

## WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

A recorded webcast of this meeting is available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tP0-tcUTiBs>

**DATE** April 19, 2024

**TIME** 10:00 a.m.

### LOCATIONS

**Primary Location** Department of Consumer Affairs  
1625 North Market Blvd., #N-220  
Sacramento, CA 95834

**Alternative Platform** WebEx Video/Phone Conference

### ATTENDEES

#### Members Present at Remote Locations

Wendy Strack, Chair, Public Member  
Justin Huft, LMFT Member  
Eleanor Uribe, LCSW Member  
Annette Walker, Public Member

#### Staff Present at Primary Location

Steve Sodergren, Executive Officer  
Marlon McManus, Assistant Executive Officer  
Rosanne Helms, Legislative Manager  
Christy Berger, Regulatory Analyst  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel

**Other Attendees** Public participation via WebEx video conference/phone conference  
and in-person at Department of Consumer Affairs

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

2  
3 Wendy Strack, Chair of the Workforce Development Committee (Committee),  
4 called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m. Roll was called, and a quorum was  
5 established.

6  
7 **2. Introductions**

8  
9 Committee members introduced themselves during role call; staff and public  
10 attendees introduced themselves.

11  
12 **3. Consent Calendar: Discussion and Possible Approval of January 19, 2024**  
13 **Committee Meeting Minutes**

14  
15 **Motion: Approve the January 19, 2024 Committee meeting minutes.**

16  
17 **M/S: Huft/Walker**

18  
19 **Public Comment: None**

20  
21 **Motion carried: 4 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstention.**

Member	Vote
Justin Huft	Yes
Wendy Strack	Yes
Eleanor Uribe	Yes
Annette Walker	Yes

22  
23  
24 **4. Overview of the Purpose of the Workforce Development Committee**

25  
26 At its January 2024 meeting, the Committee discussed the following:

- 27  
28 • Permitting early eligibility to take the Board required clinical examinations and  
29 directed staff to work with the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) and  
30 the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) to determine if this would  
31 be a feasible option.
- 32  
33 • Proposed amendments to the Board’s additional time allowance for English  
34 as a Second Language (ESL) examinees; directed staff to draft language and  
35 bring back for further discussion.
- 36  
37 • Licensure pathway draft survey; directed staff to bring the draft survey to the  
38 Board for review and additional feedback.

1 **5. Discussion and Possible Recommendation to the Board Regarding**  
2 **Permitting Early Eligibility to Take the Clinical Examination**  
3

4 At its January 2024 meeting, the Committee directed staff to have discussions  
5 with Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) and National Board for Certified  
6 Counselors (NBCC) regarding options for permitting early eligibility to take their  
7 exams.  
8

9 ASWB indicated that their requirement for taking the exam at 18 months of  
10 experience is based on psychometric research but was agreeable to the Board  
11 specifying the number of hours at which the exam could be taken, if justifications  
12 were made. They recommended the Board write a proposal letter to ASWB's  
13 Board of Directors for consideration.  
14

15 NBCC indicated that they currently permit their National Clinical Mental Health  
16 Counseling Examination (NCMHCE) exam to be taken at various times; they  
17 would likely be open to the Board's recommendation.  
18

19 Considerations for future discussion:

- 20
- 21 • If the Board were to accept 1500 hours of supervised experience to sit for  
22 the exam, the Board will need to decide if it will accept the early scores for  
23 NBCC.
  - 24 • Currently, only MFTs can earn pre-degree hours. Would those hours be  
25 accepted?
  - 26 • Can candidates continue to lock in their experience hours, or will the  
27 experience hours age?

28 Discussion/Public Comment

29 Huff: Individuals should be allowed to take clinical exams as early as reasonably  
30 possible. The Board does not have data that suggests that the difference  
31 between 1500 hours and 3000 hours improves clinical efficacy and exam rates.  
32 However, there is data that suggests that the time it takes to accrue hours is a  
33 barrier across multiple licenses.  
34

35 Helms and Sodergren: Other changes are coming down the pipeline. Expressed  
36 the importance of being mindful before implementing changes too quickly.  
37

38 Christine Tippitt: Requested the Board to consider the following exam process:  
39 1) take and pass the law and ethics exam within the first year, 2) take and pass  
40 the "midpoint" exam, 3) at the end, take the national exams.  
41

42 Dr. Ben Caldwell: Any bill that would move the exams up in the process would  
43 be welcomed by associates. It does not change the requirements and would not  
44 be a "pro" or "anti" exam bill, but it would be a workforce bill. Furthermore, 1500

1 hours is a reasonable standard. It would be even better to allow candidates to  
2 take the exam as soon as possible after completion of the qualifying degree.

3  
4 Cathy Atkins, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT):  
5 Supports taking exams earlier. Asked why a specified minimum number of hours  
6 should be met. Requested research or further discussion to consider less than  
7 1500 hours. CAMFT does not see any public protection issue.

8  
9 Kat Besse, California Alliance of Child and Family Services: Supports allowing  
10 early eligibility to take the clinical exam.

11  
12 Stephanie Stiavetti: Supports earlier testing. Students and pre-licensed  
13 clinicians with disabilities are at a disadvantage with scheduling exams based on  
14 accommodations at testing centers and find themselves scheduling their exams  
15 months in advance. Allowing for earlier testing reduces barriers for those with  
16 disabilities.

17  
18 Helms: Explained why 1500 hours was suggested (in response to Atkins'  
19 question). ASWB does not permit their exam to be taken until after 18 months of  
20 experience but indicated that they would possibly allow 1500 hours.

21  
22 **Staff was directed to start drafting language, consult with legal for direction**  
23 **on what will be proposed in statute and in regulations, and continue**  
24 **discussions regarding details.**

25  
26 Schieldge: Suggested looking at other states and their models/language.

27  
28 **6. Discussion Regarding Additional Coursework Requirements for all Board-**  
29 **Regulated Professions**

30  
31 Staff presented an overview of additional coursework requirements for all the  
32 Board-regulated professions, specifically for applicants who hold an in-state  
33 degree. This is the first step towards a holistic review of all additional  
34 coursework requirements for consistency, clarity, and relevance.

35  
36 Note Re: Out-of-State Applicant Coursework

37 This review only covers in-state applicants in order to keep the review process  
38 manageable. However, out-of-state applicants for LCSW, LMFT or LPCC  
39 licensure must also complete additional coursework.

40  
41 The coursework for these applicants must be completed at the graduate level  
42 (unlike most in-state additional coursework, which may be completed at the  
43 undergraduate level). The amount of coursework depends on which license they  
44 are applying for, and whether they are applying via Path A (streamlined path for  
45 those licensed for two or more years in another state) or Path B (licensure via  
46 evaluation of education and experience).

1 If the Committee recommends that certain coursework for in-state applicants  
2 should remain at the undergraduate level, course level requirements for out-of-  
3 state applicants should be discussed for consistency and parity.  
4

5 Discussion/Comments

6 Caldwell: Expressed that it is time for a holistic review. Education for the license  
7 should be met through the degree program. Additional courses required after the  
8 degree lead to clinicians spending hundreds or thousands of dollars more on  
9 required education. Everything on the chart (provided in meeting materials)  
10 should be a degree content requirement. Degree granting programs should be  
11 allowed the autonomy to determine how many hours of education are  
12 appropriate. Where the Board has specified requirements for particular content  
13 areas, those requirements have been arbitrary.  
14

15 Atkins, CAMFT: CAMFT concurs and supports the education requirements be  
16 integrated in the educational programs instead of fulfilling the additional  
17 coursework after the degree program. Schools should decide on the units/hours.  
18

19 Staff stated that those with older degrees will still have to complete additional  
20 coursework if their degree did not include a course requirement. Staff will need  
21 to address it without having those degrees not qualify due to new criteria.  
22

23 **No action was required for this item.**  
24

25 **7. Discussion and Possible Recommendation to the Board Regarding**  
26 **Amendments to the Human Sexuality Coursework Requirements for all**  
27 **Board-Regulated Professions: (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§**  
28 **25, 4980.36(d)(2)(H), 4980.41(a)(3), 4996.2(g), 4999.32(e)(2) and**  
29 **4999.33(d)(7); Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §1807)**  
30

31 Staff presented the human sexuality coursework requirements for all of the  
32 Board's license types for applicants who hold an in-state degree. But it is not  
33 required for LEP applicants.  
34

35 LEP Profession

36 LEP applicants are not required to have coursework in human sexuality.  
37 However, to qualify for licensure, all LEP applicants must have experience as a  
38 credentialed school psychologist in California. To obtain that credential, a degree  
39 that meets the standards set forth by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
40 is required. Those standards do not include human sexuality coursework.  
41 However, the standards do require competency in human development, and this  
42 may provide at least minimal coverage of human sexuality.  
43

44 Course Length Differences

45 For LMFT and LPCC applicants who began their degree program prior to January  
46 1, 2012, human sexuality coursework may be taken either within or outside of

1 their degree program. For these applicants, as well as for all LCSW applicants,  
2 the course must be 10 hours in length.

3  
4 For LMFT and LPCC applicants who began a degree program on or after  
5 January 1, 2012, human sexuality coursework is required to be part of their  
6 degree program, and no specific number of hours are required.

7  
8 Course timing differences

9 LMFT applicants with a pre-2012 degree, as well as all LCSW applicants, must  
10 take this course prior to obtaining a license.

11  
12 LMFT applicants with a post-2012 degree, as well as all LPCC applicants, must  
13 take this course prior to obtaining a registration.

14  
15 Note Re: Out-of-State Applicant Coursework

16 While this review focuses on applicants with an in-state degree, there are some  
17 issues to consider pertaining to applicants with an out-of-state degree. LCSW,  
18 LMFT and LPCC out-of-state applicants under Path B must complete a graduate  
19 level human sexuality course prior to licensure, and Title 16, CCR section 1807  
20 specifies course content for both in-state and out-of-state applicants. Two issues  
21 to consider are:

- 22
- 23 • If any changes are proposed to be made to section 1807, those changes  
24 would also affect out-of-state applicants. However, if the Committee believes  
25 that the changes should only apply to in-state applicants, staff can draft the  
26 language that separates them out.
  - 27 • If the Committee recommends that human sexuality coursework for in-state  
28 applicants should remain at the undergraduate level, the Committee should  
29 discuss whether the course should be allowed at the undergraduate level for  
30 out-of-state applicants.

31  
32 Discussion/Comments

33 Caldwell: This topic area belongs in the degree program with specific hours of  
34 coverage. It may be possible to group this topic along with HIV/AIDS, prenatal  
35 and perinatal mental health under a category of human sexuality and  
36 reproductive health. That could be a category within the degree program, leaving  
37 specific coverage up to the programs.

38  
39 Strack: Asked if it is possible to do what Caldwell recommended.

40  
41 Helms: Recommended having a holistic discussion on the HIV/AIDS  
42 coursework, and any other topics, in the discussion before grouping  
43 it/condensing it; and determine which topics would group together appropriately.  
44 Staff can consult with subject matter experts.  
45

1 Strack: Agreed in having discussions on other topics before taking action on this  
2 item.

3  
4 **No action taken.**

5  
6 **8. Discussion and Possible Recommendation to the Board Regarding**  
7 **Proposed Amendments to the Board’s Additional Examination Time:**  
8 **English as a Second Language Regulations: Title 16 CCR §1805.2**  
9

10 At its January 2024 meeting, the Committee reviewed the Board’s current  
11 English as a Second Language (ESL) regulations for additional exam time  
12 allowance and the allowances offered by the Board’s exam vendors. The  
13 Committee directed staff to do the following:

- 14
- 15 • Draft amendments to allow an option for additional exam time if the applicant  
16 attests under the penalty of perjury that English is their second language.
- 17 • Examine the Board’s current exam time allowances and compare those with  
18 the amount of time that “time-and-a-half” allows.
- 19 • Review the ESL allowances of other DCA boards to determine how they  
20 compare with the Board’s ESL allowance.
- 21

22 Helms: Proposed text on Attachment A, subdivision (a) has been amended since  
23 the posting of these meeting materials. Per the Board’s regulatory counsel,  
24 regulations must meet a higher standard for clarity for the Office of Administrative  
25 Law (OAL). Counsel assisted staff in drafting language for the attestation for  
26 Attachment A, subdivision (a). The draft language is as follows:

27  
28 *A written statement signed and dated by the applicant that includes a*  
29 *certification of the following statement are true and correct under penalty*  
30 *of perjury under the laws of the state of California:*

31 *“I hereby certify that I do not speak English as my primary language. I*  
32 *most frequently speak another language to communicate with others and*  
33 *have difficulty reading, writing, or speaking English proficiently.”*  
34

35 Schieldge: Explained that the text as proposed in the meeting materials is  
36 unclear as to what the attestation needs to say. The intent is to grant additional  
37 examination time to someone who has proficiency issues. Since the state’s Civil  
38 Rights Department has adopted regulations to define English proficiency, it would  
39 be appropriate to use that as part of the certification being requested.

40  
41 Discussion/Comments

42 Huft: This is an important step forward. Attestation is important to open  
43 opportunities.  
44

1 Caldwell: The current ESL requirements are stringent and expensive and are not  
2 likely serving some individuals where an accommodation would be appropriate.  
3 It is difficult to make that determination in the absence of data. Requested staff  
4 to produce a report comparing exam success rates for those with and without  
5 ESL accommodations for each of the Board's exams and for the national exams.  
6

7 Caldwell: Regarding the proposed language for the attestation, would there be a  
8 gap left of people whose language processing is slower because English is not  
9 their native language, but who would not qualify under that proposed language  
10 because they might speak English more at home? Are we potentially leaving out  
11 people who would reasonably qualify for any accommodations?  
12

13 Atkins, CAMFT: CAMFT supports lessening burdens and adding to the  
14 workforce.  
15

16 Stephanie Stiavetti: Concurred with Caldwell. Who might we miss by the current  
17 wording based on difference in language processing times and abilities?  
18

19 Schieldge: We want to make sure that we don't make the option so open-ended  
20 that everyone who speaks a second language will qualify. We want to reach  
21 those who have proficiency issues because we're talking about accuracy, not  
22 fluency, of the information communicated. We're trying to make sure we have a  
23 method for ensuring that only the people that need additional time qualify. It's  
24 not a disability to speak another language, so we're not accommodating people.  
25 We're trying to equalize the field for people when taking the exam.  
26

27 Helms: Emphasized the language states "reading, writing or speaking."  
28

29 **Motion: Direct staff to draft discussed language into Attachment A,  
30 possibly fine tune the language per the discussion, and bring the proposal  
31 to the Policy and Advocacy Committee for consideration.**  
32

33 **M/S: Strack/Walker**  
34

35 Public Comment: None  
36

37 **Motion carried: 4 yea, 0 nay**  
38

Member	Vote
Justin Huft	Yes
Wendy Strack	Yes
Eleanor Uribe	Yes
Annette Walker	Yes

39  
40



1 **9. Update on the Licensure Pathway Survey**

2  
3 Staff presented summaries of the Licensure Pathway Survey responses from  
4 registrants and licensees, and a summary of the responses to questions that  
5 asked participants to rate the impact of factors that may have posed a barrier to  
6 achieving a licensing milestone.

7  
8 Staff will be conducting an in-depth analysis of items not included in the  
9 summaries, such as the free form responses and comments. This report will be  
10 presented at a future meeting.

11 Discussion/Comments

12  
13 Huft: Would like to discuss the prohibitive cost of supervision. The cost is a  
14 barrier. We need to make sure that supervision is inclusive and accessible in the  
15 process.

16  
17 Caldwell: Curious to see differences by profession. Curious to see how these  
18 questions might interact. Are people who are paying for supervision, more likely  
19 or less likely to find that supervision prepared them well?

20  
21 Atkins, CAMFT: CAMFT is still reviewing the results of the survey.

22  
23 **10. Update on the Voluntary Examination Demographic Survey**

24  
25 Board staff continue to work on the development and the possible  
26 implementation of a voluntary demographic survey for candidates who are taking  
27 a Board-developed examination. This data will be used by DCA's Office of  
28 Professional Examination Services to perform a differential item functioning  
29 analysis of Board examinations.

30  
31 A project plan was submitted to the Department's Office of Information Services  
32 (OIS) Project Management Team and was approved on March 7, 2024, for an  
33 impact analysis. During this process, OIS staff will work with the Board in  
34 determining the specifics of the project to assess the development efforts that will  
35 be required. Once the impact analysis is complete, OIS will determine how this  
36 effort will be included in their current workload and schedule system releases.

37  
38 Board staff is in communication with legal counsel to ensure that the voluntary  
39 survey complies with information privacy laws.

40  
41 Discussion/Comments: None

42  
43 **11. Suggestions for Future Agenda items**

44  
45 None

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

2

3 None

4

5 **13. Adjournment**

6

7 The Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.