

**Licensing and Examination Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 12, 2010**

Department of Consumer Affairs
El Dorado Room
1625 North Market Blvd.
2nd Floor North, Room 220
Sacramento, CA 95834

Via Teleconference
30622 Via Pared
Thousand Palms, CA 92276

Members Present:

Elise Froistad, MFT Member, Chair
Mona Foster, Public Member
Christine Wietlisbach, Public Member
Janice Cone, LCSW Member

Staff Present:

Kim Madsen, Executive Officer
Tracy Rhine, Assistant Executive Officer
Christy Berger, MHSA Manager
Marsha Gove, Examination Analyst
Paula Gershon, Program Manager
Roseanne Helms, Legislative Analyst
Sean O'Connor, Outreach Coordinator
Sandra Wright, Examination Analyst

Members Not Present

None

Guest List:

Dr. Tracy Montez, Applied Measurement
Services
Guest list on file

Elise Froistad, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Marsha Gove called roll, and a quorum was established.

I. Introductions

Committee members, staff, and audience members introduced themselves.

II. Current Status of Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor Gap Analysis Project Presented by Dr. Tracy Montez

Dr. Tracy Montez, Applied Measurement Services, LLC, (AMS) provided a summary of her progress to date on the gap analysis. Beginning in January 2010, contact was made with the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC). After confidentiality issues were addressed, AMS was provided with various examination-related documents, including a

job-analysis report for the NBCC Professional Counselor examination and profession. Dr. Montez reported she was in the process of reviewing those documents.

Dr. Montez explained that the first phase of the project is a gap analysis comparing the Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor profession to the Licensed Clinical Social Worker and Marriage and Family Therapist professions, looking for meaningful differences. Dr. Montez indicated it is understood that differences exist between the three professions. The purpose of the gap analysis is to determine whether or not those differences are related to public health and safety and whether an exam needs to be created to measure those competencies. She reported having completed a workshop with licensed clinical social worker subject matter experts studying the various exam plans to determine the types of competencies being tested. Another similar workshop involving marriage and family therapist subject matter experts was scheduled at the end of April. Dr. Montez noted that absent unforeseen delays, the results of the initial phase of the project would be presented at the May Board Meeting.

III. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Revising the Board's Examination Program

Ms. Froistad reported that this issue has been discussed previously by the Committee. At the January 2010 Board Meeting, the full Board and other meeting participants discussed Committee recommendations relating to restructuring the examination process. Specifically, the Committee recommended requiring Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) Interns and Associate Clinical Social Workers (ASW) to complete and pass an examination on California law and ethics, the test to consist of legal and ethical questions that a recent program graduate would reasonably be expected to know. Subsequent to passing the law and ethics examination, applicants who had completed all education and experience requirements would complete and pass a second test consisting primarily of practice-oriented and vignette questions.

Ms. Froistad noted that implementation of the recommended changes was an issue of concern. She deferred to Sean O'Connor, Board of Behavioral Sciences, for suggested solutions to the problem.

Mr. O'Connor noted two areas of concern pertaining to implementation of the new examination program. First, requiring an applicant to pass the law and ethics examination in the first year of registration would presumably mean that individuals who did not pass that test would not be eligible for renewal of their registration. Given that many employment settings expect a current registration in order for unlicensed therapists to provide services to clients, the Committee's proposed examination requirement could result in a mental health workforce issue. Additionally, an applicant cannot gain hours of supervised work experience required for licensure unless the individual holds a valid registration. Therefore, the proposed change could impact an applicant's timely completion of the licensing process. Secondly, a concern was identified regarding how the proposed changes would impact individuals who are already in the examination process.

Mr. O'Connor presented the Committee with proposed modifications to the original recommendations discussed at the January 2010 Board Meeting. He reviewed the various scenarios that had been developed for successful implementation of the recommended changes.

An open discussion was held among meeting participants regarding the proposed changes.

Clarification was requested and provided regarding various facets of the proposals. Points of discussion included the requirements to renew the registration; the consequences of not passing the law and ethics examination within the proposed three years; the continuing education necessary in order to re-take the law and ethics exam; how the requirement to pass the law and ethics exam would impact individuals who are currently registered; and how individuals whose registration has been automatically cancelled due to not passing the law and ethics examination could qualify for a new registration.

IV. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda.

Ms. Madsen announced that the next Licensing and Examination Committee meeting is scheduled June 14, 2010 in Sacramento.

The meeting was adjourned.