

POLICY AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

October 20, 2017 8:30 a.m.

Attended By: Alain Montgomery, JD

MINUTES:

I. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Business and Professions Code Section 4980.43(h) (granting of qualifying master's degree program or doctoral degree) and 4999.96 (d) (granting of qualifying degree), 90 Day Rule

Under current law, an applicant for registration as an associate marriage and family therapy (AMFT) or associate professional clinical counselor (APCC) may count supervised experience hours gained in between his or her degree award date and the date the Board issues the intern registration, if he or she applies for registration within 90 days of the date the qualifying degree was granted (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 4980.43(g), 4999.46(d)). This allowance in the law is commonly referred to as "the 90-day rule."

There is no 90-day rule for applicants for associate social worker (ASW) registration. They may not gain supervised experience hours until registered as an ASW (BPC § 4996.23(f)). However, AB 456 (Thurmond), proposed this year but now a 2-year bill, would have granted the 90-day rule to ASW applicants. When discussing AB 456 at its May 2017 meeting, the Board noted it had some concern

Current Issue

While reviewing AB 93, the Board's supervision bill, the Legislature raised a public protection concern about the 90-day rule, which is contained in two of the code sections AB 93 is amending. Specifically, the concern is that the 90-day rule allows unregistered individuals to provide mental health services without a fingerprint clearance.

Possible Solutions

1. **Eliminate the 90-day Rule Entirely:** With this option, a phase-out date would be needed in current law, so that those planning to count hours already gained while the 90-day rule was in the law would not be adversely affected. (Hours are good for six years.)
2. **Allow the Counting of Non-Clinical Hours Only:** With this option, only non-clinical hours would count under the 90-day rule. A phase-out date for clinical hours would be needed.
3. **Allow the 90-Day Rule if Supervisor Certifies the Applicant was Fingerprinted:** With this option, the 90-day rule would only apply if the employer certified that they had run a fingerprint background check on the applicant.
4. **Narrow the Window that the 90-Day Rule Applies:** Currently, if an applicant applies within the 90-day rule, he or she has up to a year to remediate any deficiencies and submit the final information before the application is abandoned. (Most applicants do not take this long to remediate.) During that time, hours count because the 90-day rule was followed. One

suggestion is to only allow hours to be gained under the 90-day rule for a limited period, for example, 30 or 60 days. However, this solution likely does not address the Legislature's concerns, because the individual is still counting hours while possibly not having a fingerprint clearance.

5. Register Trainees: Under this option, the Board would register and oversee all trainees while in their master's degree program. In this situation, the Board would have disciplinary authority over trainees, and it would eliminate part of the waiting period between graduation and registration.

CAMFT advocated that the Committee recommend to the Board that the 90-day rule remain intact. Based on input from stakeholders such as schools, agencies, and pre-licensees, CAMFT contended that eliminating the 90-day rule would result in the disruption of services to California's most vulnerable populations who rely on services offered by agencies and counseling centers that employ pre-licensees which would impact continuity of care for these consumers of mental health and lead to client abandonment. Further, CAMFT argued that failure to allow pre-licensees the opportunity to gain hours in the 90-day period following their degree conferral date to the time they apply for an intern registration could result in widespread exploitation of pre-licensed members who chose to remain at their field placement without the professional benefit of being able to gain hours of supervised experience. To address the consumer protection concerns raised by the Senate, CAMFT indicated that there have not been any criminal incidents committed against a consumer involving a pre-licensed provider; and, that to specifically address the consumer/public protection concern raised by the Senate, it would be better if a criminal fingerprint clearance was obtained on a pre-licensed applicant as soon as possible, such as, at the outset of that individual's academic career. Further, CAMFT discussed which of proposed options CAMFT felt were most viable and would keep the 90-day rule intact. CAMFT proposed to the Committee an option that was not listed, which was to require schools and/or graduate programs to live-scan students.

After all public comment was heard, ultimately, the Committee determined that eliminating the 90-day rule would be one way the Board can exercise its purview to ensure consumer safety. As such, the Policy and Advocacy Committee decided to make the following recommendation to the Board: MOTION: To eliminate the 90-day rule, but to include a sunset clause for graduate students completing graduate study effective January 1, 2021. APPROVED.

CAMFT will continue to advocate on behalf of pre-licensees with the BBS to ensure that pre-licensure application times are not unduly impacted due to the elimination of the 90-day rule.

II. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed Amendments to Assembly Bill 93 (Medina) – Healing Arts: Marriage and Family Therapists, Clinical Social Workers, Professional Clinical Counselors: Required Experience and Supervision

Background

AB 93 (Medina) is sponsored by the Board and represents the work of the Supervision Committee. The bill seeks to strengthen the quality of supervision, by focusing on supervisor

responsibilities, types of supervision that may be provided, and acceptable work settings for supervisees. The bill also strives to make the Board's supervision requirements more consistent across its licensed professions.

The original bill proposal was approved by the Board at its November 2016 meeting. Minor technical amendments to the bill were approved at the Board's March 2017 meeting.

AB 93 passed through the Assembly. However, it became a 2-year bill in the Senate due to consumer protection concerns about the 90-day rule, and requests for other substantive changes to the language in the code sections being amended.

Staff has worked extensively with the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development (Senate Committee) to develop amendments that strike a balance of preserving the original intent of the bill, while making some clean-up changes that address the Senate Committee's concerns.

One of the proposed amendments is to strike the word "California" from Section 4980.03 as follows: *(6) Has and maintains a current and active California license as a marriage and family therapist, professional clinical counselor, marriage and family therapist, licensed psychologist, or physician and surgeon who is certified in psychiatry by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology that is not under suspension or probation.*

CAMFT contended that the statute should remain written in a manner as clear as possible to avoid confusion and misinterpretation. It was suggested that in the alternative of using the word "California" that a reference be made to the BBS licensing statutes which require a supervisor to be licensed by the Board of Behavioral Science. No language was pinned down, but the Committee will recommend that the Board consider this recommendation.

Also, CAMFT suggested that regarding Section 4980.43.5 (C)(1)(2), that the Committee ensure that the distinction between the supervision ratios in private practice settings and MFT corporations remain clear.

Motion: To recommend that the Board continue working on the substantive aspects of this bill.
APPROVED.

III. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed Technical and Non Substantive Amendments to Business and Professions Code Sections 27, 337, 728, 865, 2290.5, 4999.30, 4999.14, 4999.22, 4999.48, 4999.100, 4980.78, 4980.79, 4999.62, 4999.63, 4992, 4996.17, 4999.60, 4980.37, 4980.39, 4980.41, 4999.32, and Family Code Section 6924

1. Amend BPC Section 27 – Disclosure of Information on Licensees and Registrants

Background: BPC §27 requires boards and bureaus under the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to disclose certain specified information. For most boards and bureaus that register pre-

licensees, the law states that information must be disclosed on licensees and registrants. However, registrants are not mentioned in this Board's subsection.

2. Amend BPC Sections 865, 2290.5, 4990.30, 4999.14, 4999.22, 4999.48, 4999.100, and Family Code Section 6924 – Changing “Intern” title to “Associate”

Background: Legislation was signed in 2016 to change the “intern” title to “associate” for LMFT and LPCC registrants effective January 1, 2018.

3. Amend BPC Sections 4980.37, 4980.39, 4980.41, and 4999.32 – Remove Expiration Date For Accepting Degrees Begun Prior to August 1, 2012 and Completed Before December 31, 2018

Background: Educational requirements for degrees begun after August 1, 2012 or completed after December 31, 2018, are specified in BPC sections 4980.36 and 4999.33 for LMFT and LPCC applicants, respectively (new education requirements). However, the educational requirements for older degrees, contained in BPC sections 4980.37, 4980.39, and 4980.41 (for LMFT applicants) and section 4999.32 (for LPCC applicants) are still specified in law, because applicants with these older degrees will continue to apply for licensure (often because they are coming here from out-of-state, but sometimes because they need a new registration number, or took a break for a while).

4. Amend BPC Sections 4980.72, 4996.17, and 4999.60 – Acceptance of Clinical Exam Score from an Out-of-State Applicant

Background: These code sections allow an applicant who obtained a license or registration in another jurisdiction to apply for licensure with the Board without taking the clinical exam if the applicant has already passed the clinical exam that is accepted by the Board, and if the out-of-state license or registration is active and in good standing.

The law currently allows the applicant to “apply for licensure” if the above conditions are met, but it would be more accurate to state that they may “qualify for licensure”.

5. Amend BPC Sections 4980.78, 4980.79, 4999.62, and 4999.63 – Reference to “Supervised” Practicum for Out-of-State Applicants

6. Amend BPC Section 4992 – Minor Technical Changes

Background: This section contains a date reference that is obsolete. Staff also believes some references to the examination need minor adjustments. Under the examination restructure, the California law and ethics exam is now taken during registration. However, it is possible that an out-of-state applicant may apply for licensure without having taken the law and ethics exam, if he or she does not need to register as an intern to gain experience hours. Minor amendments are needed to account for this scenario

Motion: To approve the technical and non-technical recommendations with no changes.
APPROVED.

IV. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Education Requirements to Obtain a Subsequent Registration Number, Business and Professions Code Sections 4984.01, 4996.28, 4999.45, and 4999.100

Overview Current licensing law requires associate marriage and family therapists, associate clinical social workers, and associate professional clinical counselors to renew their registration number each year. The registration may be renewed a maximum of five times (six years). Once they have five renewals, the individual needs to obtain a subsequent registration number if he or she has not yet completed his or her experience hours.

To obtain a subsequent registration number, the individual must do both of the following:

1. Pass the California law and ethics examination; and 2. Meet the educational requirements for registration that are currently in effect. Potential Problems Meeting Current Educational Requirements The law says that an individual must meet current educational requirements in order to obtain a subsequent registration number. This has not historically been a problem, because the Board's education requirements have not changed drastically for a long time. However, for LMFT and LPCC applicants who began graduate study after August 1, 2012, the education requirements changed significantly. Some of the major changes are as follows: • Units required in degree increased from 48 semester units to 60 semester units (LMFT and LPCC). • An increase in required number of core content areas from 9 to 13 (LPCC only). • An increase in the required amount face-to-face supervised clinical experience in practicum from 150 hours to 280 hours. (LPCC only).

This might not be an issue if the Board interprets or clarifies the law to include the education requirements for degrees begun prior to 2012 (BPC §§4980.37 and 4999.32, which allow 48-unit degrees, nine core content areas (for LPCC applicants), and the lower practicum amount.) However, even this interpretation could be problematic for some LPCC applicants with older degrees, as LPCC law now requires the "assessment" and "diagnosis" core content areas to be included within the degree program, with no exception. A second issue that exists is the situation where an individual applies for a second registration number many years after their first number expired. If the person has not practiced in several years, and the degree was obtained many years ago, there could be public protection concerns with having this applicant practice with no current education or experience. Possible Solutions: The Board's Policy and Advocacy Committee discussed this issue at its August 2017 meeting. At the meeting, it was suggested that if an applicant had not been registered for a specified number of years, perhaps the applicant should be required to take a specified amount of coursework to refresh their knowledge and learn about current topics in the profession. Staff was directed to examine what type of coursework might be appropriate.

Motion: To continue discussion and if appropriate direct Staff to make any discussed changes and any non-substantive changes and bring them to the Board for consideration as a legislative/regulatory proposal. APPROVED.

V. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Renewal of an Expired Registration Business and Professions Code Sections 4984.01, 4996.28, and 4999.100

Summary Current law specifies actions a registrant must take to renew a registration number before its expiration. However, the law is silent on the actions needed to renew a registration number once it has expired. This proposal would specify how an expired registration number is renewed.

Proposed Solution BPC sections 4984.01, 4996.28, and 4999.100 specify the process to renew a registration that has not expired, for MFT, ASW, and PCC registrants, respectively. To renew an unexpired registration, the registrant must fill out a renewal form, pay a renewal fee, participate in the California law and ethics exam each year (if not yet passed), and notify the Board of any convictions or disciplinary action taken by another licensing board.

Staff proposes that the law be amended to specify that the requirements to renew an expired registration be the same as those to renew an active registration as listed above.

Additional Amendments – BPC Section 4996.28(a)(4) and (c) BPC §4996.28(a)(4) has also been amended to correct an error. Current language states that to renew a registration, the registrant must obtain a passing score on the California law and ethics exam.

This is not the intent of the exam restructure. The law should state that to renew a registration, the registrant must participate in the California law and ethics examination each year until passed. Passage of the examination is only needed to obtain a subsequent registration number or a license. Therefore, this subsections (a)(4) and (c) of section 4996.28 have been revised accordingly. Language about renewal after six years has also been added to subsection (c) to be consistent with LMFT and LPCC law.

Motion: To direct Staff to make any discussed changes and any non-substantive changes and bring them to the Board for consideration as a legislative proposal. APPROVED.

VI. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Proposed Rulemaking to Add California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1805.06 – Rescoring of Examinations Taken Via Paper and Pencil; and to Delete Section 1816.3 – Examination Rescoring Fees

The purpose of this agenda item is to consider a possible regulation change pertaining to candidate requests for rescoring of an examination.

Existing Law Current statute authorizes the Board to charge candidates a \$20 fee for requesting an examination rescoring (per Business and Professions Code sections 4984.7(a)(5), 4989.68(a)(6), 4996.3(a)(5) and 4999.120(j)). The fee is also listed in regulation (Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 1816.3). However, neither statute nor regulation define “examination rescoring.”

Examination rescoring has its roots in the past when all exams were given manually, via paper and pencil. The purpose of an “examination rescoring” at that time was to hand-check for

errors in Scantron processing. Now that all Board exams are administered electronically, the examination results for every single candidate are automatically double-checked by the Board's testing vendor. Paying \$20 for a rescoring provides no benefit to a candidate who took the exam electronically. The Board does accept and respond to exam complaints filed by candidates, and if concerns are expressed about scoring, this would be investigated and addressed. No fee is required to file a complaint.

The Board currently offers the \$20 examination rescoring to candidates who took a Board developed exam via paper and pencil. Exams are only provided via paper and pencil to those candidates who have been granted such as a disability accommodation. The attached proposed language would codify this process. The proposed language would also strike the regulation section pertaining to the \$20 fee. This section is unnecessary as the fees are set in statute.

Motion: To direct Staff to make any discussed changes and any non-substantive changes and bring them to the Board for consideration as a legislative/regulatory proposal. APPROVED.

VII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Proposed Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1806 – Abandonment of Application

The purpose of this agenda item is to consider a possible regulation change pertaining to application abandonment criteria. "Abandonment" in this context describes the situation where an applicant has not taken required action on his or her pending application for at least a one-year period. At the one-year mark, the file is closed and the applicant must reapply and requalify if he or she wishes to pursue registration or licensure.

Existing Law Current regulations specify the circumstances under which a registration or licensure application is considered "abandoned" by the applicant, and describes, in general, the repercussions of abandonment. The following circumstances are considered "abandonment" per Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 1806:

- The applicant has not completed his or her application within one year after it has been filed (this includes all required documents and information required).
- The applicant has not submitted the information required to correct an application deficiency within one year from the date of the Board's deficiency notice to the applicant.
- An applicant for licensure fails to take or retake an examination within one year of any of the following:
 - o Fails to take an exam within one year after application approval;
 - o Fails to retake an exam within one year after notification of failing; or
 - o Fails to take the Clinical Exam within one year of passing the Law and Ethics Exam (this does not apply to registrants who have not yet applied for licensure).
- Fails to pay the initial license fee within one year after passing the Clinical Exam.

An individual who abandons his or her application must submit a new application, fees, and meet current requirements if he or she still wishes to pursue the application. Depending on how long the applicant takes to reapply, much of the documentation that remains on file may not have to be resubmitted. This is determined on a case by case basis. Proposed Changes The attached proposed language would do all of the following:

- Move text that appears in the last line of the regulation section toward the top in order to emphasize the repercussions of abandonment.
- Delete subdivision (a), which is outdated and unnecessary. Application completion is fully covered by paragraph (b) (now re-numbered as (a)), as all application completion problems are addressed in a deficiency letter.
- Collapse the paragraphs that refer to specific examinations into one statement that encompasses all of the circumstances, thereby improving readability and understanding.

Motion: To direct Staff to make any discussed changes and any non-substantive changes and bring them to the Board for consideration as a legislative/regulatory proposal. APPROVED.

VIII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Proposed Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1856 – Experience Equivalent to Three (3) Years Full-Time Experience as Credentialed School Psychologist

The purpose of this agenda item is to consider a possible regulatory change pertaining to the experience and documentation required to become a Licensed Educational Psychologist (LEP).

Existing Law LEP applicants are required to have a total of three (3) years of experience to qualify for licensure¹ as follows: Category A. Two (2) years of full-time (unsupervised) experience as a credentialed school psychologist². AND Category B. One (1) year of supervised experience in an accredited school psychology degree program; OR Category C. One (1) year of full-time experience as a credentialed school psychologist under the direction of an LEP or Licensed Psychologist² (implied supervision). LEP experience requirements differ significantly from the other professions regulated by the Board. For example, the two (2) years of experience listed in category “A” above must be gained while holding a credential as a school psychologist, and must take place in a school setting. This may be why LEP law does not require this portion of the experience to be supervised, and does not require registration with the Board. The same is true for the one additional year of experience listed in category “C” above.

The one year of supervised experience listed in category “B” above must take place in an accredited school psychology degree program, and IS required to be supervised. Although BBS law does not specify who must supervise, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Per Business and Professions Code section 4989.20 2 Part-time experience may be accumulated if obtained within six (6) years. It requires supervision by a credentialed school psychologist who has at least two (2) years of fulltime experience. At least 1,200 hours of supervised experience is required in order to complete the degree program, and a written plan for supervision is required. See Attachment C for further details on CTC degree accreditation requirements.

1. Improve Readability and Provide Clarification: Divide the regulation into three subdivisions (a, b and c), each of which would pertain to the three different experience categories outlined in BPC section 4989.20. This is necessary because each experience category is somewhat different, and clarification of certain aspects of each category’s requirements would be helpful

for applicants and staff. 2. Specify Required Documentation: Define the documentation that must be submitted to the Board to verify experience and coursework. 3. Specify Requirements for Individuals Overseeing Experience: Require an individual who “supervises” or “directs” the experience listed under categories B or C to meet all of the following: • Possess a current and valid license or credential that was not under suspension or probation during the time the applicant was gaining experience. • Has not provided therapeutic services to the applicant (category C only - credential holders do not provide therapy outside of a school setting). • Is not related to the applicant, and is not the spouse or domestic partner of the applicant. • Did not have a personal or business relationship with the applicant which undermined the licensee’s or credential holder’s authority or effectiveness. 4. Formalize and Define “School Year”: Define experience as being on a “school year” basis rather than “calendar year” as follows: • Section 41420 of the California Education Code requires a school year to consist of 175 days or more, which equals 35 weeks. Staff currently uses “8 months” as equivalent to a school year, but this does not have a basis in the Education Code. • Staff currently assumes that “full-time” is equal to 32 or more hours per week. • Based on the above assumptions, the experience gained full-time during one school year would equal at least 1,120 hours (35 weeks x 32 hours per week=1,120 hours). 5. Define “Full-time” and “Part-time” Equivalency: Define “full-time” experience (weekly number to be determined by the Committee) and define “equivalent part-time” experience. The following may help inform the Committee’s discussion/determination: • LMFT, LCSW and LPCC licensure require 3,000 hours of experience gained over a minimum of 104 weeks, which would average out to 29 hours per week if completed in 104 weeks. • LEP experience is currently evaluated on a “school-year” basis (one year = 175 school days = 35 weeks) as follows: o “Full-time” is currently considered to be 32 hours per week, which equals 1,120 hours per year, and a total of 3,360 hours of experience over the entire three (3) years required. o “Equivalent part-time” experience is currently determined by prorating hours worked on a weekly basis against a standard “full-time” week. For example, if an applicant works 16 hours per week for 35 weeks, 16 part-time hours would be divided by 32 full-time hours to obtain a percentage (16/32=.50). The number of weeks worked is then multiplied by the percentage to obtain the credited amount of experience (35 weeks x .50=17.5 weeks).

- The following definitions of “full-time” may be helpful in making the determination: o Dental Board - 40 hours per week (16 CCR § 1042). o Speech-Language Pathology Board - 30 hours per week (BPC § 2532.2(c)). o IRS (for purposes of the ACA) - 30 hours per week, or 130 hours per month. o California Labor Code - 40 hours per week (§ 515(c)).

Motion: None required.

IX. Discussion and Possible Recommendation on Proposed Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, CCR Section 1816.1 - Add Fee for Subsequent Professional Clinical Counselor Intern Registrations

The first Professional Clinical Counselor Intern (PCCI) registrations were issued in January 2011. These registrations will soon be reaching their maximum allowable time span. Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 4999.45 limits an intern registration to five renewals (for a total

of 6 years), but also allows for the ability to obtain a subsequent registration, which also has a maximum of six years. When staff was developing the application for subsequent registration, we found that the law which sets the intern application fee was in need of clarification.

LPCC statute sets the maximum “intern application” fee at \$150 (4999.120(b)), and regulations specify the actual fee of (\$100) for a PCCI “initial application” (Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1816.1(e)).

The proposed regulatory change would clarify that this fee is for both initial and subsequent intern registration applications.

Motion: To direct staff to make any clarifications to the language as recommended and bring to the Board or consideration as a regulatory proposal. APPROVED.

X. Status on Board-Sponsored Legislation, Board-Supported Legislation, and Board Monitored Legislation

a. Assembly Bill 93 (Medina) - Healing Arts: Marriage and Family Therapists, Clinical Social Workers, Professional Clinical Counselors: Required Experience and Supervision

b. Senate Bill 800 - Proposed Technical and Non-Substantive Amendments to Business and Professions Code Sections 801, 801.1, 802, 4980.09, 4999.12.5, 4980.44, 4984.7, 4999.32, 4999.42, 4999.53, 4999.62, 4999.63, 4999.120, 4984.4, 4984.7, 4996.3, 4996.6, 4999.32, 4999.33, 4999.60, 4999.61, 4984.9, 4992.8, 4989.46, 4999.18, 4980.72, 4996.17, 4999.53; Evidence Code Section 1010(f)(o); and Penal Code Section 11165.7(a)(25) and (a)(40)
Signed by Governor. Effective 1/1/18

c. Assembly Bill 191 (Wood) - Mental Health: Involuntary Treatment

d. Assembly Bill 456 (Thurman) – Healing Arts: Associate Clinical Social Workers

e. Assembly Bill 508 (Santiago) – Health Care Practitioners: Student Loans

f. Assembly Bill 1116 (Grayson) – Peer Support and Crisis Referral Services Act

g. Assembly Bill 1188 (Nazarian) – Health Professions Development: Loan Repayment. Signed by Governor. Effective 7/1/18

h. Assembly Bill 1372 (Levine) – Health Professions Development: Loan Repayment

i. Assembly Bill 1591 (Berman) – Medi-Cal: Federally Qualified Health Centers and Rural Health Center: Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors. Vetoed by Governor.

j. Senate Bill 27 (Morrell) – Professions and Vocations: Licensees: Military Service

k. Senate Bill 355 (Lara) – Privacy: Agencies: Personal Information

l. Senate Bill 374 (Newman) – Health Insurance: Discriminatory Practices: Mental Health

m. Assembly Bill 89 (Levine) – Psychologists: Suicide Prevention Training. Signed by Governor.

n. Assembly Bill 700 (Jones-Sawyer) – Public Health: Alcoholism or Drug Abuse Recovery: Substance Use Disorder Counseling

o. Assembly Bill 767 (Quirk-Silva) – Master Business License Act

p. Senate Bill 715 (Newman) – Department of Consumer Affairs: Regulatory Boards: Removal of Board Members

q. Senate Bill 762 (Hernandez) – Healing Arts License: License Activation Fee Waiver

XI. Status of Board Rulemaking Proposals a. Enforcement: Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 1823, 1845, 1858, 1881, 1886.40, 1888 and Uniform Standards Related to Substance Abuse and Disciplinary Guidelines b. Application Processing Times and Registrant Advertising: Amend Title 16. California Code of Regulations, Sections 1805.1 and 1811 c. Contact Information; Application Requirements; Incapacitated Supervisors: Amend Title 16. California Code of Regulations, Sections 1804, 1805 and 1820.7; Add Section 1815.8

XIV. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items: No suggestions were made.

XV. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: No suggestions were made.

XVI. Adjournment