

BOARD MEETING MINUTES August 27-28, 2014

Department of Consumer Affairs
Hearing Room
1625 North Market Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95834

Wednesday, August 27th

Members Present

Christina Wong, Chair, LCSW Member
Deborah Brown, Vice Chair, Public Member
Samara Ashley, Public Member
Dr. Leah Brew, LPCC Member
Dr. Peter Chiu, Public Member
Sarita Kohli, LMFT Member
Patricia Lock-Dawson, Public Member
Renee Lonner, LCSW Member
Karen Pines, LMFT Member
Dr. Christine Wietlisbach, Public Member

Staff Present

Steve Sodergren, Acting Executive Officer
Dianne Dobbs, Legal Counsel
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst

Members Absent

Betty Connolly, LEP Member

Guests

On file

FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION

Christina Wong, Chair of the Board of Behavioral Sciences (Board), called the meeting to order at 8:44 p.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

Board Members, Board staff, and Administrative Law Judge Karl S. Engeman introduced themselves.

I. **Petition for Modification of Probation for Kwamina Amonoo-Neizer, LCS 26843**

Judge Engeman opened the hearing at 8:47 a.m. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Stephanie Alamo-Latif presented the facts of the case on behalf of the Board of Behavioral Sciences. Mr. Kwamina Amonoo-Neizer was not represented by an attorney.

Ms. Alamo-Latif presented the background of Mr. Amonoo-Neizer's probation. Ms. Alamo-Latif provided an opening statement. Mr. Amonoo-Neizer was sworn in. Mr. Amonoo-Neizer presented his request for modification of probation and information to support the request. Mr. Amonoo-Neizer was questioned by Ms. Alamo-Latif and Board Members. Ms. Alamo-Latif gave closing argument. Judge Engeman closed the hearing at approximately 9:25 a.m.

II. Petition for Modification of Probation for Megan Harris, ASW 35916

Judge Engeman opened the hearing at 9:27 a.m. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Stephanie Alamo-Latif presented the facts of the case on behalf of the Board of Behavioral Sciences. Megan Harris was represented by her Attorney, Steve Frankel.

Ms. Alamo-Latif presented the background of Ms. Harris' probation. Ms. Alamo-Latif provided an opening statement. Ms. Harris was sworn in. Mr. Frankel presented the request for modification of probation and information to support the request. Ms. Harris was questioned by Ms. Alamo-Latif and Board Members. Ms. Alamo-Latif and Mr. Frankel gave closing arguments. Judge Engeman closed the hearing at approximately 10:20 a.m.

The Board took a break at 10:20 a.m. and reconvened at 10:35 a.m.

III. Petition for Early Termination of Probation for Pamela Moore-Jones, LCS 25462

Judge Engeman opened the hearing at 10:35 a.m. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Stephanie Alamo-Latif presented the facts of the case on behalf of the Board of Behavioral Sciences. Pamela Moore-Jones was not represented by an attorney.

Ms. Alamo-Latif presented the background of Ms. Moore-Jones' probation. Ms. Alamo-Latif provided an opening statement. Ms. Moore-Jones was sworn in. Ms. Moore-Jones presented her request for early termination of probation and information to support the request. Ms. Moore-Jones was questioned by Ms. Alamo-Latif and Board Members. Ms. Alamo-Latif gave a closing argument. Judge Engeman closed the hearing at approximately 11:14 a.m.

IV. Petition for Reinstatement of License for Mary Eichel, MFC 43826

Judge Engeman opened the hearing at 11:15 a.m. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Stephanie Alamo-Latif presented the facts of the case on behalf of the Board of Behavioral Sciences. Mary Eichel was not represented by an attorney.

Ms. Alamo-Latif presented the background, and an opening statement. Ms. Eichel was sworn in. Ms. Eichel presented her request for reinstatement of license and information to support the request. Ms. Eichel was questioned by Ms. Alamo-Latif and Board Members. Ms. Alamo-Latif gave a closing argument. Judge Engeman closed the hearing at approximately 12:22 p.m.

V. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items *(This item was taken after agenda item VIII.)*

Deborah Brown requested an overview of the new requirements regarding the DSM-V, which is useful knowledge when making decisions on enforcement items.

Renee Lonner requested a discussion and consideration regarding the ability to count continuing education (CE) hours towards the next license renewal period during the 60-day period before a license expires.

- VI. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda** *(This item was taken after agenda item VIII.)*
No public comments were presented.

FULL BOARD CLOSED SESSION

- VII. Pursuant to Section 11126(c)(3) of the Government Code, the Board Will Meet in Closed Session for Discussion and to Take Action on Disciplinary Matters**
- VIII. Pursuant to Section 11126(a) of the Government Code, the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Evaluate the Performance of the Board's Executive Officer**

FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened in open session at 3:58 p.m. Items V. and VI. were heard.

- IX. Adjournment**

The Board adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Thursday, August 28th

Members Present

Christina Wong, Chair, LCSW Member
Deborah Brown, Vice Chair, Public Member
Samara Ashley, Public Member
Dr. Leah Brew, LPCC Member
Dr. Peter Chiu, Public Member
Betty Connolly, LEP Member
Sarita Kohli, LMFT Member
Patricia Lock-Dawson, Public Member
Renee Lonner, LCSW Member
Karen Pines, LMFT Member
Dr. Christine Wietlisbach, Public Member

Staff Present

Steve Sodergren, Acting Executive Officer
Rosanne Helms, Legislative Analyst
Christy Berger, Regulations Analyst
Dianne Dobbs, Legal Counsel
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst

Members Absent

None

Guests

On file

FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION

Christina Wong called the meeting to order at 8:46 a.m. Christina Kitamura called roll. A quorum was established.

X. Introductions

Board Members, Board staff and attendees introduced themselves.

Ms. Wong announced that Renee Lonner was reappointed to the Board for another term by the Governor.

Ms. Wong presented a Resolution to Dr. Harry Douglas, who has resigned from the Board.

XI. Approval of the May 21-22, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes

*Dr. Peter Chiu moved to approve the May 21-22, 2014 Board meeting minutes.
Dr. Christine Wietlisbach seconded. The Board voted unanimously (11-0) to pass the motion.*

XII. Approval of the June 26, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes

Samara Ashley moved to approve. Deborah Brown seconded. The Board voted unanimously (11-0) to pass the motion.

XIII. Executive Officer's Report

a. Budget Report

The 2013/2014 budget for the Board is \$8,240,648. As of June 30, 2014, the Board has spent \$6,934,179, reflecting 84% of the total budget. Final expenditures for 2013/2014 will be received in mid-August. Staff estimates an unencumbered balance of \$118,656.

As of June 30, 2014, total revenue collected is \$7,739,443.

The Board's budget for fiscal year 2014/2015 is \$9,139,000.

The Board's fund condition reflects 3.5 months in reserve.

The Board's loan balance to the General Fund is \$10.9 million dollars. This figure reflects the \$1.4 million dollar repayment received in fiscal year 2013/2014. The Board is scheduled to receive a \$800,000 loan repayment during the 2014/2015 fiscal year. This repayment is reflected in the current fund condition; leaving a General Fund loan balance of \$10.1 million dollars at the end of fiscal year 2014/2015.

b. Operations Report

Board staff continues to experience challenges in obtaining statistical data to compile quarterly statistics. Staff has observed that some of the reports do not appear to capture all of the requisite data that is necessary to provide accurate statistics. These errors have been reported to the BreEZe team, and efforts are underway to correct these errors. Additionally, the BreEZe team has created a Reports Users Group that will work to improve the existing reports and develop new reports for statistical reporting. Staff is participating in this group.

Construction to remodel the Board's suite is complete. Thirteen cubicles were added to accommodate the new staff. Additionally, the Board relocated its file room to another suite away from the office suite. To date the remodel costs total \$172,000. The total cost will not exceed \$200,000 after all invoices are paid.

The additional licensing staff has made a positive impact on the Board's licensing backlogs. Since May 27, 2014, the licensing staff has reduced the examination application backlog by nearly four months for Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT) applicants and nearly three months for Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) applicants.

As of August 4, 2014, the licensing staff is evaluating LMFT examination applications received the week of January 2, 2014 and LCSW examination applications received the week of January 7, 2014.

Dean Porter, California Association for Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors (CALPCC), indicated that the processing times for Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors (LPCC) examination eligibility is not posted on the Board's website. Mr. Sodergren responded that staff is working on applications received on July 31, 2014.

Two positions remain to be filled in the licensing unit. The first vacancy is a full-time permanent position. Interviews for this position were conducted the last week of July. An offer of employment will be made after all of the appropriate approvals have been received. The second vacancy is a two-year limited-term position in the licensing unit. Recruitment for this position will begin this month.

Recruitment is underway for the remaining three positions received this fiscal year. The positions include an additional probation monitor, an enforcement analyst, and a support position.

Board staff will attend the Sacramento MFT Consortium meeting on August 22, 2014.

c. Personnel Update

Positions acquired through the 2014/2015 Budget Change Proposal:

- Staff Services Analyst (SSA) (full-time), Enforcement Unit
Jason Glasspiegel was hired in the Criminal Conviction and Probation Unit.
- Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA) (full-time), Enforcement Unit
The AGPA will serve as the Discipline Analyst for the Consumer Complaint and Investigations Unit and the Expert Reviewer Coordinator for the Enforcement Program.

The Board has decided to also reassign the duties of Gena Beaver, an AGPA within the Criminal Conviction and Probation Unit. Ms. Beaver was acting as the Lead Analyst for the Enforcement Program but with the hiring of the new manager Gina Bayless in May 2014, the Board no longer needs a lead analyst to assist in this capacity. Ms. Beaver will be assigned the duties of the Discipline Analyst and the Discipline Actions Reporter for the Criminal Conviction & Probation Unit.

- AGPA (part-time), Enforcement Unit
The AGPA will work in the capacity of a Probation Case Analyst. This incumbent is being hired to assist the current Probation Case Analyst. The Probation Analyst will also be responsible for the Petition to Revoke Probation & Surrender License Cases and the Petition for Modification. In addition, the Probation Analyst will ensure the probationers who require random drug testing as a term and condition of probation are compliant with their Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- Office Technician (OT) (full-time), Enforcement Unit
The OT will provide additional Enforcement Unit support pertaining to complaints, as well as clerical support for the Enforcement Unit staff and the Expert Reviewer Program.
- Management Services Technician (MST) (2-year limited-term), Licensing Unit
This MST will be hired to assist in the application processes for the LMFT and LCSW. The staff will provide assistance to alleviate the backlogs associated with the increased application volumes and processing times.

Melissa Lara was promoted to the SSA vacancy in the Criminal Conviction & Probation Unit within the Enforcement Program. Christina Hansen was hired to fill the licensing evaluator vacancy behind Melissa Lara.

d. BreEZe Update

Board staff is continuing to work with the BreEZe team in order to address functionality issues that are discovered. These issues are being resolved with subsequent releases.

Staff opted for a delayed release of the online features to minimize the impact to staff and stakeholders. Online renewals were expected to go live in August, but because of priority of more critical fixes, this feature is now expected to be in place in November.

Staff is continuing to collaborate with the BreEZe team in an effort to develop and correct BreEZe reporting functions in an effort to ensure that correct data is available for year-end reporting.

The Board took a break at 9:14 a.m. and reconvened at 9:25 a.m.

XIV. Strategic Plan Update

Management and staff continue to address the strategic goals and objectives. Status changes were made to the following areas:

- Licensing 1.1-1.4;
- Examinations 2.1;
- Enforcement 3.1 and 3.3;
- Legislation and Regulation 4.1-4.4;
- Organizational Effectiveness 5.1 and 5.2; and
- Outreach and Education 6.1-6.3

Jill Epstein, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT), offered assistance in reaching out to LMFTs for recruitment of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). She also expressed that it is CAMFT's desire that the SMEs who are involved with child custody evaluation cases are highly skilled and possess an expertise in child custody evaluations.

XV. Supervision Committee Update

The Supervision Committee (Committee) met on June 27, 2014 at the Phillips Graduate Institute in Chatsworth, California. Topics of discussion included:

- Review of current supervised experience requirements for California applicants;
- Presentation of an examination eligibility application evaluation;
- Discussion and review of other state's supervised experience requirements for LMFT, LCSW, and LPCC; and
- Discussion and review of proposed survey questions for supervisees and supervisors.

The discussion revolved around streamlining the "buckets", or various required categories of supervised hours, that must be satisfied for licensure. There was also discussion about the supervision ratios. The consensus of the Committee and stakeholders was that changes should be made to the current requirements in order to streamline the "buckets".

The Committee directed the staff to:

- Research and estimate the percentage of Marriage and Family Interns that were claiming the maximum hours available for couples and family therapy supervised hours;
- Research and address in draft language the concept of triadic-supervision;
- Draft language that would streamline the "buckets"; and
- Make suggested changes to the supervisee and supervisor draft survey.

This information will be presented and discussed at the next Committee meeting scheduled for August 29, 2014 at the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) in Sacramento.

XVI. Policy and Advocacy Committee Report

a. Discussion and Possible Rulemaking Action to Implement Senate Bill 704, Statutes of 2011, Chapter 387 – Examination Restructure

Effective January 1, 2016, the Board's examination process will change. LCSW and LMFT applicants will be required to pass two new exams that replace the existing exams. Additionally, for LCSW, LMFT and LPCC applicants, the timing of when examinations must be taken, will change.

In order to fully implement the restructured program, the Board needs to revise its regulations to incorporate the new requirements and to ensure that the regulations are consistent with the examination process authorized by the new law.

Impacts of the Exam Restructure on the LMFT, LCSW, and LPCC Licensure Process

Exam Types:

- LPCC licensing program - A California Law and Ethics Exam and a national exam is already in place for the LPCC program.
- LMFT and LCSW licensing programs - A California Law and Ethics Exam and a Clinical Exam will replace the Standard Written and Clinical Vignette exams currently in place.

Impact on Registrant Renewals and Issuance of Subsequent Registration Numbers:

- A registrant will not be permitted to renew his or her registration without having taken the law and ethics exam during the prior renewal period.
- Subsequent intern or associate registration numbers will no longer be issued unless the applicant has passed the exam.

Law and Ethics Course for Registrants:

Registrants who did not take and pass the law and ethics exam will be required to take a 12-hour continuing education (CE) course on law and ethics in order to continue to be eligible to take the law and ethics exam.

Differences for Registrants vs. Applicants who are Not Registrants:

A "registrant" means an individual who holds a current or delinquent registration. The requirements under the exam restructure are different for a registrant than for an applicant who is not a registrant.

- California Law & Ethics Exam Requirements for Registrants
 - New Registrants – Exam must be taken within the first year of registration as an intern or associate.
 - Existing Registrants - Exam must be taken within the registrant's first renewal period that follows January 1, 2016.
 - All Registrants - Exam must be taken during every one-year renewal cycle until passed.
 - Registrants with an Approved Application for Licensure - Exam must be taken within one year after approval of the registrant's licensure application.
- Clinical Exam Requirements for Registrants

- All Registrants - Exam must be taken upon completion of all other licensure requirements.
- California Law & Ethics Exam Requirements for Non-Registrants
 - Cancelled Registrants - Exam must be taken upon request
 - Other Non-Registrants - Exam must be taken within one year of being made eligible to take the exam.
- Clinical Exam Requirements for Non-Registrants
 - All Non-Registrants – Exam must be taken within one year of passing the law and ethics exam.

Proposed Regulatory Changes:

In accordance with the exam restructure, the Board’s regulations need to be revised for consistency and clarity. The following revisions are proposed:

- Change the names of the exams and describes what the new examinations are designed to assess.
- Clarify the criteria for eligibility to take the law and ethics exam.
- Clarify the time frames during which a registrant or applicant must take the California Law and Ethics examination.
- Change application abandonment criteria to fit the new application process.
- Clarify the waiting periods between exam attempts.
- Incorporate language allowing the Board to accept the national examinations for LMFT and LCSW licensure, if the examinations are determined to be acceptable by the Board.
- Make technical amendments.

Ben Caldwell, American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy California Division (AAMFT-CA), suggested adding “except as provided in (c)” to Section 1805.05(b).

Christy Berger agreed that Section 1805.05(b) needs to be amended and suggested amending the language to state “applicants retaking a board-developed examination.”

Mr. Caldwell referred to Section 1829.2(a)(1)(A). The word “shall” in this context may prohibit taking the exam again in the same registration cycle. Ms. Berger agreed that this section needs to be clarified.

Board members requested a flow chart of the process outlined in the proposed examination restructure.

Dr. Leah Brew moved to direct staff to make any discussed changes, and any non-substantive changes to the attached amendments, and to run as a regulatory proposal. Dr. Peter Chiu seconded. The Board voted unanimously (11-0) to pass the motion.

- b. Discussion and Possible Rulemaking Action Regarding Proposed Revisions to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 18, Article 9 Board of Behavioral Sciences Disciplinary Guidelines – Uniform Standards**

DCA and the Legislature requested that all healing arts licensing boards run regulations to create uniform standards for discipline in cases of licensee or registrant substance abuse.

The Board has considered and approved these regulations several times, most recently at its March 2014 meeting. The proposed language was then submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for notice, and the regulations have gone through a 45-day public comment period.

However, DCA has requested additional amendments, which are required if the regulations are to gain their approval and continue to move forward. The amendments requested by DCA are as follows:

- Amend Section 1888:
This section outlines the circumstances in which the Uniform Standards related to substance abuse would apply. The language had stated that in the case of a substance abuse violation, the Uniform Standards must apply without deviation if the licensee or registrant does not rebut the violation. However, the language also allowed deviation from the Uniform Standards if the licensee, registrant, or the Board established that appropriate public protection could be provided with modification or omission of a specific standard.

DCA states that the law allows no deviation from the Uniform Standards. Therefore, language stating that the licensee, registrant or Board has discretion to modify or omit a specific uniform standard is prohibited.

Due to this change, staff has also rearranged some language in Section 1888, because while deviation from the Disciplinary Guidelines is permitted, it is not permitted for the Uniform Standards.

- Amend “Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abuse and Disciplinary Guidelines”, page 4, 1st paragraph:
This section also outlines the cases in which the Uniform Standards related to substance abuse would apply. It allows deviation from the Uniform Standards if the licensee, registrant, or the Board establishes that appropriate public protection can be provided with modification or omission of a specific uniform standard.

Due to DCA’s determination that such deviation is not allowed, this discretion has been removed. However, the language used in Section 1888, allowing a licensee or registrant to rebut that the violation is a substance abuse violation, has been added as permitted by DCA.

Ms. Epstein stated that CAMFT will comment during the 15-day comment period to express their concerns regarding the inability to deviate if rebutted.

Dr. Leah Brew moved to direct staff to make any discussed or any non-substantive changes; to approve the modified text for a 15-day public comment period and delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to adopt the proposed regulatory changes as modified; and to delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file. Patricia Lock-Dawson seconded. The Board voted (11-0) unanimously to pass the motion.

The Board took a break at 10:31 a.m. and reconvened 10:42 a.m.

XVII. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Other Legislation Affecting the Board

AB 1629 regarding Crime Victims Compensation, Reimbursement of Violence Peer Counseling Expenses, would make costs incurred for certain services provided by violence peer counselors reimbursable to crime victims through the California Victim Compensation Board.

Existing law:

- Sets forth a procedure for the state to assist crime victims in obtaining compensation for certain losses suffered as a direct result of a criminal act.
- Defines “peer counseling” as counseling offered by a provider of mental health counseling services who does the following:
 - Has completed a course in rape crisis counseling skills development;
 - Participates in continuing education in rape crisis counseling skills development; and
 - Provides rape crisis counseling in California.
- States that payment by the California Victim Compensation Board for peer counseling provided by a rape crisis center may not exceed \$15 per hour of service.

This bill:

- Defines a “service organization for victims of violent crime” as a nongovernmental organization whose primary mission is to provide services to victims of violent crime, and, in fact, provides such services to these victims and their families.
- Defines a “violence peer counselor” as a provider of formal or informal counseling services who is employed by a service organization for victims of violent crime, whether or not they are financially compensated. The violence peer counselor must meet the following criteria:
 - Has at least six months full-time equivalent experience providing peer support services, acquired through employment, volunteering, or an internship;
 - Has completed a training program to prepare an individual who was once a mental health services consumer to use his or her life experience with mental health treatment to promote the mental health recovery of others who were victims of a violent crime;
 - Possesses 40 hours of training in specified coursework.
- Requires a violence peer counselor to be supervised by a licensee of the Board of Behavioral Sciences when providing violence peer counseling services. The licensee must be employed by the same service organization as the violence peer counselor.

Staff has two concerns with the definition of “violence peer counselor” and the definition of a “service organization for victims of violent crime.”

- Violence peer counselor – This definition is very broad. The term “formal counseling services” is not defined. It is unclear whether formal counseling services would rise to the level of psychotherapy or clinical practice for which a Board license would be required. If the formal counseling services do rise to the level where a license would be required, the language seems to create an exemption from licensure.
- Service organization for victims of violent crime - The definition of “service organization for victims of violent crime” states that it may be any nongovernmental organization that meets certain criteria.

Consequences of the unclear language:

- It is misleading because it could imply to an unlicensed violence peer counselor that he or she may practice psychotherapy in a private practice setting without a license, even though that is a violation of the Board's practice acts; and
- It could also mislead a Board licensee, who is supervising a violence peer counselor, into believing that his or her violence peer counselor supervisee does not need to be licensed or registered, even if they are in a non-exempt setting.

Staff worked with the author's office and provided suggested language. The language has been sent to the legislative counsel, and the author's office committed to running urgency legislation next year.

Dr. Wietlisbach expressed concern regarding violence peer counselors providing services with very little training or supervision.

Dr. Brew expressed concern regarding any licensee providing supervision. She recommended changing "any licensee" to "a licensee who has met the requirements as a supervisor." She also recommended criteria regarding the supervision, such as meeting once per week.

Several Board Members expressed concerns regarding unlicensed practice, training, supervision, and liability of the licensed supervisor.

Ms. Helms responded that these suggestions can be presented at the November meeting.

Renee Lonner moved to oppose AB 1629 unless amended. Sarita Kohli seconded. The Board voted unanimously (11-0) to pass the motion.

XVIII. Legislative Update

Board-sponsored legislation:

- AB 2213 regarding LMFT and LPCC Out-of-State Applicant Requirements, is awaiting consideration by the Governor.
- SB 1466 regarding the Omnibus Legislation is enrolled.
- AB 1843 regarding Child Custody Evaluations was signed earlier this week.

Board-supported legislation:

- AB 809 regarding Telehealth is enrolled.
- AB 1775 regarding Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act, Sexual Abuse, was signed by the Governor.
- AB 2058 regarding Open Meetings is enrolled.
- SB 909 regarding Dependent Children, Health Screenings, is dead.
- SB 578 regarding Marriage and Family Therapists, Record Retention, is enrolled.
- SB 1012 regarding Marriage and Family Therapists, Trainees, is enrolled.

Board-monitored legislation:

- AB 186 regarding Temporary Licenses for Military Spouses – The request to remove the Board from this bill has been granted; therefore, the Board's position has changed to neutral.

- AB 2198 regarding Suicide Prevention Training is awaiting consideration by the Governor.
- SB 570 regarding the Advanced Alcohol and Drug Licensing Act died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1904 regarding expediting licensing process for military spouses and active duty military service members, was a “gut and amend.”

XIX. Rulemaking Update

- Continuing Education regulation package is with OAL for final review, and they will be making a decision by September 19th.
- Disciplinary Guidelines and SB 1441 regarding Uniform Standards for Substance Abuse – A 15-day comment period notice will be issued tomorrow.
- Requirements for Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors to Treat Couples or Families regulation package - Staff is developing materials that are required for submission of the proposal to OAL for publication, which will begin the 45-day public comment period.
- Implementation of SB 704 regarding the Examination Restructure regulation package – this item was heard today and is a priority project.

XX. Presentation of the Association of Social Work Boards National Examination

Dwight Hymans, LCSW, Executive Vice President and Maryjo Monahan, LCSW, CEO from the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) gave a presentation of the Social Work Licensing Exams. Information provided was related to ASWB’s exam categories, pass rates for 2013, exam development process, and social work practice analysis.

XXI. Board Meeting Dates 2015

The 2015 Board meeting dates were presented. Ms. Wong requested a location change for the disciplinary hearing scheduled on October 22nd in southern California. She requested that the location of the meeting be moved to Sacramento.

XXII. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Ms. Epstein had 2 suggestions for discussion:

- Fees that the interns will have to pay while waiting to have their exam applications to be evaluated, and
- ESL (English as a second language) testing accommodations.

Mr. Sodergren responded that the subject of ESL testing accommodations was discussed at a previous Board meeting.

Mr. Caldwell suggested a discussion regarding the process by which an exam gets amended mid-cycle when there is either legal or regulatory change, or legal confusion. An example is the reporting of consensual activity among minors, in which there is a legal opinion and a statute. The legal opinion and statute are not consistent with each other. Test preparatory representatives have expressed concern about items on the exam surrounding that issue. Dr. Brew suggested a discussion regarding Board meeting schedules to be changed from Wednesday-Thursday to Thursday-Friday.

Ms. Brown had 2 suggestions for discussion:

- The Board's website, and
- Delivery of meeting materials.

XXIII. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

There were no public comments.

XXIV. Adjournment

The Board adjourned at 12:26 p.m.