

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

1
2
3 Archived recordings of the Board of Behavioral Sciences meetings held on November
4 20–21, 2025, are available for viewing at the following links:

- 5
- 6 • [BBS Board Meeting February 19, 2026 - 1 of 2](#)
- 7 • [BBS Board Meeting February 19, 2026 - 2 of 2](#)
- 8 • [BBS Board Meeting February 20, 2026](#)

9
10

11 **DATE** February 19, 2026

12

13 **LOCATION** Department of Consumer Affairs
14 1625 N. Market Blvd., #S-102
15 Sacramento, CA 95834

16

17 **TIME** 8:30 a.m.

18

19 **ATTENDEES**

20 **Members Present at Primary Location**

21 Wendy Strack, Chair, Public Member
22 Nicholas (Nick) Boyd, Ph.D., Vice Chair, LPCC Member
23 Lorez, Bailey, Public Member
24 Justin Huft, LMFT Member
25 Susan Friedman, Public Member
26 Kelly Ranasinghe, Public Member
27 John Sovec, LMFT Member
28 Rebecca Thiess, Public Member
29 Eleanor Uribe, LCSW Member
30 Annette Walker, Ed.D., Public Member

31

32 **Members Absent:** Christopher (Chris) Jones, LEP Member

33

34 **Staff Present:** Steve Sodergren, Executive Officer
35 Marlon McManus, Assistant Executive Officer
36 Shelley Ganaway, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Legal
37 Counsel
38 Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst

39

1 **Other Attendees:** Matthew Block, Administrative Law Judge
2 Anahita Crawford, Deputy Attorney General
3 Jacqueline Susan Cooper, Petitioner
4 Public participation via Webex and in-person
5
6

7 **OPEN SESSION**
8
9

10 **1. Call to Order and Establishment of Quorum**
11

12 Wendy Strack, Chair of the Board of Behavioral Sciences (Board), called the
13 meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Roll was called, and a quorum was established.
14

15 **2. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**
16

17 Walker: Discussion on artificial intelligence (AI).
18

19 **3. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**
20

21 None
22

23 ***Administrative Law Judge Matthew Block presided over the following petition***
24 ***hearing. Deputy Attorney General Anahita Crawford presented the facts of the***
25 ***case below on behalf of the People of the State of California.***
26

27 **4. Jacqueline Susan Cooper, LMFT 150556, Petition for Early Termination of**
28 **Probation**
29

30 The record was opened at 8:45 a.m., and Jacqueline Cooper represented
31 himself. Deputy Attorney General Anahita Crawford presented the background
32 of this case. Ms. Cooper was sworn-in and presented her request for early
33 termination of probation and information to support the request. She was
34 questioned by Crawford and board members. The record was closed at 9:56 a.m.
35
36

37
38 **CLOSED SESSION:** *The Board entered closed session at 10:00 a.m.*
39

40
41 **5. Pursuant to Section 11126(c)(3) of the Government Code, the Board will**
42 **Meet in Closed Session for Discussion and to Take Action on Disciplinary**
43 **Matters, Including the Above Petition(s).**
44
45

1
2 **OPEN SESSION:** *The Board reconvened in open session at 10:54 a.m.*

3
4
5 **6. Strategic Planning Session for the Board's 2026-2030 Strategic Plan**

6
7 At the February 2025 Board meeting, the Board initiated its strategic planning
8 process with a presentation from the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
9 SOLID team. In April 2025, SOLID conducted a comprehensive environmental
10 scan that included interviews with Board members, Board leadership, staff, and
11 an online survey distributed to external stakeholders, generating approximately
12 1,300 responses. The environmental scan was designed to capture internal and
13 external stakeholder perspectives on the Board's performance and environment
14 using the SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) framework.

15
16 In July and September 2025, SOLID facilitated two pre-strategic planning
17 sessions with Board management to brainstorm and identify potential objectives.
18 The results of these sessions, along with the environmental scan report, will
19 inform the Board's upcoming strategic planning session.

20
21 The purpose of this agenda item was to conduct a working session to develop
22 the Board's strategic plan objectives. Board members and stakeholders used the
23 Strategic Planning Objectives Worksheet to guide discussion and provide input.
24 The session was facilitated by Sarah Irani and Trisha St. Clair from SOLID.

25
26 Attachments provided in the meeting materials:

- 27 • Attachment A: BBS 2025 Environmental Scan
- 28 • Attachment B: Strategic Planning-Objectives Worksheet

29
30 Discussion

31 A suggestion was made to include DEIA language in the Mission Statement.

32
33 Discussion ensued regarding language and terms for the Mission Statement and
34 the Vision (competency, highest quality, proficient, culturally responsive). The
35 SOLID facilitators will continue to work on the Mission Statement with Mr.
36 Sodergren.

37
38 Board members and staff reviewed each goal and its corresponding objectives.
39 At the Board's direction, the SOLID facilitators refined the wording of the
40 objectives and recommended moving the Administrative Services goal to the first
41 position.

42
43 The Board also proposed an additional goal, Goal 7: Protection for Marginalized
44 and Endangered Communities, and developed objectives to support this new
45 goal.

1 SOLID will further refine the goals and objectives to include DEIA language
2 where appropriate and bring it back to the Board for further review.

3

4 Public Comment: None

5

6 **7. Recess Until 8:30 a.m., Friday, February 20, 2026**

7

8 The Board recessed at 5:10 p.m.

9

1 **8. Call to Order and Establishment of Quorum**

2
3 Wendy Strack, Chair of the Board, called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. Roll
4 was called, and a quorum was established.

5
6 The Chairperson announced that Item 23 will not be discussed.

7
8 **9. Introductions**

9
10 Board members, staff, and attendees introduced themselves.

11
12 **10. Consent Calendar: Possible Approval of the November 20-21, 2025, Board**
13 **Meeting Minutes**

14
15 Motion: Approve the November 20-21, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes.

16
17 M/S: Walker/Friedman

18
19 Discussion/Public Comment: None

20
21 Vote: Yea 9; Nay 0, Abstention 1, Absent 1. Motion carried.

Member		Vote
Lorez Bailey		Y
Dr. Nick Boyd		Y
Susan Friedman		Y
Justin Huft		abstain
Christopher Jones		absent
Kelly Ranasinghe		Y
John Sovec		Y
Wendy Strack		Y
Rebecca Thiess		Y
Eleanor Uribe		Y
Annette Walker		Y

22
23 **11. Board Chair Report**

24
25 **a. Board Member Attendance**

26 The current fiscal year attendance report was provided in the meeting
27 materials as Attachment A

28
29 **b. Future Board Meetings**

30 The 2026 board meeting and committee meeting dates were provided.
31

1 **c. Staff Recognitions**

2 There were no staff recognitions this quarter. However, board members
3 Annette Walker, Kelly Ranasinghe, and Justin Huft are seeking
4 reappointments. Their appointments are expected to be confirmed in March.

5
6 Discussion: None

7
8 Public Comment: None

9
10 **12. Budget Update**

- 11
- 12 • The Board’s budget for fiscal year (FY) 2025-26 is \$14,699,000.
 - 13 • Authorized reimbursements of \$50,000
 - 14 • Reserve balance beginning at the beginning of fiscal year was \$26.2M
 - 15 • Projected collection of revenue by fiscal year end is \$24.9M
 - 16 • Fund condition reflects a reserve of 27.2 months.
 - 17 • As of December 31, 2025, the Board encumbered approximately \$8.8M
 - 18 (60%) of its total budget.
 - 19 • After estimated savings, projected expenditures by fiscal year end are
 - 20 \$14.5M (98.8% of authorized budget).

21
22 Discussion: None

23
24 Public Comment: None

25
26 **13. Personnel Update**

27
28 The California Department of Human Resources has renamed the Staff Services
29 Analyst classification to Analyst I and the Associate Governmental Program
30 Analyst classification to Analyst II. The purpose of this change is to clarify career
31 progression, and consistency across state departments, and to ensure titles
32 accurately reflect responsibilities, skills, and experience.

33
34 The Board’s staffing activity is as follows:

- 35 • 3 promotions/new employees
- 36 • 2 departures
- 37 • 4 vacancies

38
39 Discussion: None

40
41 Public Comment: None

42
43 **14. Licensing Update**

44
45 Lisa Cigelske, Licensing Manager, presented the licensing update.

1 2nd Quarter Population Statistics

- 2
- 3 • Population of approximately 157,249 licensees/associates
 - 4 • Population of 16,277 supervisors
 - 5 • 12% increase in supervisor population
 - 6 • 4.48% increase in licensee/associate population over 2nd quarter of fiscal
 - 7 year (FY) 24/25

8 2nd Quarter Registration Statistics

- 9
- 10 • 11% increase in applications received over the 2nd quarter of FY 24/25
 - 11 • Processed 4,481 initial and subsequent applications; 34% increase over
 - 12 2nd quarter of FY 24/25
 - 13 • Processing times for approved initial and subsequent registrations
 - 14 decreased for each registration type.
 - 15 • Processing times for deficient AMFT and APCC initial and subsequent
 - 16 registrations decreased; deficient ASW registrations increased.
 - 17 • 9,808 emails received – an increase of 8.22% over 2nd quarter of FY 24/25

18 Since spring 2024, the registration unit added three new positions, resulting in

19 higher application processing volumes and reduced processing times. The most

20 common deficiencies in initial registration applications involve missing transcripts

21 and program certifications, while the primary issue for subsequent applications is

22 the lack of a passing score on the required California Law and Ethics exam.

23

24 Registrant statistical charts were provided in the meeting materials as

25 Attachment A.

26

27 2nd Quarter Licensing Statistics

- 28
- 29 • 30.76% increase of in-state licensing applications received over 2nd
 - 30 quarter FY 24/25
 - 31 • Steady increase of out-of-state license applications received over 2nd
 - 32 quarter FY 24/25
 - 33 • Processing times for approved in-state and out-of-state applications have
 - 34 increased from 2nd quarter FY 24/25.
 - 35 • Processing times for deficient in-state and out-of-state applications have
 - 36 increased for LCSWs and LEPs.
 - 37 • 5,444 emails received – a decrease of 0.53% over 2nd quarter of FY 24/25

38 Licensing statistical charts were provided in the meeting materials as Attachment

39 B.

40

41 Discussion

42 Ranasinghe: Asked which tasks are most time-consuming for the licensing unit.

43

44 Lisa Cigelske, BBS Licensing Manager: Explained that managing the email inbox

45 requires significant staff time. To address this, evaluators rotate responsibility for

1 answering emails one day each week. Many inquiries involve information already
2 available on the Board's website, so staff frequently provide links to relevant
3 pages and publications. A large portion of emails relate to supervision
4 requirements, such as supervision ratios and required hours. In response, staff
5 have regularly updated the FAQs and are developing a new supervisor-specific
6 FAQ to address these recurring questions.

7
8 Walker: Expressed appreciation for the comprehensive report and to the staff.
9 The information shared was very valuable in painting a picture of the day-to-day
10 tasks of the evaluators.

11
12 Thiess: Asked if the gains in processing numbers can be partly attributed to
13 technology.

14
15 Cigelske: Responded that the gains in processing are due to staffing. While
16 efforts are underway to improve online efficiencies, these have not yet been
17 implemented. Units are relying on cross-training and additional headcount to
18 manage workload. A significant time burden involves reviewing supervision
19 hours, which can include multiple supervisors per application. To streamline this
20 process, staff developed an Excel worksheet that automates calculations and
21 identifies potential deficiencies, now in use by the licensing unit.

22
23 Sovec: Asked how the licensing unit plans to prepare for significant increases in
24 the license and registration populations, which do not appear tied to typical
25 seasonal patterns like graduation cycles, and what resources or support the unit
26 anticipates needing to stay ahead of the growing demand.

27
28 Cigelske: The licensing unit is preparing a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) and
29 anticipates receiving additional analyst positions if it is approved. In the
30 meantime, staff are relying on cross-training and identifying internal process
31 improvements. They are also exploring technological upgrades and other
32 efficiency measures to better manage increasing workload demands.

33
34 Friedman: Asked why the application process takes so long. Cigelske responded
35 that there are a lot of documents that staff must review for each application.

36
37 Ranasinghe: Suggested video presentations to a mass audience (applicants) to
38 address deficiencies.

39
40 Sodergren: Added that staff are exploring the use of Instagram Reels with short
41 videos, along with additional online and in-person events, to expand outreach
42 and engagement.

43
44 Boyd: Asked why supervisors cannot be identified on the website or otherwise
45 validated as qualified supervisors.

46

1 Cigelske: Noted that all supervisors self-certify their qualifications, and the Board
2 does not review their documentation. Because other states verify supervisor
3 qualifications before listing them publicly, caution is needed when considering
4 similar approaches.

5
6 Public Comments

7 Dr. Ben Caldwell, LMFT: acknowledged that moving applications online will take
8 time and asked whether any interim solutions could reduce staff workload — for
9 example, using optical character recognition or similar tools to automate data
10 entry and calculations.

11
12 Sodergren: Responded that the board is currently developing a system similar to
13 an hours-tracking platform, where applicants enter their hours and supervisors
14 approve them. The system would automatically consolidate hours, flag issues
15 such as missing or incorrect ratios, and notify applicants about their progress.
16 Because this platform would handle calculations and tracking, staff believe it is a
17 better investment than pursuing optical character recognition, and this is the
18 direction they are focusing on now.

19
20 Dr. Ben Caldwell: In regard to Dr. Boyd’s question regarding supervisors, he
21 explained that supervisors must currently be licensed for two years and complete
22 initial supervisor training, but the training can legally be done up to 60 days after
23 supervision begins. Because of that timing, if the board were to mark someone
24 as a supervisor online, the simplest approach would be to list them as
25 self-certified rather than fully verified.

26
27 Helms: Added that while a public supervisor list had been discussed previously,
28 some supervisors did not want their names displayed publicly. Because of those
29 concerns, any move to create such a list would need to address legal and
30 consent requirements before proceeding.

31
32 Sara Carasco, William Jessup University: Expressed strong appreciation for the
33 licensing and registration unit, outreach team, and Steve, noting that the board’s
34 resources are easily accessible across multiple platforms and have helped them
35 maintain zero deficiencies. They also praised the significantly improved
36 processing times, which have benefited students and clients, and thanked the
37 team for their quick, professional email responses.

38
39 **15. Examination Update**

40
41 2nd Quarter Statistics:

- 42 • 5,998 exams were administered (13.8% decrease from previous quarter)
- 43 • 5 exam development workshops were conducted.

44 Exam School Report was provided in the meeting materials as Attachment A.
45 Exam School Report (Endorsed Out-of-State Applicants) was provided as
46 Attachment B.

1 Examination Pass Rates

2 The Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) reviewed five years of
3 candidate data, including demographics, education, and exam history, to
4 investigate lower pass rates on the California LPCC Law and Ethics Exam. The
5 analysis found no statistically significant or specific factors explaining the trend.
6

7 Examination Development

8 The Board is working with OPES to recruit qualified Subject Matter Experts for its
9 exams and is finalizing a February Newsletter article outlining participation
10 opportunities, workshop types, qualifications, and compensation. This effort aims
11 to bring diverse professional perspectives to ensure exam content remains
12 relevant, fair, and reflective of real-life practice.
13

14 American Association of Social Work Board (ASWB)-Clinical Exam

15 ASWB will launch updated exams in August 2026 to enhance industry standards
16 and focus on applied knowledge over simple recall. Key changes include
17 consolidating content areas from four to three, reducing the total number of
18 questions, increasing three-option multiple choice items, and emphasizing
19 problem-solving and reasoning. Exams will retain the four-hour time limit and
20 continue meeting psychometric standards for validity and fairness. Additional
21 details, updated resources, and a revised guidebook will be released in spring
22 2026.
23

24 Pearson Vue

25 Pearson VUE is rebranding as Pearson and modernizing its candidate web
26 experience. The first phase, launching in January, introduces an updated
27 account management system with a cleaner interface and improved navigation.
28 Additional enhancements to scheduling and registration will roll out throughout
29 the year to create a more seamless process. The Board will share more details
30 as they become available, and updated candidate handbook revisions are
31 expected in February.
32

33 Public Comment

34 Dr. Ben Caldwell: Noted that ASWB exam pass rates appear very low and
35 questioned whether it makes sense that so many candidates who have
36 completed all other requirements would be deemed unqualified by the clinical
37 exam. They asked whether the board views this as a concern and what actions, if
38 any, are being taken in response.
39

40 Sodergren: Responded that staff are looking into this and report back with its
41 findings at the next meeting.
42

1 **16. Enforcement Update**

2
3 2nd Quarter Statistics: Consumer Complaints

- 4 • 715 consumer complaints received; 50% increase over 2nd quarter FY
5 24/25
6 • 249 cases closed without investigation
7 • 410 complaints closed after investigation
8 • 85 days to close a complaint
9 • 7 cases referred to the Office of the Attorney General (AG)
10 • 7 citations issued
11

12 Based on the volume of complaints received for the 1st and 2nd quarters, the
13 Board is projected to receive over 3,000 complaints for the entirety of FY
14 25/26.

15
16 2nd Quarter Statistics: Probation

- 17 • 11 new probationers
18

19 2nd Quarter Statistics: Criminal Convictions

- 20 • 273 criminal convictions; 23.5% increase over 2nd quarter FY 24/25
21 • 268 cases assigned for investigation
22 • 193 cases closed after investigation
23 • 16 cases referred to the AG Office
24

25 Based on the volume of new criminal conviction cases received for the 1st
26 and 2nd quarters, the Board is projected to receive approximately 1,076
27 criminal conviction cases for the entirety of FY 25/26 (9.8% increase from FY
28 24/25).
29

30 Continuing Education (CE) Audits

- 31 • Audits completed for renewal cycles ending June 30, 2025.
32 • 44 CE audits are pending for renewal cycles ending July 31, 2025.
33 • 40 Citations and Fines issued for failed CE audits
34

35 The most frequent cause for a failed audit was a lack of response to the Board's
36 audit letters. The second most common reason was due to a 4–6-hour deficiency
37 out of the 36-hour minimum requirement.
38

39 Supervisor Audits

40 The Board began audits on licensees who submitted a Supervisor Self-
41 Assessment and have been designated as a Supervisor to ensure compliance
42 with the continuing education requirements for supervisors set forth in
43 regulations.
44

45 For licensees who were designated as Supervisor in September 2025:

- 46 • 26 audit letters mailed in December 2025

- 1 • 2 of the 26 supervisors did not respond to the Board's request
- 2 • 5 licensees failed the audit
- 3 • 19 supervisors passed the audit

- 4
- 5 For licensees who were designated as Supervisor in October 2025:
- 6 • 26 audit letters mailed in January 2026, with 10 audits still pending
 - 7 • 1 licensee failed the audit
 - 8 • 15 supervisors passed the audit

- 9
- 10 Attachments provided in meeting materials:
- 11 • Attachment A: Enforcement Charts
 - 12 • Attachment B: Continuing Education Audits
 - 13 • Attachment C: Supervisor Audits

14

15 Discussion

16 Strack: Expressed concerns about supervisor audits, noting that although the

17 sample size is small, having about 20 percent of supervisors fail the first audit is

18 concerning and not a good early sign.

19

20 Boyd: Asked how the board projects the number of criminal convictions.

21

22 Sodergren: Explained that projections are based on year-over-year growth trends

23 from the past several years.

24

25 Boyd: sought clarification on whether these projected convictions refer to criminal

26 convictions among all licensees and registrants, indicating they were not fully

27 clear on what the metric represents.

28

29 Sodergren: Explained that projections for consumer complaints and criminal

30 convictions are based on a four-year average of past trends. These estimates

31 are mainly used to anticipate potential workload by year's end. While the

32 projections don't significantly impact day-to-day operations, they help the board

33 recognize and prepare for expected increases.

34

35 Boyd: Voiced concerns about the supervisor audits, noting it's troubling that

36 many associates rely on supervisors without knowing whether those supervisors

37 meet the requirements. Highlighted a significant gap between what the board

38 intends to ensure and what is currently verified. Emphasized that discovering a

39 supervisor was unqualified after completing hours would be very upsetting for an

40 associate, and argued that despite the administrative burden, verifying supervisor

41 qualifications is essential for both consumer protection and ensuring proper

42 supervision.

43

1 Ranasinghe: Agreed with Dr. Boyd and stated that if someone presents
2 themselves as a supervisor, they are putting a registrant's training at risk if they
3 are not actually qualified.
4

5 Uribe: Asked whether the board provides associates with guidelines that clearly
6 outline supervisor prerequisites, so associates can verify on their own that a
7 supervisor meets the required qualifications.
8

9 Sodergren: Explained that the supervisor agreement already outlines all legal
10 requirements for supervisors, and associates are expected to review it to confirm
11 their supervisor meets those standards. The board also emphasizes in
12 presentations that associates must verify their supervisor's qualifications
13 because failing to do so can put their hours at risk. Acknowledged that more
14 improvement is still needed in this area.
15

16 Sovec: Argued that placing the responsibility on associates to verify supervisor
17 qualifications is flawed. Because there are too few supervisors, associates are
18 often desperate to accept any supervision they can find and may not have the
19 capacity to vet requirements. When an unqualified supervisor is later discovered,
20 the associate loses their hours, creating a harmful loophole. Suggested the board
21 take on more responsibility for addressing this issue rather than leaving the
22 burden on those seeking supervision.
23

24 Strack: Asked why hours wouldn't count if a supervisor later fails an audit, given
25 that supervisors self-certify and the associate acted in good faith. They
26 suggested that hours earned before the board discovers the supervisor is
27 unqualified should still be accepted and asked whether that is how the process
28 currently works.
29

30 Sodergren: Explained that, legally, hours earned under an unqualified supervisor
31 do not count because supervisors must meet all requirements. However, the
32 board reviews these situations case by case and tries to avoid penalizing the
33 supervisee when possible.
34

35 Strack: Suggested revisiting the policy, arguing that if an associate acts in good
36 faith and verifies what they reasonably can — especially given the power
37 imbalance with supervisors — their hours should be honored up until the point
38 the board identifies a supervisor as non-compliant.
39

40 Discussion continued amongst the board members and staff. The discussion
41 then focused on how the current system places too much responsibility on
42 supervisees, who are expected to rely on supervisors' self-attestation despite
43 power imbalances and their own vulnerable position. Concerns were raised that
44 supervisees can be penalized for supervisors' mistakes or misuse of the 60-day
45 training window, and that the system may enable exploitative situations. The

1 discussion resulted in a recommendation to reconsider this structure to better
2 protect supervisees.

3
4 Public Comment

5 Carolyn Cummings: Asked how to explain the CE audit process to associates.
6 Specifically, she wants to know what happens when someone gets an audit letter
7 and what format the board prefers for submitting CE documentation. Sodergren
8 and Helms confirmed that the board accepts PDF documents.
9

10 **17. Outreach and Education Update**

11
12 2nd Quarter Statistics: Outreach Presentations

- 13 • 7 presentations conducted by BBS staff
- 14 • 11 conferences attended

15
16 In late 2025, staff engaged in outreach through key events and partnerships.
17 They participated virtually in the CAMFT Pre-licensed Summit in December to
18 share BBS requirements on employment, supervision, and work settings, and
19 attended NASW-CA's Social Work Conference in November to provide
20 information to registrants and licensees. Staff also renewed communications with
21 UC Berkeley and CSU San Bernardino to coordinate spring 2026 events and
22 secured arrangements with NASW-CA for presentations during lunch-hour
23 sessions and participation in Lobby Days in April.
24

25 Updated Publications/Newsletter

- 26 • *Don't Lose Your Hours: Know the 90-Day Rule*
- 27 • *MFT Trainees: Practicum Course Requirements*
- 28 • *The Board of Behavioral Sciences Fall 2025 Newsletter* is available on the
29 Board's website.

30
31 Discussion: None

32
33 Public Comment

34 Bindu Mukkamala, National Association of Social Workers – California Division
35 (NASW-CA): Expressed appreciation for the BBS attending their annual
36 conference, hosting ongoing Lunch and Learn events, and announced NASW's
37 upcoming lobby days in Sacramento on April 12–13.
38

39 **18. Administration Update**

40
41 BreEZe System Updates

42 Staff are finalizing system testing for Work Authorization 165, which will bring
43 Board applications online and improve system functionality. The AMFT
44 application is the top priority and will launch first, followed by ASW and APCC
45 applications after successful implementation and validation.

1 2nd Quarter Statistics

- 2 • 3% decrease in calls handled by DCA Consumer Information Center from
3 2nd quarter FY 24/25
4 • 1.77% increase in total renewal applications received over 2nd quarter FY
5 24/25
6 • 0.14% increase in online renewal transactions over 2nd quarter FY 24/25
7 • 3.08% increase in online transactions of other administration applications
8 over 2nd quarter FY 24/25
9 • 8.65% decrease in emails over 2nd quarter FY 24/25.

10
11 Discussion

12 Sovec: Requested that the report include call-handling time metrics again, such
13 as how long calls last and how quickly they're answered
14

15 Public Comment

16 Dr. Ben Caldwell: Asked whether there is an estimated go-live date for the online
17 AMFT application. Sodergren responded that the goal is by June 2026.
18

19 **19. Workforce Development Committee Update**

20
21 At its January 2026 meeting, the Workforce Development Committee reviewed
22 proposed updates to LMFT education requirements in BPC §4908.36 to improve
23 clarity and consistency. Staff outlined seven focus areas, with discussion
24 centered on Step 1:

- 25 • Step 1: Qualifying Degree Accreditation, Core Content and Practicum
26 Requirements
27 • Step 2: Graduate-Level Course Content and Allowable Remediation
28 • Step 3: Supplemental Coursework Requirements (Content allowed as
29 Continuing Education)
30 • Step 4: National Attainability and Unintended Consequences
31 • Step 5: Pre-Degree Hours
32 • Step 6: Provisional Associate Registration Concept
33 • Step 7: Formal Approval of School Programs
34

35 Staff shared demographic findings from HCAI's 2025 renewal survey on the
36 statewide health workforce, including data specific to the Board's licensees. Staff
37 also presented AAMFT's 2025 workforce study, which highlights trends,
38 workforce experiences, and emerging issues based on responses from over
39 2,000 MFTs, associates, and students.
40

41 Discussion

42 Uribe: Encouraged early communication with schools about potential changes
43 allowing students to begin accruing hours sooner, noting that program updates

1 and coordination with licensed instructors take a long time. Advised keeping
2 schools informed so they can prepare.

3
4 Helms: Stated that this topic has been discussed during the MFT consortium
5 meetings.

6
7 Public Comment: None

8
9 **20. Outreach & Education Committee Update**

10
11 At the January 2026 Outreach & Education Committee meeting, staff reported on
12 outreach and education efforts, including the first virtual listening session on AI in
13 mental health, website improvements, and plans for more live events, new
14 materials, consumer-focused outreach, and career-interest engagement.

15
16 Staff also discussed expanding social media use, identifying platforms like
17 TikTok, Instagram Reels, SMS, and prerecorded Facebook videos as promising
18 options, with next steps requiring coordination with DCA's Public Information
19 Office.

20
21 Finally, staff reviewed the Board's newsletter content and distribution and noted
22 plans to improve the email system to make the newsletter more visually
23 engaging.

24
25 Discussion

26 Walker: Reminded attendees that the Outreach and Education Committee is new
27 and still building its foundation. Emphasized intentional planning, alignment with
28 the Board's strategic plan, and ongoing collaboration with consumers,
29 stakeholders, and schools. Noted that serving on the subcommittee gives board
30 members a valuable chance to work closely with staff.

31
32 Public Comment: None

33
34 **21. Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Report Which May Include Updates**
35 **on DCA's Administrative Services, Human Resources, Enforcement,**
36 **Information Technology, Communications and Outreach, and Legislative,**
37 **Regulatory, or Policy Matters**

38
39 Lucia Saldivar, Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations, presented the
40 following updates:

- 41
42
 - 43 • Christine Lally has been named as the acting director of DCA. She will
44 serve in this position until a director is formally appointed by the
governor's office.

- 1 • Governor Newsom took action via an Executive Order to allow one year
2 postponement of license renewal fees for those affected by the fires.
- 3 • Governor Newsom has released the proposed 2025–2026 state budget,
4 which includes a plan to divide DCA’s oversight body—the Business,
5 Consumer Services and Housing Agency—into two new state agencies:
6 The California Housing and Homelessness Agency and the Consumer
7 Services Agency. The Reorganization Plan was enacted on July 5, 2025.
8 The new agencies will become operative on July 1, 2026.
- 9 • Reminded board members to be fiscally responsible when traveling for
10 board business, encouraged considering rideshares or carpooling instead
11 of rental cars, and noted that receipts should be kept for reimbursable
12 expenses like baggage fees.
- 13 • Form 700 filing requirements: forms must be submitted within 30 days of
14 starting or leaving a position and annually by April 1. This year’s filing
15 covers January 1–December 31, 2025, with a March 20, 2026 target to
16 ensure compliance. Filings must be submitted electronically through the
17 FPPC portal. Instructions were emailed to filers.
- 18 • Board Member Training:
19
 - 20 ○ Unconscious Biased Training for board members will be uploaded on
21 the Learning Management System (LMS)
 - 22 ○ Virtual training for Presidents and Vice Presidents on LMS.
 - 23 ○ Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT) is offered April 1st, June
24 24th, and October 21st. This training must be completed by board
25 members within one year of appointment and reappointment to the
26 board.

27
28 Discussion: None

29
30 Public Comment: None

31
32 **22. Update on the Association of Marital and Family Therapy Regulatory**
33 **Boards’ Marital and Family Therapy National Examination Transition Efforts**

34
35 Staff provided an update on the Board’s transition planning for potentially
36 adopting the AMFTRB National Exam, covering rulemaking, system readiness,
37 stakeholder outreach, and the exam transition process. A new OPES linkage
38 study is underway to validate exam alignment, system work has begun with DCA
39 and vendors, and outreach materials are being developed.
40

1 Staff also reviewed plans to ensure exam accessibility and proposed approaches
2 to transfer existing eligibilities and extend expiration dates to support candidates
3 during the transition.
4

5 Discussion: None
6

7 Public Comments

8 Dr. Ben Caldwell: Thanked staff for the update and emphasized the importance
9 of minimizing negative impacts on candidates during the exam transition. Noted
10 ongoing concerns about testing standards across clinical exams and asked
11 whether conversations with AMFTRB about improving alignment with industry
12 testing standards have been productive and whether AMFTRB is open to making
13 improvements. Also asked whether extending the testing window would still
14 require candidates to wait up to 30 days for exam results due to post-test
15 analysis.
16

17 Sodergren: Responded that he can't speak to the specifics yet, but conversations
18 with AMFTRB have been positive and they appear willing to work with the Board.
19 He noted that more detailed discussions will likely occur after the linkage study is
20 completed, and AMFTRB seems open to making improvements and building the
21 Board's trust. Also responded that candidates will still need to wait for results, as
22 the post-exam validation process will remain in place.
23

24 Shanti Ezrine, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists
25 (CAMFT): Thanked staff for their transparency about the linkage study and the
26 potential implementation delay, emphasized the importance of addressing
27 concerns early, and appreciated the ongoing work across all transition
28 workstreams. Also noted gratitude for staff's help reviewing CAMFT's FAQ,
29 which is now published on their website. Expressed appreciation for AMFTRB's
30 consideration of expanding the testing window and expressed support for the
31 Board's plan to extend eligibility expiration dates for candidates affected during
32 the first three months of the transition.
33

34 Cathy Atkins, CAMFT: Echoed earlier comments and stressed the importance of
35 ensuring that as many people are informed about the exam transition.
36 Encouraged attendees to share CAMFT's FAQ and direct impacted individuals to
37 submit questions, emphasizing that broad communication will help minimize
38 bumps during the transition.
39

40 **23. Discussion and Possible Action to Reconsider Previously Approved Text,**
41 **and to Consider Initiation of Rulemaking to Accept the Association of**
42 **Marital and Family Therapy National Exam for Licensure as a Marriage and**
43 **Family Therapist (Title 16, California Code of Regulations (16 CCR) CCR §§**
44 **1816.2 and 1829.1)**
45

46 *This item was removed from the agenda.*

1 **24. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Possible Statutory**
2 **Amendments to the Required Notice to Consumer Requirements (Business**
3 **and Professions Code (BPC) §§4980.32, 4989.17, 4996.75, 4999.71, and add**
4 **BPC §§4980.33, 4989.17.1, 4996.76, and 4999.71.1)**
5

6 SB 1024 (2024) modernized how Board of Behavioral Sciences licensees
7 provide licensing information to clients. Because telehealth has made physical
8 license displays impractical in many settings, the law now requires license
9 display only when services are provided in person at the primary place of
10 practice.

11
12 To maintain transparency, the law also requires therapists to include their full
13 legal name, license or registration type, number, and expiration date in the
14 written notice given to clients before starting psychotherapy services. This
15 approach aims to ensure clients have essential information while reducing
16 unnecessary administrative burden for licensees.
17

18 Safety Concerns for Those Working with Incarcerated Populations

19 Licensees working with incarcerated individuals have raised serious safety
20 concerns about the law’s requirement to disclose their full name and license
21 number, explaining that this could increase risks of harassment or retaliation
22 toward them or their families. Staff received multiple reports of these concerns
23 and committed to bringing the issue to the Policy and Advocacy Committee for
24 discussion and consideration
25

26 Board of Psychology Requirements

27 The Board of Psychology requires psychologists to disclose their name, license
28 type, and highest degree either in writing on the first visit or by displaying it
29 prominently in the office. However, the law exempts certain licensed facilities —
30 such as acute care hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, correctional treatment
31 centers, and nursing facilities — allowing psychologists in those settings to forgo
32 these disclosure requirements.
33

34 Additional Research

35 Staff consulted correctional agencies to understand privacy protections and
36 challenges related to SB 1024. California Correctional Health Care Services
37 (CCHCS) explained that providers in CDCR facilities typically use only their last
38 name and title to protect their safety, and existing policies allow complaints to be
39 processed without full legal names. CCHCS and CDCR echoed concerns that
40 requiring full-name disclosure increases safety risks, even with available privacy
41 tools. CDCR’s Legislative Office reviewed the proposed exemption language and
42 indicated no concerns, noting they already have processes to ensure proper
43 disclosures while protecting clinicians.
44

1 Previous Committee Discussion

2 The Policy and Advocacy Committee reviewed this issue in October 2025 and
3 asked staff to gather more information from criminal justice agencies. At its
4 January 2026 meeting, the Committee reviewed the issue again, made minor
5 revisions to the draft language, and directed staff to bring the proposal to the full
6 Board for consideration.

7
8 Proposed Language

9 Staff presented proposed language, which was provided in the meeting materials
10 as Attachment A. The proposed language mirrors an existing exception in BPC
11 680, allowing safety-based discretion for identifying information. It would permit
12 limited exemptions from full disclosure requirements only in specific settings:
13 inpatient acute psychiatric hospitals, inpatient correctional treatment centers, and
14 any setting where mental health services are provided to individuals in local,
15 state, or federal custody.

16
17 Changes Made Since January Policy and Advocacy Committee Meeting

18 After the January Committee meeting, staff identified and made additional
19 clarifying edits to the proposed language. These changes apply across all license
20 types but are highlighted in Attachment A within BPC section 4980.32 to show
21 the revisions.

22
23 Discussion

24 Huft: Argued that safety concerns are being used as an unjustified reason to
25 reduce transparency in mental health care. Cited research showing that about
26 5% of mental health providers report stalking, mostly psychiatrists, and only
27 about one-third of those stalkers are patients. Roughly 0.1% of inpatient clients
28 engage in stalking, and evidence does not show that inpatient settings or the use
29 of full provider names increases this risk. Because people receiving mental
30 health care — especially in institutions — are highly vulnerable, reducing
31 transparency harms them. Internal grievance systems in these organizations are
32 often unreliable; Cited that the state inspector general found that nearly 90% of
33 inmate complaints within CDCR were handled inadequately. Argued that, given
34 only a small fraction of complaints is handled appropriately, it is unsafe and
35 inappropriate to grant additional opacity to organizations that have already
36 demonstrated they cannot be trusted.

37
38 Ranasinghe: Noted that the proposed language would allow private correctional
39 facilities — and potentially immigration detention centers — avoid disclosure
40 requirements because they operate under government contracts. Argued it is
41 reasonable to expect professionals working with such vulnerable populations to
42 provide their name and license number.

43
44 Uribe: Drawing on her experience working in high-security prisons, explained that
45 staff are discouraged from using their last names because many inmates have
46 serious criminal histories, and this policy exists to protect employees.

1 Recommended keeping the current safety practices and, if needed, having the
2 board reevaluate decisions through a separate process rather than requiring staff
3 to disclose their full names. Cautioned that mandatory disclosure could deter
4 people from working in prisons, where mental health staff are urgently needed.
5 Suggested that the policy should also account for individuals in alternative
6 sentencing programs monitored by probation officers and noted that similar
7 safety concerns may arise in outpatient settings when clients remain under
8 correctional supervision.

9
10 Sovec: Asked why new language was added making licensees and registrants
11 responsible for ensuring their correctional programs have required notification
12 procedures.

13
14 Helms: Explained that the purpose was to create accountability, since licensees
15 should not assume their employer will handle these requirements. If a facility
16 does not have the procedures in place, the individual licensee would still be
17 responsible for providing the required information.

18
19 Sovec: Raised concerns about how this would work in practice, noting that
20 licensees are low-level employees who lack control over correctional agencies.

21
22 Helms: Responded that the board only has jurisdiction over licensees — not
23 CDCR — so placing the duty on practitioners is the only workable option. Other
24 healing arts boards fully exempt correctional settings, but this approach attempts
25 to maintain some level of disclosure while accounting for potential safety risks.
26 Helms emphasized that the board cannot compel CDCR to comply or provide
27 records, limiting their options.

28
29 Sovec: Reflected that the incarceration landscape has changed significantly
30 since the legislation was first considered. Acknowledging earlier comments about
31 the many layers of risk and inadequate protection for the public, including
32 incarcerated individuals, he is leaning away from supporting the legislation.
33 Noted this is disappointing given the personal testimonies heard in previous
34 meetings, but the broader context makes it difficult to continue supporting the
35 proposal.

36 37 Public Comment

38 Shanti Ezrine, CAMFT: Acknowledged that the issue is difficult because it
39 involves balancing legitimate safety concerns with the need for transparency.
40 Expressed appreciation for the work that went into drafting language intended to
41 address both sides by allowing certain exceptions while requiring agencies to
42 have complaint processes in place. CAMFT is looking forward to more feedback
43 and continued discussion to determine the best path forward in trying to balance
44 these competing concerns.

1 Further Discussion

2 Huff: Cautioned the board against treating concerns about safety as if they were
3 established facts. Emphasized that available data does not show mental health
4 providers face increased danger when working with inpatient psychiatric clients
5 or incarcerated individuals. Urged the board not to equate providers' feelings of
6 unsafety with empirical reality and warned against allowing subjective concerns
7 to distort efforts to reach an appropriate balance.

8
9 Ranasinghe: Argued that the proposed language oversimplifies how correctional
10 systems operate. Although the statute distinguishes between various types of
11 correctional facilities, in practice people in detention are housed together, and
12 their level of danger varies widely. Noted that the policy would result in denying
13 required notice not only to individuals who may pose a risk but also to those who
14 present no danger at all. Because of this mismatch between the statutory
15 categories and real-world conditions, he cannot support the proposed language.

16
17 Uribe: Requested to see the actual research behind claims that there is no
18 increased risk to providers in these settings. They emphasized that rather than
19 simply hearing others state there is no evidence of heightened danger, they
20 would like to review the data themselves and understand the concerns raised by
21 agencies requesting the exemption.

22
23 Board member Uribe was directed to the October 24, 2025, Policy & Advocacy
24 Committee meeting webcast available online.

25
26 No action taken.

27
28 **25. Discussion and Consideration of:**

29
30 **a. Comments Received on Text During the 45-Day Public Comment Period**
31 **and Proposed Responses Thereto for the Board's Rulemaking to Amend**
32 **16 CCR Sections 1822.51, 1829.2, 1877.2, 1887, 1887.1, 1887.2, 1887.3,**
33 **1887.4.2, 1887.4.3, and 1887.12 (Continuing Education; Exams;**
34 **Renewals Regulations)**

35
36 At its February 2025 meeting, the Board approved updates to its Continuing
37 Education, Exams, and Renewal regulations. The proposed regulatory
38 package was publicly noticed on December 5, 2025, with a 45-day comment
39 period ending January 20, 2026. Six written comments were received and
40 were provided in meeting materials as Attachments B-G. Staff provided
41 summaries of those comments, recommended responses, and updated
42 regulatory language reflecting suggested changes. The revised language was
43 provided in meeting materials as Attachment A.

44
45 Discussion

46 Boyd: Supports reducing supervisory CE hours to 6 hours.

1 Uribe: Suggested specifying how much of a meeting attendees must be
2 present for, noting that people often arrive late or leave early, which can
3 undermine attendance requirements.
4

5 Motion: Direct staff to proceed as recommended as specified and provide
6 responses to the comments as indicated in the staff recommended
7 responses.
8

9 M/S: Huft/Uribe
10

11 Public Comment

12 Shanti Ezrine, CAMFT: Expressed appreciation to staff for incorporating
13 CAMFT's feedback into the revised text. Thanked staff for adding clearer
14 definitions, clarifying that California law and ethics includes all applicable
15 state and relevant federal laws, and refining the Continuing Education
16 provisions. Highlighted the value of recognizing CE credit for attending BBS
17 meetings and providing supervision and supported the adjustment to six CE
18 hours for supervision.
19

20 Vote: Yea 10; Nay 0, Absent 1. Motion carried.

Member	Vote
Lorez Bailey	Y
Dr. Nick Boyd	Y
Susan Friedman	Y
Justin Huft	Y
Christopher Jones	absent
Kelly Ranasinghe	Y
John Sovec	Y
Wendy Strack	Y
Rebecca Thiess	Y
Eleanor Uribe	Y
Annette Walker	Y

21
22 **b. Adoption of Amendments to 16 CCR Sections 1822.51, 1829.2, 1877.2,**
23 **1887, 1887.1, 1887.2, 1887.3, 1887.4.2, 1887.4.3, and 1887.12 (Continuing**
24 **Education; Exams; Renewals Regulations)**
25

26 Staff recommended adding an amendment to section 1887.1 to include the
27 required renewal timeframes for delinquent licensees and registrants, as well
28 as the required delinquency fee for those renewing after their licenses have
29 expired. These elements were unintentionally omitted from the original
30 proposal.
31

1 Discussion

2 Sovec: Asked whether the definitions of “delinquent” and “inactive” status are
3 clearly distinguished in the regulations, and whether there is any potential
4 overlap the Board should consider as the language is drafted.

5
6 Staff responded that the law is very clear in those distinctions.

7
8 Kristy Schiede: Clarified that the regulatory text being discussed applies only
9 to active renewals, while inactive requirements are set in statute. After
10 reviewing the language months later, staff realized it addressed only
11 licensees who are current and renewing, not those whose licenses have
12 expired. Explained that individuals reinstating after expiration use the same
13 application but must also pay a delinquency fee (except registrants, who do
14 not pay such a fee). Apologized for the oversight and noted that new
15 language was added to ensure the regulations also cover expired, or
16 “delinquent,” licensees who can still renew to active status by submitting
17 required documentation and paying the delinquency fee.

18
19 Motion: Approve the proposed modified regulation text for CCR sections
20 1822.51, 1829.2, 1877.2, 1887, 1887.1, 1887.2, 1887.3, 1887.4.2, 1887.4.3,
21 and 1887.12 as set forth in Attachment A, and direct staff to take all steps
22 necessary to complete the rulemaking process, including preparing modified
23 text for notice of a 15-day public comment period. If after that 15-day
24 comment period, the Board does not receive any objections or adverse
25 recommendations specifically directed at the modified text, the notice, or to
26 the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting this action,
27 authorize the Executive Officer to make any non-substantive changes to the
28 proposed regulations and rulemaking file, and adopt amendments to Title 16,
29 CCR, sections 1822.51, 1829.2, 1877.2, 1887, 1887.1, 1887.2, 1887.3,
30 1887.4.2, 1887.4.3, and 1887.12 as set forth in Attachment A.

31
32 M/S: Strack/Walker

33
34 Public Comment: None

35
36 Vote: Yea 10; Nay 0, Absent 1. Motion carried.

Member	Vote
Lorez Bailey	Y
Dr. Nick Boyd	Y
Susan Friedman	Y
Justin Huft	Y
Christopher Jones	absent
Kelly Ranasinghe	Y
John Sovec	Y
Wendy Strack	Y

Rebecca Thiess	Y
Eleanor Uribe	Y
Annette Walker	Y

1
2 **26. Update on Board-Sponsored and Board-Monitored Legislation**

3
4 **a. Technical and/or Non substantive Amendments**

5
6 The Board identified several technical and non-substantive amendments
7 needed to clarify or update its current practice acts:

- 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
- Clarifying when supervisors must assess the appropriateness of using videoconference supervision.
 - Modernizing statutory requirements for coursework in human sexuality and child abuse assessment.
 - Correcting references to incorrect section numbers.
 - Making technical updates to advertising and client disclosure requirements to ensure consistency across all Board license types.

17 The Board approved these proposed amendments at its September 20, 2024,
18 and November 21, 2025 meetings.

19
20 **b. AB 1598 (Quirk-Silva) Statutory Amendments to Restructure the**
21 **Licensure Pathways**

22
23 This proposal represents the first step in restructuring and modernizing the
24 Board’s licensing process to make the path to licensure more accessible and
25 responsive to the real-world challenges applicants face, without
26 compromising standards for safe and competent practice. Key amendments
27 include:

- 28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
- Removing the requirement that associates attempt the California Law and Ethics Exam each year in order to renew their registration.
 - Requiring that the California Law and Ethics Exam be passed within seven years prior to applying for an initial license.
 - Extending the validity of supervised experience hours from six to seven years.
 - Increasing the maximum number of associate registration renewals from five to six, allowing a total of seven years of registration before a new number is required.
 - Permitting associates with a subsequent registration number to request a one-time, two-year hardship extension to work in one private practice setting with that subsequent number.

1 The bill also updates the exemption language for faith-based counseling by
2 clarifying the criteria under which such counseling is exempt from licensure.

3
4 The Board approved these proposed amendments at its August 22, 2025
5 meeting.

6
7 *Status: This bill was introduced on January 16, 2026.*

8
9 Discussion/Public Comment: None

10
11 **27. Update on Board Rulemaking Proposals**

12
13 **Advertising**

14 Status: Approved to OAL; takes effect April 1, 2026

15
16 **Fee Reductions**

17 Status: Approved by OAL; takes effect July 1, 2026

18
19 **Continuing Education**

20 Status: Noticed to the public December 5, 2025; comments considered at this
21 meeting under item 25.

22
23 **English as a Second Language: Additional Examination Time**

24 Status: Submitted for DCA Production Phase Review on August 14, 2025

25
26 **AMFTRB National LMFT Examination**

27 Status: Staff preparing documents for Production Phase Review. This was
28 discussed under Item 22.

29
30 **Licensed Educational Psychologist (LEP) Experience**

31 Status: Staff preparing documents for Production Phase Review

32
33 Discussion/Public Comment: None

34
35 **28. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**

36
37 Sovec: Review current supervision practices for associates, with the goal of
38 ensuring consistent quality, ethical compliance, and alignment with organizational
39 standards and state licensure requirements for supervisors.

40
41 Boyd: Explore adopting a policy similar to the Board of Psychology's policy,
42 which prohibits associates from paying supervisors for supervision.

1 **29. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda**

2
3 Elyse Springer, CA Chapter of Postpartum Support International: Reminded the
4 Board of its prior commitment to increase public awareness of perinatal mental
5 health and emphasized the urgency of the issue. Cited a recent infanticide case
6 in Massachusetts in which clinicians are being sued for misdiagnosing
7 postpartum psychosis, noting this could set a precedent affecting California
8 practitioners as well. Added that many clinicians are expressing concern due to
9 the lack of consistent, foundational training in perinatal mental health and urged
10 the Board to keep this issue at the forefront.

11
12 Rick McCarthy, LMFT: Urged the Board to reinstate an oral examination for
13 LMFT licensure. Explained that discontinuing the oral exam in 2003 removed the
14 Board's only direct method for assessing applied clinical competence. Drawing
15 on his twelve years as an examiner, he stated that roughly half of the candidates
16 he would have deemed incompetent at the time would now be licensed
17 therapists. Emphasized that only a small percentage of harmed or dissatisfied
18 clients ever file complaints, meaning most incompetence goes unreported.
19 Argued that new structured, scenario-based oral and performance exams
20 address the concerns that prompted the exam's elimination and represent an
21 improved, modernized approach. Noted he is working with Senator Tony
22 Strickland's office on potential legislation, but stressed that the issue ultimately
23 relates to the Board's core mandate of public protection, stating that written
24 exams measure knowledge, while oral exams measure how that knowledge is
25 applied.

26
27 Anna: Asked whether the Board has any ability to advocate regarding the U.S.
28 Department of Education's proposal to limit which graduate degrees qualify as
29 "professional" for federal student loan caps, noting that such changes could
30 directly affect counseling and mental health programs.

31
32 **30. Adjournment**

33
34 The Board adjourned at 12:37 p.m.