towards consistency in language would be beneficial.

Mr. Riches commented that grades K-12 is not an exempt setting for MFTs, but it is for LCSWs.

Ms. Johnson said that this is especially important as a result of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) because more MFTs will be working in K-12 schools.

Mr. Riches expressed that differences in exempt settings should not be there because there are no compelling reasons for variance. Another concern is jurisdictional – the Board cannot investigate a complaint against someone in an exempt setting.

Mr. Wong explained that the implementation of exempt settings for LCSWs came as a result of some people’s problems working in certain settings when LCSW licensure was initially implemented. People working in certain settings did not feel licensure would be necessary.

*Joan Walmsley moved and Howard Stein seconded to have staff continue its investigation of normalizing exempt settings and to bring back to the Committee a proposal to align the exempt settings for Marriage and Family Therapists and Licensed Clinical Social Workers. Approval was unanimous.*

**VII. Propose to Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 1887(b), Continuing Education Requirements for Marriage and Family Therapists and Licensed Clinical Social Workers, 1887.2(a), Exceptions From Continuing Education Requirements, and 1887.3(a), Continuing Education Course Requirements**

At its April 21, 2006 meeting, the Consumer Protection Committee discussed the distinctions between conventional, self-study, and online continuing education (CE) courses. Currently, licensees are permitted to take an unlimited amount of CE by conventional or online means. However, hours earned through self-study courses are limited to one-third of the total required CE hours. After discussion the Committee decided there was no reason to limit the amount of CE obtained by any one method, and directed staff to bring such a proposal back to the committee.

Ms. Berger explained the draft proposed language would eliminate the self-study limiting language.

Ms. Walmsley believes the limited hours given for home study courses should be retained. She believes that a seven-hour home study course does not take seven hours to complete.

Ms. Johnson stated that the content in a home study course is there; classroom courses are just more engaging. She mentioned that perhaps the quality of a course is something the Board should discuss with the CE providers.

Ms. Riemersma commented that the provider's quality of CE content is the real issue. If a provider is lacking, they are lacking across the board. She recommended a more conservative approach by suggesting the "self-study" CE option be removed. Ms. Riemersma also recommended retaining the elements (definition) of a self-study course in the language.

Mr. Wong commented that CE is necessary to being a good professional. The opinion changes when one considers how that is delivered. He suggested that limiting the method by which people learn is counterproductive. He suggested sharing in the Board's newsletter and/or website examples of what might be a good provider.

*Howard Stein moved to recommend that some additional minor modifications be incorporated [moving some language from Section 1887(b) to 1887(a) to incorporate the definition of self-study into the definition of a CE course]. By doing so, this deletes the limitations regarding hours of self-study. The Committee recommended that the proposed language go forward to the Board at its November 2006 meeting for review and approval. Judy Johnson seconded the motion. Vote: Howard. Stein and Judy Johnson voted in favor and Joan Walmsley voted to oppose. The motion passed.*

**VIII. Review Appeals Process for Continuing Education Provider Application Denials and Provider Revocations**

Ms. Maggio stated that currently the Board has 2213 approved continuing education providers. To be granted an approval from the Board, a continuing education provider must complete an application, submit course content information, and remit the appropriate fees. If the applicant meets the Board's criteria a continuing education provider number will be issued.

A provider number expires on the last day of the twenty-fourth month after the approval issue date. To renew an unexpired provider approval, the provider must pay the renewal fee on or before the expiration date of the approval. A provider approval, which is not renewed by the expiration date, may not be renewed, restored, reinstate, or reissued. However, the provider may apply for a new approval.

In fiscal year 2005/06 the Board received 262 provider applications, three were denied. In each of the three cases the applicants were previously issued provider approvals; however, during the process of conducting CE audits of the licensees, it was discovered the previously approved providers had been offering courses after their provider approval had expired.

Ms. Maggio said when a licensee takes a course from a provider whose approval had expired, the licensee is penalized in that the CE course hours are not accepted by the Board. This situation arises during random CE audits. As part of the audit process staff will review the courses completed by a licensee and verify the approval status of each CE provider. When the audit reveals that the CE provider's approval was expired at the time the licensee took the course, the licensee is notified that he/she must take another course to count towards meeting the CE requirement for license renewal. The provider is notified of the expired status of the approval and is asked to reimburse the licensee(s) for the cost of the course taken while the approval was expired. Since the Board began conducting CE audits, staff has identified a number of instances where this problem has occurred.

Ms. Maggio stated that if an applicant is denied an approval, the applicant may appeal the decision by requesting an informal conference with the Board's Executive Officer (EO). The informal conference is typically held via a telephone conference. The applicant has an opportunity to submit information for consideration to the EO prior to the conference. If the EO determines to uphold the denial of the application, the applicant may then request an appeal before the Continuing Education Appeals Committee (called a formal appeal for the purpose of clarity). The Board has not had a request for such an appeal.

Ms. Walmsley inquired how a provider might lose a license (revocation), Mr. Riches responded fraud, conviction of a crime substantially related to the approval, and if the provider is also a licensee, then other violations of law may apply.

Mr. Riches stated that auditing providers is a possibility but limited resources prevent staff from conducting such audits at this time. He added that the Board has never really fleshed out the process of disciplining CE providers. Mr. Riches reported that the Policy and Advocacy Committee is considering a delinquency status for CE providers. If approved, the delinquency status for providers would be similar to that of licensees. Once the approval expired the provider would have a set period of time, such as one year in which the provider approval could be renewed by paying the renewal fee and a delinquency fee.

Ms. Johnson noted that this is an important issue to move forward on once the resources are there. Ms. Walmsley concurred. Ms. Walmsley added that involvement with CAMFT and NASW to spread the word about good providers is a helpful tool.

## **IX. Examination Statistics**

The Committee reviewed and discussed the statistical information provided by the Examination Unit.

Mr. Riches explained that staff provides statistics as an informational item for candidates and licensees. The school-by-school breakdown is especially useful.

Mr. Wong asked about the difference in MFT and LCSW examination pass rates. Mr. Riches explained that some MSW students do not have licensure as a goal where as MFT candidates tend to know they will be seeking licensure. Ms. Walmsley concurred with Mr. Riches.

Mr. Riches explained that the bulk of the content of the examination is in diagnostic and psychotherapy. A person with limited experience in this arena will have trouble on the

examination. He stated the supervision surveys indicated that MFTs get their experience across a broader scope of work settings.

Robin Emerson of CSCSW commented that at the onset of supervision, the supervisor and supervisee should discuss licensure, especially what type of work experience/settings will prepare the supervisee to take and pass the licensing examination and for licensure. This might even involve suggesting going outside of an employment setting.

Mr. Wong recommended gathering gross aggregate statistics on what areas people tend to fail on the examination.

#### **X. Review Enforcement Program**

The Committee reviewed the statistical information provided by the Enforcement Unit.

#### **XI. Review Expert Witness Selection Criteria**

Ms. Maggio explained that Expert Witnesses are marriage and family therapist, licensed educational psychologists, and licensed clinical social workers that perform case review for the Board's Enforcement Program and sometimes testify at administrative hearings. The Expert Witness Program is an impartial professional means by which to evaluate complaints received by the Board against licensees and registrants. Its effectiveness is vital for fulfilling the legislative mandate to protect the California public's health, safety and welfare.

To ensure that enforcement cases are assigned to the most qualified expert, the Enforcement Unit staff is currently revising the expert guidelines, creating a training manual, and developing a training curriculum for an expert training session. As a first step in improving the expert witness selection criteria, staff developed a questionnaire to aid in identifying the expert's areas of expertise and forensic experience.

The Committee made the following suggestions to revise the *Expertise Questionnaire*:

- Ask for the theoretical framework
- Reference the California Association of School Psychologists (CASP) Code of Ethics
- Reference the Code of Ethics for both the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT) and CAMFT
- Reference CSCSW Code of Ethics

*Recess called at 12:00 p.m.*

*Meeting reconvened at 1:05 p.m.*

#### **XII. Review and Discuss Prior Recommendation to the Board to Sponsor Legislation to Add Violations of the Health and Safety Code to the Definition of Unprofessional Conduct**

Ms. Berger explained that a proposal was brought before the Board at its May 18, 2006 that would have added a violation of Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 123110 to the definition of unprofessional conduct in each of the three practice acts. At this meeting, the suggestion was made to instead reference the chapter of the HSC that pertains to the release of patient records, as there are other applicable sections. This chapter is Chapter 1 of part 1 of Division 106, of the HSC which includes Section 123110, et. al.

Ms. Berger explained that staff is also proposing to add a statute regarding the practice of telemedicine. In 1999, Business and Professions Code Section 2290.5 was amended to require LCSWs and MFTs to comply with the telemedicine statute. The Board has been treating BPC as part of our law even though

it is part of the Medical Practice Act. However, it would be difficult for the Board to take enforcement action under a provision that is not directly part of the Board's law.

Ms. Berger explained that the failure to report abuse of a child, elder, or dependent adult are in the MFT and LCSW regulations, but are not in statute. To have a consistent, cohesive unprofessional conduct law, it is preferable to list all instances of potential unprofessional conduct in one place.

Ms. Riemersma requested that the Board add "willful violation" for consistency with the other violations in the unprofessional conduct statute.

*Joan Walmsley moved for the Consumer Protection Committee to recommend that the Board sponsor legislation to amend the unprofessional conduct statutes for marriage and family therapists (BPC sections 4982 and 4992.3), respectively as follow:*

- *Delete the regulation for failure to comply with child, elder, or dependent adult abuse reporting requirements and add it to statute.*
- *Add to statute the failure to comply with Division 106, Part 1, Chapter 1 of the HSC pertaining to release of records*
- *Add to statute the failure to comply with telemedicine requirements of BPC Section 2290.5*
- *Make minor editorial changes.*

*Amend unprofessional conduct statutes for LEPs (BPC Section 4986.70) as follows:*

*Add to statute the failure to comply with Division 106, Part 1, Chapter 1 of the HCS pertaining to release of records.*

*Howard Stein seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.*

### **XIII. Review and Approve June 28, 2006 Communications Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Walmsley stated that the Board's efforts to be a more open and receptive organization are being noticed. She is hearing positive comments as she attends conferences and outreach programs on behalf of the Board.

*Judy Johnson moved and Howard Stein seconded, for the Committee to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2006 Communications Committee Meeting. Approval was unanimous.*

### **XIV. Strategic Plan Goal #1 – Report on Progress**

The Committee reviewed and discussed the following objectives.

- A. Objective 1.1 -- Provide Six Educational Opportunities for Stakeholders and Staff on BBS Budget by July 30, 2006

Staff has identified this objective as being met.

- B. Objective 1.2 -- Distribute a Handbook Outlining Licensing Requirements by December 31, 2006 to 100% of California Schools Offering Qualifying Degrees

Mr. O'Connor has prepared a handbook that is awaiting distribution.

- C. Objective 1.3 -- Distribute Consumer Publication Regarding Professions Licensed by the Board by June 30, 2007

- D. Objective 1.4 -- Achieve 60% on Customer Service Satisfaction Surveys by June 30, 2008

Surveys are going out as planned. The website survey has been up since June, and August saw the mailing of hard copy surveys.

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

Board representatives attended the NASW and CAMFT annual conferences, and hosted the Cultural Diversity conference.

F. Objective 1.6 – Review and Revise Website Content Four Times Per Year

Staff updates the website on a weekly basis. Lynne Stiles, Administrative Analyst also ensures each unit reviews content on the website on an ongoing basis.

G. Objective 1.7 – Objective 1.7 Student Outreach

This objective is working well. Ms. Johnson suggested staff contact the California Association of School Psychologists (CASP) to work with the LEP constituent base.

**XV. Outreach and Communications Presentation by BP Cubed**

Sean O'Connor reported that the Board recently established a contract with the public relations firm BP Cubed. BP Cubed will assist the Board's staff in creating an effective outreach program, improving customer service, updating current Board publications, creating new publications and developing a Board logo. The service that BP Cubed will provide directly relates to several of the goals identified in the 2005 Strategic Plan, specifically Goal 1 and Goal 4.

Mr. O'Connor introduced Jairo Moncada, the Board's representative with BP Cubed. Mr. Moncada shared that one of the key themes is to ensure that the work performed by BP Cubed is in synch with what the Board wants to communicate. He provided a brief description of the goals BP Cubed hopes to achieve for the Board, including establishing a clear vision and message for the Board.

Mr. Riches noted that the process is in the early stages. The second year of the contract will see more tactical involvement.

Mr. Wong noted that a key message for the Board is cultural diversity. Ms. Johnson added that revisions to the website will be a great improvement as the website is a valuable tool for the Board's stakeholders.

**XVI. Update on Customer Service Satisfaction Surveys**

Ms. Maggio expressed that the overall results of the surveys thus far have rated the customer service received as excellent. However, one concern voiced in the surveys is response time from the Board. The response time issues stem from several problems in the Board's telephone system. Justin Sotelo and Sean O'Connor are researching the problems and taking corrective action.

Mr. Riches stated that the survey would be a feedback mechanism for the phone and other problems as well. Mr. Riches added that staff would receive data/results.

Mr. Riches discussed the suspension of administering the clinical vignette examinations due to the problem with the examination time allotted by Thomson Prometric. Due to the increase of pre-test items, the examination time was increased from 90 minutes to 120 minutes. However,

the computer system at the test centers only allowed candidates 90 minutes to complete the examination.

Ms. Riemersma voiced that candidates have high levels of anxiety regarding the test process and explained how that is compounded by errors in the administration of the examination.

Mr. Wong echoed Ms. Riemersma's concerns. He also suggested the Board consider an emergency back up plan. Mr. Riches responded that a back up plan is a possibility, but it will need to be researched. An adaptive exam plan is also a possibility.

Mr. Wong responded that an adaptive exam has other positives as well (i.e. exam integrity).

Gerry Grossman suggested "disaster communication plan" might be necessary.

Mr. Wong recommended that the Board ask Thomson Prometric to post a notice at each test center to inform candidates of the current problems with the administration of the CV examinations. The notice would also provide the candidates with information on how to file a complaint with the Board; a Candidate's Bill of Rights.

**XVII. Review and Discuss Updates to Licensed Clinical Social Work Examination Candidate Handbook**

This item was not discussed, as the revisions to the handbook were not completed prior to the meeting.

**XVIII. Discuss Future Committee Meeting Agenda Items**

The next meeting of the Consumer Protection Committee is scheduled for January 10, 2007, location to be announced. Suggestions for future agenda items were: 1) a discussion on Tarasoff and Ewing decisions and reporting requirements, and 2) to review the Supervisor Responsibility Statement.

**Adjournment**

Ms. Johnson adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.