



BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
1625 N. Market Blvd., Suite S-200, Sacramento, CA 95834
Telephone (916) 574-7830
TDD (916) 322-1700
Website Address: <http://www.bbs.ca.gov>



MEETING MINUTES

Policy and Advocacy Committee

January 3, 2007
Burbank Airport Marriott
2500 Hollywood Way
Burbank, CA 91505

9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Gordonna DiGiorgio, Chair, Public Member
Dr. Ian Russ, MFT Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

Victor Law, Public Member
Karen Roye, Public Member

STAFF PRESENT

Paul Riches, Executive Officer
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer
Christy Berger, Legislative Analyst

GUEST LIST ON FILE

I. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. Ms. DiGiorgio called the roll and a quorum was established.

II. Review and Approval of the June 21, 2006 Budget and Efficiency Committee Meeting Minutes.

The Committee was asked to approve the June 21, 2006 Budget and Efficiency Committee meeting minutes.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 21, 2006 BUDGET AND EFFICIENCY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.

III. Review and Approval of September 27, 2006 Committee Meeting Minutes.

The Committee was asked to approve the September 27, 2006 Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting minutes.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 27, 2006 POLICY AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.

(Agenda item IV was moved to the afternoon just after item IX)

V. Discussion and Possible Action on Increasing Portability of Licensure for Marriage and Family Therapists.

Ms. Berger reported that through legislation, the Board recently improved portability of licensure for out-of-state licensed clinical social workers. Stakeholders requested the same be done for Marriage and Family Therapists (MFT). Staff prepared a report regarding MFT licensure requirements across the country, which showed the variations in experience and educational requirements. The Committee directed staff to work with stakeholders to come up with a proposal that they would support. The following proposal resulted from staff working with stakeholders:

1. Modify the requirement for a course in California law and ethics. Out-of-state applicants would still be required to have completed a course in law and ethics within their degree, but could take a continuing education in California law and ethics. CAMFT has proposed that the course be an 18-hour requirement. This is currently under consideration by AAMFT.
2. Clarify that the Board will count hours of experience gained in the 6-years prior to the issuance of the applicant's MFT license in another state. This is current Board practice, but the law could be interpreted as requiring the hours within the 6 years prior to applying for licensure with the BBS. This change would preserve the requirement that experience be substantially equivalent to California requirements.
3. Current law allows out-of-state applicants to make up coursework or units in the MFT core curriculum. The core MFT courses, including practicum, should be required as part of any qualifying degree, but any other units should be allowed to be made up.
4. Provide a method to allow documented practice experience while licensed in another state to count in place of supervised experience. This will help those who are unable to document their experience. This part of the proposal has not yet been fully developed.

Dr. Russ asked Mr. Riches about the status of the Bureau for Private, Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE). Mr. Riches stated that not much has changed, which is that barring legislative action, the BPPVE ceases to exist on July 1, 2007. Mr. Riches has been in contact with the Department of Consumer Affairs (Department) and the legislature, and it is a priority. The Department is going to roll out their communication about the BPPVE in January 2007. The Board recently sent a letter to schools asking about their planning. We have received responses from five schools so far, and expect to hear from more after the winter break. Mr. Riches hopes to have a better sense of what will happen by the February Board meeting.

Dr. Russ asked how the proposal under consideration would impact the work that the MFT Education Committee is doing. Mr. Riches explained that when the MFT curriculum is rewritten, these changes would be incorporated. Dr. Russ asked whether this proposal would make it easier for someone from another state to meet the educational requirements than a person who earned their degree in California. Mr. Riches responded that this flexibility is not available to California graduates. He explained that California has some very particular requirements, including specific degree titles, but we can't expect all 49 other states to have that same structure. Flexibility is required so that it is not a practical impossibility to come in from another state and get licensed.

Dr. Russ asked Ms. Riemersma her thoughts about this. She stated that it would seem unfair that people from another state have it easier, but she agreed that we can't expect people from another state to have a degree with a specific title and content named in

California law. So CAMFT has been okay with the flexibility, and they don't want to be nonreceptive to people coming in from out of state. It seems to have worked okay and is better than requiring people to come in and get a whole new degree.

Janlee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter (NASW-CA) asked whether there were any data regarding disciplinary actions on licensees from another state. Mr. Riches responded that our current system does not have that capability, though there is a project that should allow us to start querying our own data, possibly this year. It will in theory allow us to look at a number of different factors. Mr. Riches stated that from his own subjective look at cases over the past two years, the Board doesn't often get competency-based complaints, and that boundary issues and dual relationships are more common. Mr. Wong asked whether the proposed law and ethics course could be designed around the types of issues shown by the data. Olivia Loewy, Executive Director of the American Association of Marital and Family Therapy, California Division (AAMFT-CA) stated that she doesn't think it has much to do with training, it is a person who makes a decision who is often in denial or taking a risk. They know they are violating the standards.

Dr. Russ asked if it were known how many people would apply if this proposal were passed. Mr. Riches stated that we get 400 or 500 applications per year from out of state. Often the challenge is to get the law and ethics, psychopharmacology and psychological testing courses. A lot of schools don't like to offer single classes.

Dr. Russ asked the audience, many of who are educators, whether their schools would permit people to take single courses. One educator responded that it depends on the particular program, providing there is space and it doesn't prevent a student admitted to the program from taking that course. Another educator confirmed their school was the same way, and that there is often a waiting list for their own students to take these courses.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE PORTABILITY OF LICENSURE FOR MFTS TO THE BOARD.

VI. Discussion and Possible Action to Repeal Business and Professions Code Section 4980.40(i).

Ms. Berger explained that on January 1, 1988 the educational requirements for registration as a MFT intern or for MFT licensure had some significant changes. The statute permitted those who would have qualified prior to January 1, 1988 but did not apply, to be granted an intern registration if they had a specific degree title and made up courses needed to meet the current requirements. In the past five years or more, the Board has had only one applicant under that provision. For this reason staff believes this law is outdated and recommends that this statute be deleted.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSAL TO REPEAL BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 4980.40(i) TO THE BOARD.

VII. Presentation by Stephanie Clendenin of the Health Professions Education Foundation.

Mr. Riches introduced Ms. Clendenin, who is the Interim Director of the Health Professions Education Foundation (HPEF), an arm of the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). HPEF is the administrator of loan repayment

programs for health professionals. There is a law that places a \$10 surcharge on the Board's licensees at the time of renewal to fund this program, which is not yet in operation. Staff has been working with HPEF on this for the past two years

Ms. Clendenin stated that the main reason she was asked to come to HPEF was to work on this program and develop the regulations. She has been there since November 20. HPEF has received many phone calls from professionals and associations inquiring about the status of the program, especially since AB 1852 was passed. The regulations had been worked on by the prior administration, were pretty much drafted, but the definition of the publicly funded facility and a full-time workweek, 32 vs. 40 hours, were holding things up.

Ms. Clendenin brought a copy of the draft regulations, which were given to HPEF's legal office the prior day. She expects to have them back by the end of the week, and plans to send it to interested parties prior to beginning the formal regulatory process to determine any other issues. Their goal is to have the regulations implemented by summer of 2007 and implement the program for their fall funding cycle, which would have an application deadline of September 11. They plan to have the application ready to go at the same time the regulations are passed.

Dr. Russ expressed his hope that the professional associations would advertise this program when it becomes available, including a press release. Ms. Clendenin stated that part of their process is to call together an advisory group consisting of representatives from associations and affected Boards to help them develop the application. That should leave everybody very informed about the process.

Dr. Russ expressed his understanding that Ms. Clendenin is a new interim director, but that from this side it has been a bureaucratic nightmare. Ms. Clendenin responded that she is only an interim director, but the executive director is committed to this process so if she were to leave, the commitment remains.

Ms. Loewy inquired regarding the timelines for the application process. Ms. Clendenin explained that there is an 8-week processing deadline. Since she is new, she did not know exactly when the funds are released but offered to obtain that information.

Ms. Clendenin brought a handout showing the fund's condition. It shows the funds coming into the program and that those funds are being invested. The money has not been kept in separate pools for each license type as the law requires, but they are working to make that separation. The expenditures show the authorization of .8 personnel years which accounts for the salary being charged to that fund.

Dr. Russ stated his concerns regarding the high administrative costs. Ms. Clendenin responded that work has been done on the program, including developing regulations and accounting functions. Also, OSHPD is moving, so each program is being charged for its fair share of moving costs. Mr. Riches stated that it is frustrating that we are bearing expenses without a program in place, and that a lot of these concerns will go away once the program is up and running. Ms. Clendenin expressed her understanding regarding the frustration.

Dr. Russ asked what amount of awards might be available to applicants. Ms. Clendenin stated that this would be determined by the advisory committee, who will balance the cost of education and the amount of money available. Mr. Wong stated that we should all be aware that \$155,000 split among three professions would not be a lot of awards. Also, since there are more MFTs than anybody else, they would get the majority of those awards. He stated that the criteria should include financial need. Ms. Clendenin stated

that the advisory committee would look at those types of criteria. Mr. Riches stated that the Board is considering a proposal that will put more money into this fund, which will expand the amount available for grants.

The Committee adjourned briefly for a break.

VIII. Discussion of Fee Reduction Alternatives and Funding for Loan Repayment Program.

Mr. Riches explained that the Board has too much money in its reserve. There was a prior proposal for a temporary reduction of license renewal fees, which would have been redirected to the loan repayment program. The Department said no to that proposal, as they did not believe a temporary reduction of fees would be feasible, as it would eventually result in a fee increase. That sent staff back to the drawing Board. We had brought a new proposal to the September meeting of the Committee, but some reservations were expressed and it was decided to hold it over for one meeting.

Staff looked at the Board's fund condition and considered the reservations expressed regarding the budget. There is a law that the Board can't have more than two years of reserves, and we will be there within four years. At that point the law requires a mandatory fee reduction. So there is an abundance of revenue, and in order to spend any of that revenue authority is needed in the budget act. Staff projected that the Board could sustain a \$40 fee reduction over a 10-year period, and after that time we would still be left with a 4-month reserve. The general advice from the Department of Finance is 3-6 months. This proposal would put nearly one million dollars a year into the loan program. Licensees would see no change in their renewal fee, but there would be a redirection of \$40 dollars per renewal into the loan repayment program.

This proposal has two parts. Our fees have a range set in statute. The first step is a rulemaking to reduce the fees. The second step would be legislation to increase the surcharge by a comparable amount. Passage of the legislative proposal is not a certainty as fees and surcharges are not a popular with legislators. We will have to make the argument that there is a neutral impact on our licensees. If everything goes well, it is possible that this could be implemented on July 1, 2008.

Mr. Riches asked Ms. Clendenin what impact this would have operationally on their program. She stated that most of their processes are fairly manual, so they would have to look at systems changes. Mr. Riches asked whether this would be similar in scale to their other programs. She said it would be significantly greater. Dr. Russ asked whether we could get support for this from the Department of Mental Health (DMH). Mr. Riches stated that they have had some discussions. Ms. Clendenin stated that the DMH did approach HPEF recently to see if they could transfer approximately two million dollars per year to HPEF to fund these types of programs. HPEF was not able to do it because of the large scale and time frames in which DMH wanted to do it. Dr. Russ asked if HPEF was the only governmental agency that could distribute these types of funds. Ms. Clendenin stated that they are one of a limited number of programs within the state. HPEF is able to solicit donations from private parties. Mr. Riches explained that HPEF is a nonprofit and charitable organization which is also a state agency, a bit unusual.

Mr. Riches asked whether HPEF has considered outsourcing to other entities, such as the private sector. Ms. Clendenin stated that they might have to as their programs grow. Dr. Russ expressed his concern that outside entities may have even higher administrative costs. Ms. Clendenin stated that they would look for entities with low

administrative costs. Dr. Russ asked the professional organizations whether they would have the facilities to create these types of scholarship funds. Mr. Riches stated that this is already being done by several social work organizations. Ms. Riemersma stated that CAMFT could do it on a contract basis, as they have a 501(c)(3). She stated that there are programs on the way for MFTs through different consortia.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSAL FOR FEE REDUCTION AND FUNDING FOR LOAN REPAYMENT TO THE BOARD.

IX. Discussion and Possible Action on Legislative Proposal for Licensure of Professional Counselors.

Mr. Riches stated that the California Coalition for Counselor Licensure (CCCL) has proposed legislation for licensure of professional counselors. The Board looked at a similar bill two years ago. Staff has been working with the sponsors over the past couple of years on drafting issues. The Board's analysis of the bill mostly addresses administrative issues. There are two very significant issues from a staff perspective, the provisions for grandparenting existing counselors and the source of startup funding for the program. There is one other question regarding the inclusion of career development in the scope of practice, and whether that activity should be regulated.

There are questions that need to be answered, such as whether there is a threat to public harm, and if so, whether that threat that is remedied by this proposal, the scope, need, and workforce considerations. These are some of the core philosophical questions. Staff has tried to whittle down the administrative and ministerial issues so that the Board can wrestle with the core issues. Staff has prepared an analysis that recommends a position of oppose unless amended based on the amendments we have requested. This reflects our extraordinary caution in taking on something like this rather than a reflection on the philosophical questions.

Dean Porter, the President of the CCCL explained that they are a coalition of 12 professional associations that have come together for the purpose of obtaining licensure for counselors in California. She introduced the other CCCL Board members, who are all nationally certified counselors. Dr. Gregory Jackson is a counselor educator at California State University (CSU) Northridge, Dr. Lea Brew is licensed in Texas as a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) and is a counselor educator at CSU Fullerton. Jan Cummings is a master's level counselor and has been attending some of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) and mental health planning council meetings.

Dr. Jackson explained that LPC licensure exists in 48 other states. There are more than 95,000 LPCs in the U.S. There is a national effort to improve the portability of counselors from state to state to improve conditions for practitioners and consumers. The bill reflects American Association of State Counseling Boards' (AASCB) standards. He described the U.S. Department of Human Services' definition of professional counseling, and explained what professional counselors often do and whom they work with. He explained that the ethical standards are set by the American Counseling Association (ACA), established in 1952. He described several pieces of federal legislation that would have provided opportunities to LPCs in California, but because this type of licensure does not exist, none of California's counselors were able to take advantage of these opportunities.

Dr. Brew described the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), an accrediting body that works with ACA and the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), which develops the exams. CACREP creates rigorous

standards for counselor education programs, consistent with the NBCC. There are seven CACREP accredited programs in California even though there is not licensure. Dr. Brew explained that they are proposing a 48 unit program and in five years that would increase to 60 units. She described the core curriculum, and the practicum hours which would start at 150 and later increase to 280 hours.

Ms. Cummings explained that she has had a career-long interest in quality of mental health care issues. She believes that licensure of professional counselors would help to address the workforce shortage of mental health counselors in California, help with accessibility of mental health services to meet the increasing need of underserved populations, and have a role in protecting the consumer. She referred to a mental health workforce report which indicates that there is a large growth in need for such professionals and that there seems to be a disconnect with the population that is growing increasingly diverse and aging. She reported on a survey of counselor students in California and found that they are quite diverse. Unlicensed counselors are often found in exempt settings and are often underemployed. They often cannot be promoted or offer clinical services. She also explained that acute shortages of professionals are often found in rural areas, so California needs to broaden the accessibility in order to meet increasing needs. The MHSAs are working to increase that access to the underserved.

Ms. Porter provided an overview of the legislation, including scope of practice, exemptions from licensure, educational requirements comparable to MFTs, 3000 hours of postgraduate supervised experience, and the examination requirement such as the national counseling examinations and possibly a California supplemental examination. She also described the grandparenting provisions which require core counseling courses, documentation of 1,000 hours of supervised postdegree direct client contact, and passage of an examination. MFTs could be grandparented if they have all of the core courses.

Ms. DiGiorgio asked what the counselors are doing who are currently practicing in California but are not licensed. Ms. Porter responded that they are working in exempt settings where they are not regulated, or they are underemployed as case managers, doing rehabilitation or career counseling, or working in the schools. Some from other states have had to change careers. Ms. DiGiorgio asked whether they all came from other states or did they get their education in California. Ms. Brew responded that both are true. Mr. Riches asked whether some of the counselor education programs qualify people for pupil personnel services credentials as a school counselor. Ms. Brew said many of them do, but in other states people could get this degree and work in schools or independently. There are approximately 3,500 graduates in these programs per year. Dr. Russ asked how many they expect to apply for grandparenting. Ms. Porter explained that there are approximately 1,000 certified counselors and approximately 1,000 rehabilitation counselors but beyond that it would be hard to estimate because many might come from out of state.

Dr. Russ asked about what rehabilitation counselors do. Dr. Brew explained that they counsel people with disabilities providing basic psychotherapy and career counseling. Dr. Russ asked whether LPCs could treat within the military. Ms. Porter responded that they could under supervision of a physician. Dr. Russ then asked about how this licensure would increase access to the underserved. Dr. Brew stated that there is greater ethnic diversity and social class backgrounds within the students of counselor education programs, and there are LPC-qualified people in rural areas. Dr. Russ asked why they draw a more culturally diverse group of students. Dr. Jackson stated that he has had a number of students of color who are concerned that the term "psychotherapist" is a western orientation, and the term "counselor" offers another

framework that is not as threatening to other cultures. Dr. Brew stated that marriage and family therapy traditionally takes a systemic view and tries to work with the whole family and acculturation issues are huge for many people and so they are more likely to look for individual therapy.

Dr. Russ asked about the staff implications to the Board from including MFTs in the grandparenting process. Mr. Riches replied that it would be one very busy year and explained the different processes that the Board would have to go through to get such a program up and running. Dr. Russ asked why grandparent MFTs and not LCSWs. Ms. Porter stated that the education for MFTs and LPCs were more similar, and that MFTs would be required to have particular coursework. Dr. Russ asked whether counselor education programs were teaching the recovery model. Dr. Brew stated that they do teach from a strengths-based, wellness perspective, which is similar.

Ms. Riemersma asked to clarify what MFTs do, which is not only treat couples, families and groups, but also individuals. It is often from a systems perspective, but they rarely have the family in the room. She stated her feeling that the workforce study is flawed regarding shortages. She believes that instead there is a disconnect where people aren't getting information about the available jobs. She does believe there are shortages of professionals who are culturally diverse or multilingual.

A member of the audience questioned the proposed scope of practice, and asked how it is different than what is currently available to consumers in California. If it is a matter of not having enough providers, why don't we increase the numbers of current licensees rather than adding a new license type, which makes things more complex and confusing for consumers. Dr. Brew stated that the training is from a different perspective, focusing on prevention and lifespan development. She stated that there are people who are qualified to provide psychotherapy but don't meet the specific requirements for licensure in California.

Dr. Russ stated his concern that this bill would newly regulate career counseling. Dr. Jackson stated that this depends. If you're talking about someone who writes resumes, helps with job searches and does some assessments, no. But those who counsel people with psychological problems and help them to make life transitions, yes. Mr. Riches stated that in terms of drafting a scope of practice, you need to be very careful about what to include, because anything included will be regulated. Dr. Jackson stated that there are people who currently provide straight career counseling without psychotherapy, and they do not intend to regulate those people. Ms. Porter offered to remove career counseling from the scope. She stated they had included it because it appears in the scope of practice for other states. Mr. Riches stated that the Board's other licensees do work that is not listed in their scope of practice and which doesn't require a license. He stated that it would be cleaner from his perspective to remove it.

Mr. Wong asked why the bill would grandparent MFTs but not LCSWs, as the work they do is very similar. He suggested that the ability to diagnose be included in the scope of practice. He questioned the diversity statistics provided by the sponsor, stating his belief that it is dangerous to use national statistics in California. He stated that LCSWs are just as diverse if not more diverse than counselors. He stated his belief that the number of different license types is already confusing to the public.

Ms. DiGiorgio stated that as a consumer she would love to see just one license type but with different specializations. It is really difficult for a consumer who has no knowledge, and as a first-generation American, she wouldn't know where to begin. She would like to see a pamphlet for consumers regarding the different license types.

Ms. Riemersma asked what the sponsor's relationship is, if any, with the alcohol and drug abuse counselors who will be attempting a licensure bill, or the expressive arts therapists. Ms. Porter stated there is no relationship with the alcohol and drug abuse counselors. As far as the art therapists, to become licensed as a LPC they would have to meet all of the requirements, just as they would to become a MFT.

The Committee adjourned for lunch.

Dr. Russ asked for feedback from those who think the LPC license is not a good idea. A member of the audience responded that it doesn't seem there has been a documented need for another license in California, the distinguishing scopes of practice between the three license types is not there. It is not clear about the financial impact on the existing professions and the system, adding another layer of bureaucracy and another level of complexity adding to different systems in California. Coming from Ventura County, there would have to be job descriptions and policies written to address this, taking a tremendous amount of resources.

Another audience member stated that with just the two license types, it is already a major struggle providing oversight in her agency for supervised hours. So if this went forward, it would be more of a struggle.

Ms. Loewy asked for clarification about the demographics relating to diversity, whether it is for students in California or nationwide. Ms. Cummings responded that they surveyed the students in California counseling programs, and about one-third of the schools responded. A member of the audience asked whether the Board had surveyed students. Mr. Riches responded that they had not, only registrants and licensees.

Dr. Russ stated he was not interested in regulating new areas, but if there is a qualified workforce that has substantially equivalent education, training, experience and ability who are available to serve in mental health, why shouldn't we license them. In terms of consumer protection, there are no significant issues. The Board could explain the history and orientation of each profession. It seems that more qualified people would be better for consumers. He recommended that this proposal be recommended to the Board.

A member of the audience asked how fiscal impact is determined to the state, counties and practitioners who would be competing for the same jobs with the other license types. Dr. Russ acknowledged that it could create more competition and may lower prices for consumers. He stated that the Board's job is to protect consumers but at the same time therapists should not be put out of business.

Mr. Wong stated his understanding that the Board's job is not to serve consumers, but to protect consumers, which is a big difference to him. He explained that depressed prices to increase access doesn't sound like consumer protection to him, it sounds like marketplace and business. He believes that lowering prices could have the opposite effect. This happened in Medi-Cal when the rates were lowered, creating a shortage of physicians willing to accept Medi-Cal. His belief is when a new license type is proposed, quantitative data and studies showing there is a consumer protection problem that needs to be remedied should be provided.

Mr. Riches responded that he has seen a lot of people fight for licensure or expansion of licensure, and rarely are there any reviewed, study level quantitative analysis to back up any of it. This includes the existing licenses in California, none of them have crossed that hurdle. The fact that LPCs would be joining an existing field is an unusual situation in Mr. Riches' experience. The kind of studies Mr. Wong is asking for would be relevant if we were looking at a field not already being regulated. It was determined a long time ago

that psychotherapists need to be licensed, so we are past the question of whether this profession needs regulation. The core question is whether the population seeking licensure is qualified to perform the service for which you need a license. You only need to demonstrate public harm when you are attempting to regulate a new field.

Ms. DiGiorgio stated she had no problem taking this proposal forward to the Board, since 48 other states have this classification of licensure. This would help with increasing access to services.

Mr. Riches stated that one of the primary issues in the analysis is where the startup funds would originate, because there are significant up front costs. He recommends that the Board oppose the bill because there are no visible means of support. This is one issue of several that need to be resolved before we take any other position. The larger question of whether licensure of LPCs is appropriate is a different issue, from his standpoint.

Dr. Russ clarified that the Board is not attempting to create a new license, it is a group of people who brought forth this proposal. It is just a question of whether the Board supports the proposal or not. The Board's mission statement has broadened in the past several years, including addressing quality and delivery of services and diverse consumers.

Mr. Riches stated that any time there is a new program, it is a significant undertaking for the organization, and this is a consideration for the Board.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD SUPPORT THE BILL IF STAFF CONCERNS ARE ADDRESSED.

IV. Presentation by Lindle Hatton of Hatton Management Consultants Regarding Strategic Planning Process.

Mr. Riches introduced Dr. Hatton, who worked with the Board on its previous strategic plan, and is now working with us to update our strategic plan. Dr. Hatton thanked the Committee for the opportunity to meet with them. He stated that he has worked with state government for the past 25 years working on strategic plans.

Dr. Hatton explained that he uses an expanded approach using multiple constituencies, engaging as many internal and external stakeholders as possible. To do that, the model approach is to follow the state's strategic planning guidelines, consistent with the Governor's office and the Department of Finance. That model consists of four driving questions. 1. Where are we now?; 2. Where do we want to go?; 3. How do we want to get there?; and, 4. How do we measure progress? We are now moving into the first phase of scanning the environment. Previous discussions with Mr. Riches and Ms. Maggio involved developing a list of key stakeholders who have an interest in the Board and with a working knowledge of the Board. Dr. Hatton received a list of 91 stakeholders, 52 of which are external. He asked the Committee whether they felt this was a good sample.

Mr. Riches stated there are a few more that they wish to add and he would provide that information soon. He explained that they were going to pull their attendance lists from Board events, with an emphasis on those who attended more than one meeting, as it is preferable to have people with a reasonable understanding of and familiarity with the Board. They are still working to track down some of the people on that list, which

includes people from agencies, schools, students, and consumers casting as broad of a net as possible.

Dr. Hatton stated that the strategic planning process was last performed 23 months ago and there was a very nominal response from stakeholders. They are working to get a greater response by expanding the list and using the Internet. The survey is designed in two primary segments. The first is regarding the Board's organizational effectiveness, consisting of approximately 25 questions rated on a scale of one to five, then five open-ended questions, the first asking about the accomplishments of the Board over the past two years, the other four speak to the SWOT Analysis, the strengths and weakness that may limit the Board's effectiveness, opportunities the Board should be prepared to pursue, and the threats that might limit the Board.

The survey will probably be sent out soon with a two-week response deadline. Dr. Hatton will be meeting with all Board staff on February 7th and 20th, where the survey responses will be reviewed. Management and Board members will initially review the responses and have the opportunity to provide feedback, then it will go to staff for prioritization of themes. Those themes should be able to fit into existing goals, or we will need to create new goals. This is also an appropriate time to revisit the mission statement. In May the Board will have a focused working session with Dr. Hatton to review vision, mission and themes based upon data collected from the surveys, and how they align with current goals, and taking new suggestions. The objectives this time are to have a more robust data and to have more staff involvement than last time.

Dr. Hatton explained that all information collected from stakeholders would be kept confidential. The Board has a two-year contract with him to allow training and assistance to staff for actualization and accountability on an ongoing basis, at least quarterly. He would have a more hands-on role in creating work action plans. As tasks are aligned with people responsible for those tasks, we will create a forum for them to return and report on progress. He would like to do that by having staff report personally to the Board, as he feels it is important to send a strong message to staff that the Board is interested in what they are doing. It also gives them an opportunity to interact with the Board in a more formal level, and for staff development purposes.

Mr. Riches stated that while the prior strategic planning process had its successes, one of the breakdowns in the prior process, partially due to his newness, were large gaps in reaching stakeholders, so we have been working very hard to develop that list. The other gap was giving staff more of a voice in where the Board is going, and giving them more of a leadership role. This will provide another tool in building staff capability and providing a professional development opportunity. Like any other organization we need to be mindful of building staff from within.

Dr. Hatton stated that our approach is to first train staff and then coach them. As their voice is heard, they will have ownership of the plan. Dr. Russ asked whether staff felt they had the opportunity to express concerns about internal issues without feeling they would get in trouble. Dr. Hatton responded that they could express concerns through open-ended questions in the survey, which would not be anonymous to Dr. Hatton, but would be to everybody else, and he will not edit content of the responses. Mr. Riches stated that in prior staff sessions, staff did express some concerns in an open forum. Dr. Hatton confirmed that they felt comfortable to express those concerns in the presence of the management team, but if they did not want to vocalize it in that setting, they can send us an email. Dr. Russ asked if outside stakeholders expressed significant concerns, how that would be handled. Dr. Hatton stated that they would bring them in for a group work session.

X. Discussion and Possible Action to Revise Board Policy on Succession of Officers.

Mr. Riches explained that the Board adopted a policy two years ago addressing the succession of Board officers, which is now outdated. The policy references a prior statutory requirement that the Board elect officers before March 1 of every year. That statute was changed in Senate Bill 1475 (Chapter 659, Statutes of 2006) to require election of officers before June 1, in alignment with the expiration of Board terms. The misalignment in the prior law caused the Board to lose three consecutive chairs due to reappointment issues. The policy needs to be updated to reflect the new statute.

THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSAL REGARDING UPDATING THE POLICY ON SUCCESSION OF OFFICERS TO THE BOARD.

XI. Update on Results from the Board's Demographic Survey.

Mr. Riches explained that at the February 2006 meeting, the Board directed staff to complete a demographic survey of its licensees to inform its deliberations on workforce issues. Staff developed the survey, mailed it in October and received a 38% response rate. This response rate is much higher than anticipated and about one-half of the responses have been entered.

Mr. Riches presented a summary of the data entered thus far, representing nearly 12,000 responses. He expects to have all surveys entered by the end of January. The responses show a very different response from registrants vs. licensees in terms of linguistic capabilities, racial and ethnic makeup, primary practice environment and gender. He plans to also solicit information from the schools to get pipeline data.

The average age in the license base is very high and the distribution is very high, but it seems we have the same baby boomer problem as everyone else if not worse. Ms. Riemersma stated her feeling that this won't be a problem for this profession, as they tend to keep practicing even after retirement.

XII. Review of Progress on Strategic Plan Objectives.

Mr. Riches stated that he did not have any major updates to provide as we are still on track across the Board. One area we will need to look at down the road is under Goal #5 where we are now getting detailed information from the Department about the iLicensing program. He just received the business requirements document that the Department released. There are a couple of places where our objectives don't line up with what they are going to provide so we will need to revisit those. Ms. DiGiorgio asked whether this would slow down the process. Mr. Riches responded that he is cautiously optimistic that we will be up on the web in early 2009 which is near our objective, but he is skeptical of whether that date will hold.

XIII. Budget Update

Mr. Riches reported that the Board has a budget change proposal for two new enforcement analysts, which he expected would be approved. The funding would be redirected from other enforcement-related lines. This will tighten up the enforcement budget, which is not a problem. We typically revert about \$400,000 per year to the Board's reserve, and this budget change proposal should reduce that by half. This year we are projecting an \$80,000 end of year reversion due to some one-time costs and

contracts, which is about as low as we should go. However, we are in a very comfortable budget situation. We expect to introduce some budget change proposals for next year.

XIV. Legislation Update

Ms. Berger stated that the legislature just came back into session so there is no new legislation to report on other than the draft bill for LPCs. She provided an update on the Board's proposals for 2007, including changes to the unprofessional conduct statute, elimination of extensions for associate clinical social worker registrations, a minor change to MFT out-of-state education requirements, reducing the license delinquency period for three years, addressing the use of fictitious business names for LCSWs in private practice, technical and structural changes relating to fee and renewal statutes, and continuing education credit for licensees to attend Board meetings.

Mr. Riches stated that we had a meeting with the California Association of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors (CAADAC), who will be advancing legislation for licensure of alcohol and drug abuse counselors. We will be discussing that at the next meeting of the Committee, as it is a significant piece of legislation. Also, at the February Board meeting there will probably be an item on the agenda relating to the BPPVE. They have been working on ideas so that graduating students are not impacted by the potential sunset.

XV. Rulemaking Update

Ms. Berger provided an update on rulemaking proposals that are in process, including the delegation of authority to the executive officer to compel a physical or mental evaluation of a licensee, changes to supervisor qualifications, technical cleanup to LEP and Board administration regulations, consistency in time frames for abandonment of application files, delinquency fees for continuing education providers, technical changes regarding fees, and increasing the amount of self-study hours accepted for continuing education and citation and fine of continuing education providers.

XVI. Future Meeting Dates

Mr. Riches referred to the list of proposed meeting dates for the Committee for 2007 and asked whether there were any conflicts. None were stated.

XVII. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

None were suggested.

The meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.