



## *Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board*

---

50 West Broad Street, Suite 1075  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5919  
614-466-0912 & Fax 614-728-7790  
[www.cswmft.ohio.gov](http://www.cswmft.ohio.gov)

### **Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes** **Thursday, January 15, 2014**

**Members Present:** Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Erin Michel, Mr. Steve Polovick

**Staff Present:** Mr. Bill Hegarty, Ms. Tracey Hosom, Mr. Andy Miller, Ms. Patty Miller, Mr. Jim Rough, Ms. Tamara Tingle, and Mr. Doug Warne

**Guests Present:** Ms. Teresa Lampl, Ohio Council of Behavioral Health & Family Services Providers Associate Director; Ms. Katie Nicholas, student; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director; and Mr. Sean Young, student.

#### 1) **Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

#### 2) **Discussion/Approval of the January 15 & 16 Agenda**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed to the January 15 & 16 Agenda, then asked to add two items to New Business: 1) bereavement photography, and 2) the CSWMFT Board's spring retreat. Mr. Brady motioned to approve the agenda. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### 3) **Approval of the November 21 & 22 Minutes**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the November 21 & 22 minutes. Mr. Miller stated that at the November meeting, Mr. Polovick had asked for an opinion from the AAG on whether social workers are able to conduct IQ testing, but this opinion had already been solicited some time ago, and social workers can perform this testing if they have the appropriate training. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### 4) **Approval of Applications for Licensure**

The SWPSC reviewed the 137 LSW applicants and 110 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 3 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from November 20, 2013 through

January 15, 2014. Mr. Brady asked if these numbers were on pace with last year. Mr. Miller confirmed that the Board's number of social work applicants actually increases each year, and has been for some time. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the applicants. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## 5) New Business

- a) Mr. Polovick had recently reviewed information on a CEU program regarding bereavement photography, photographing funerals as a way of helping clients move through grief. Several social work licensees attended and gave feedback to the CEU provider, which the provider passed along to us. The licensees found it very useful, and all evaluations were positive. The consensus was that this was indeed a useful and appropriate topic for social work education.
- b) For the CSWMFT Board spring retreat, the Board has put together a survey to send to supervisors, faculty, and students, with questions on topics such as strengths of graduates, topics that graduates struggle with, etc. Each Board member will be asked to locate and identify individuals to take the survey, and ask them to provide data.

## 6) Investigations

### a) Closed cases

Mr. Polovick made a motion to close the following case, as he had determined that no actionable offenses had been found. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2013-227      Competency. Close with strong caution

Mr. Brady made a motion to close the following cases, as he had determined that no actionable offenses had been found. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2013-194      Non-sexual boundaries. Close with no violation.  
2013-216      Record keeping. Close with caution.  
2013-203      Competency. Close with caution.  
2013-230      Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.  
2013-235      Confidentiality. Close as unsubstantiated.  
2013-240      Sexual boundary with client family member. Close as unsubstantiated.  
2013-243      Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.  
2013-245      Competency. Close with caution.  
2013-261      Misrepresentation of credentials. Close with no violation.  
2013-268      Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.  
2013-277      Competency. Close with no jurisdiction.

### b) Goldman Reviews

- a) **Mr. Brian M. Davis:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Mr. Davis's social work license

because Mr. Davis did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- b) **Ms. Jane A. Cox:** Ms. Michel moved to revoke Ms. Cox's social work license because Ms. Cox did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- c) **Ms. Diane A. Merriweather:** Mr. Brady moved to revoke Ms. Merriweather's social work license because Ms. Merriweather did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- d) **Ms. Catherine I. Van Riper:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Ms. Van Riper's social work license because Ms. Van Riper did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) **Consent Agreements**

- a) **Mr. Craig R. Campbell:** Mr. Campbell is a licensed independent social worker. On August 6, 2013, the Board received a complaint alleging that Mr. Campbell may be impaired. On November 22, 2013, the Board ordered Mr. Campbell to obtain an impairment evaluation, to determine whether his alleged substance abuse or mental health impairment may constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-05. Mr. Campbell admits to these statements. The Board will allow Mr. Campbell to surrender his social work license in lieu of other potential disciplinary action. Should he reapply for licensure in the future, he will be required to obtain the previously ordered assessment. Mr. Polovick made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Campbell based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- b) **Mr. George R. Kennedy:** Mr. Kennedy is a licensed social worker. While employed with Afrocentric Personal Development Shop in Columbus Ohio from August through December, 2012, Mr. Kennedy is accused of having sexually harassed two female colleagues and one female client, and terminated from his position. If true, Mr. Kennedy's actions constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1), and OAC 4757-5-02(F). Upon achieving new employment, or at his current workplace, Mr. Kennedy is required to receive two years of monitoring in all aspects of his practice from a Board-approved monitor. Mr. Brady motioned to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Kennedy based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) **Mr. John A Keister:** Mr. Keister is a licensed social worker. In June 2013, he was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. Mr. Keister was unable to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed her license. Failure to comply with an audit constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Keister admits these allegations. Mr. Keister's license to practice social work is indefinitely suspended, until he is able to complete the continuing education hours. Ms. Michel made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Keister based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**d) Notice of opportunity for hearing**

**Mr. Robert Carson:** Mr. Carson is a licensed social worker. Beginning in October 2013, he entered into a sexual relationship with a current client of his agency, where he was employed in a supervisory capacity. Ms. Michel motioned to issue a notice of opportunity for hearing to Robert Carson, based on the information provided in the document. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**e) Executive session**

Mr. Polovick motioned to go into executive session to discuss Investigations matters. The SWPSC began a roll call vote: Mr. Polovick—aye. Mr. Brady—aye. Ms. Michel—aye. The committee moved into executive session at 9:41. Mr. Polovick motioned to end executive session at 9:49.

Mr. Brady motioned to accept the consent agreement between the Board and a licensee on case #2013-15, an agreement which orders the licensee into a diversion program. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**7) New Business**

Ms. Michel had recently spoken with a chapter services representative from NASW national on how to improve communication between the Board and NASW. She was referred to Stephanie, who processes CEU approval, and Ms. Michel planned to talk to Stephanie about opening lines of communication. Email has not been conducive to building the relationship, so Ms. Michel planned to speak with her in person, and get an idea how she would like to communicate with the Board in the future. Mr. Polovick also suggested delivering a list of demands. Ms. Smith raised the issue that National always refers to NASW-OH when there's a question and that they are not accustomed to talking with state boards directly. They need to realize that it is okay to deal directly with the Board. Ms. Miller alleged that NASW's conduct had been unprofessional so far. Mr. Polovick asked to put this issue on the agenda for March; success would be Ms. Miller getting all information she needs in a timely fashion.

**8) Correspondence**

a) **4757-19-04 rule change:** Mr. Miller explained the current exam structure in Ohio, and

presented several emails received from licensees in opposition to the rule change (which would require applicants to complete 18 months of supervision prior to taking the clinical or advanced generalist exams). He discussed current pass rates, which are slightly lower in Ohio than is the national average for these two exams, and the inference is that it's because students can take it. Mr. Brady stated that this would increase public protection by improving the supervision process, and the exam is wrong for graduates to take according to the ASWB, but this could also look like the State of Ohio helping the ASWB get more money. Ms. Michel stated that the validity of the exam must be protected, but now that applicants do have the choice to take the exam early, it's hard to take that choice away. She asked for data dividing recent graduates' pass rates from the pass rates of exam candidates who waited at least 18-24 months to take them.

- b) The Board and NASW received an email from a licensee asking why social workers are not able to bill Medicaid. Ms. Smith verified that social workers can bill Medicaid, but only under the provider number of a physician or psychologist. ODJFS is looking into having state rules changed to allow social workers to bill directly. With Medicaid expansion, more providers are needed who can bill.
- c) Mr. Warne received an email from a licensee whose agency was being provided fact sheets on medication uses and dosage of psychotropic medications, so that a social worker might be able to refer a client back to their doctor if their medication appears to be inappropriate for their needs. Mr. Rough clarified that this is within a social worker's scope of practice, but significant training would be required. Ms. Smith stated that medication knowledge base needs to be highlighted more vigorously in schools.
- d) The Board received a second letter from a licensee asking to reconsider their decision not to remove her disciplinary record from the CSWMFT website. Mr. Polovick stated that the Board has never removed a record before. He felt bad for her situation personally, but discipline needs to stay on the website for public protection and as a deterrent to others. He asked that Mr. Hegarty respond back to her, and include the language from her consent agreement stating that discipline is a public record. Ms. Smith stated that NASW would talk to her about how to disclose her discipline in cover letters and interviews.

## 9) Working Meeting

The SWPSC began its working meeting to review pending applications for licensure, files to be audited, CEU Programs & Providers, Related Degree course worksheets, and Licensure Renewal Issues. The SWPSC adjourned for lunch at 12:00, and resumed at 1:00.

## 10) Rule Comments

The Board met with Teresa Lampl from the Ohio Council of Behavioral Health & Family Services Providers, a statewide organization representing mental health providers, regarding the proposed rule change to 4757-19-04. Ms. Lampl stated that from a workforce perspective, she saw this as a barrier to people seeking LISW licensure. Training supervision

is how someone learns about practice, not the exam, and though other states do it differently, maybe Ohio is already doing it better. She stated that the clinical and advanced generalist exams are not actually practice-based, and really deal more with the background knowledge and skills needed FOR practice. Mr. Rough stated that the Board was seeking to validate this, by having social workers complete questions from the ASWB practice test to see if the test reflects their practice knowledge, and also compare pass rates for students versus licensed professionals. According to the ASWB, applicants will do better on the test if they wait, but Ms. Lampl argued that pass rates would actually drop, that there are differences between what people are taught to do in practice and the foundational practice concepts examined in the test. Mr. Polovick stated that he had attended ASWB trainings on how the test is written, and it's difficult but they do try to address this discrepancy. Ms. Lampl stated that in her work, she can ask graduates who took the Bachelor's exam why they didn't feel they were ready for a more difficult test, and this gives her more decision ability when hiring someone. It seemed wrong to her to only evaluate an MSW graduate at the Bachelor competency level. Mr. Brady asked how she would respond to the idea that an MSW who has passed an advanced exam and is working through training supervision is just biding their time and not working hard to learn the practice. Ms. Lampl responded that supervisors have an ethical responsibility to ensure that their supervisees are ready to practice, and altering test structure won't change that. Mr. Polovick asked if anyone saw this rule as a fund-raising scheme for the ASWB; Ms. Lampl responded that she did not. Her main concern was that no one could pass the exam after practicing for two years. Mr. Polovick stated that CEUs and practice itself helps keep practice procedures in the licensee's mind; Ms. Lampl replied that the test is a broad array of knowledge which one person's experience could not prepare them for. She said that licensees will inevitably forget specific policy content issues over time. Mr. Young agreed that he would be more likely to remember things right out of school. Mr. Brady said that this perspective would be tantamount to telling the ASWB that they're doing a poor job of writing the exam; is that a legitimate argument? Mr. Rough replied that he would like to review other states' pass rates and see how they compare when required to wait. It also needs to be verified that the test is based on solid practice analysis, like the Counselors' exam. Ms. Michel stated that she wanted to hold social workers to a high standard; licensees SHOULD have to prepare for the test, they shouldn't be able to simply pass it from practice experience. Ms. Lampl replied that with regard to quality criteria, government boards do not set quality standards, they set MINIMUM standards for licensees, and that clients' access to care can be badly affected if those standards are set too high. Mr. Brady asked if workforce capacity wasn't already adversely affected by students who were encouraged to take a more difficult exam that they were then unable to pass. Ms. Lampl replied that people should have a choice, that they know their own competencies and should be trusted. Mr. Warne summed up that the main issue is whether the test really is practice-based, and if this is determined then the right course will be obvious.

## **11) CEU Committee**

Ms. Michel discussed that staff have been pursuing the idea of promoting the use of CEBroker for licensees. Providers could register with the system, and users would have their CEUs automatically tracked, improving the audit process and overall compliance. The system is free, though licensees can pay extra for an enhanced account. The committee also

discussed hand-written CEU certificates, and decided not to make a rule change since there has been no evidence of licensees using fraudulent certificates. They discussed new requirements for CEU quality control, which would require in-text citations for text-based CEUs. They discussed what to do with agencies who continue to approve CEUs but have no licensed individual signing off on them. The proposed solution is to suspend their Provider status for one year, and require them to submit programs individually.

## **12) Meeting adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

### **Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes** **Friday, January 16, 2014**

**Members Present:** Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Erin Michel, Mr. Steve Polovick

**Staff Present:** Mr. William Hegarty, Mr. Andy Miller, Ms. Patty Miller, Mr. Jim Rough, and Mr. Doug Warne

**Guests Present:** Ms. Bobbie Boyer, Institute for Human Services; Mr. Glenn Karr, Esq.; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director; and Mr. Sean Young, student.

## **1) Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

## **2) Old Business**

- a) Following up on a licensee who had asked about MMPI testing from the November meeting, Mr. Warne presented OAC 4757-5-06, which allows social workers to perform testing/evaluations, as long as they are familiar with testing techniques prior to performing them, and are adequately trained. Mr. Karr stated that in his opinion, testing gives social workers an edge when they're making a diagnosis, and he stresses this in all his trainings. Mr. Brady asked how far this extended, whether social workers could check blood pressure or insulin levels. Mr. Rough stated that this only applied to testing procedures within a social work scope of practice, not medical testing. Ms. Michel asked if screening tools were covered under this rule, and Mr. Rough replied that they are. Mr. Karr stated that psychologists have unlicensed aides administer the tests, but only the licensees can interpret the test results. Ms. Michel asked how a licensee could differentiate between a screening tool and an assessment, and Mr. Karr replied that the

publisher of the screening tool will make that determination, and it would be stated clearly in their contract with the licensee once use of the tool is requested.

- b) Mr. Warne had been working with a Training Supervision Discussion group on LinkedIn, and based on their responses he discussed a rule change to 4757-23-01 to provide elaboration on the role of the training supervisor. The language for the rule change was taken from a pamphlet on Best Practice in Social Work Supervision that the ASWB and NASW published jointly in 2013:

4757-23-01 Social work supervision.

This rule applies to all social work assistants; to all social workers employed in a private practice, partnership, or group practice; to all social workers engaged in social psychotherapy; and to all social workers seeking licensure as independent social workers.

**(A) Definitions of social work supervision:**

(1) "Clinical supervision" of social workers performing social psychotherapy and social workers employed in a private practice, partnership, or group practice means the quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the supervisee's performance; professional guidance to the supervisee; approval of the supervisee's intervention plans and their implementation; the assumption of responsibility for the welfare of the supervisee's clients; and assurance that the supervisee functions within the limits of their license. The assessment, diagnosis, treatment plan, revisions to the treatment plan and transfer or termination shall be cosigned by the supervisor and shall be available to the board upon request.

(2) "Training supervision" means supervision for the purposes of obtaining a license and/or development of new areas of proficiency while providing services to clients. The training supervisor is responsible for providing direction to the supervisee, who applies social work theory, standardized knowledge, skills, competency, and applicable ethical content in the practice setting. The supervisor and the supervisee both share responsibility for carrying out their role in this collaborative process of professional growth and development. Training supervision may be individual supervision or group supervision.

Mr. Polovick motioned to approve the rule change. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- c) Mr. Warne discussed a rule change to OAC 4757-21-03, clarifying who can supervise the SWT, and the rule of the LISW-S as opposed to the LISW. A rule change had been approved in November, but further changes were needed for clarification based on feedback from the LinkedIn Training Supervision Discussion Group:

**4757-21-03 Scope of practice for an independent social worker**

(B) The scope of practice for an independent social worker may include those duties as described in the subparagraphs that follow.

(1) Psychosocial assessment: intervention planning, psychosocial ~~psychosocial~~ intervention, and social psychotherapy, which includes the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders and counseling.



(2) Program assessment, planning, and development, program implementation and evaluation.

(3) Organizational assessment, planning and development, intervention, accountability, and supervision.

(4) Specialized problem-oriented assessment, specialized project or case-oriented planning, specialized intervention, evaluation of consultation activities, provide training supervision for social workers seeking licensure as independent social workers.

(5) Provide work and/or clinical supervision of ~~registered social worker trainees unless they are diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders~~, social worker assistants, social workers except for their training supervision, professional counselors, and marriage and family therapists; and supervision of chemical dependency counselors and prevention specialists and as specified in Chapter 4758. of the Revised Code. Provide work supervision for social worker trainees, which does not include the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders.

(C) The scope of practice for an independent social worker with supervision designation may include those duties as described as follows:

(1) Psychosocial assessment: intervention planning, psychosocial ~~psychosocial~~ intervention, and social psychotherapy, which includes the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders and counseling.

(2) Program assessment, planning, and development, program implementation and evaluation.

(3) Organizational assessment, planning and development, intervention, accountability, and supervision.

(4) Specialized problem-oriented assessment, specialized project or case-oriented planning, specialized intervention, evaluation of consultation activities, provide training supervision for social workers seeking licensure as independent social workers.

(5) Provide work and/or clinical and/or training supervision of ~~registered social worker trainees~~, social worker assistants, social workers, professional counselors, and marriage and family therapists; and supervision of chemical dependency counselors and prevention specialists as specified in chapter 4758. of the Revised Code. Provide training supervision for social workers gaining supervised hours to meet the requirements of paragraph (C)(2) of rule 4757-19-02 of the Administrative Code to become licensed as independent social workers per rule 4757-23-01 of the Administrative Code. Provide training and work supervision for social worker trainees, which includes the diagnosis and treatment of mental and emotional disorders.

Mr. Karr asked about the purpose of the SWT; if the purpose of the registration is for billing, who allows SWTs to actually bill? He was not familiar with anyone. Mr. Hegarty suggested that the CSWMFT Board could be out of date, at the time the SWT was created they were able to bill, but possibly no longer can. Mr. Polovick stated that some people may bill under their supervisor's name, which is illegal. Mr. Brady asked if this rule change put social workers in line with professional counselors; Mr. Miller replied that it did. Mr. Polovick motioned to approve the rule change. Mr. Brady seconded. Motion carried.

- d) Mr. Miller discussed proposed rule changes to 4757-19-01 and 4757-19-02. The rule change to 4757-19-01 had already been approved by the SWPSC in November. The proposed rule change to 4757-19-02 had been augmented since then and required approval:

4757-19-02 Requirements for licensure as an independent social worker.

The requirements for licensure as a licensed independent social worker are generally set forth in division (A) of section 4757.27 of the Revised Code. With regard to such applicants, the social work professional standards committee hereby prescribes:

(A) That the applicant shall apply for a license in accordance with the provisions of rule 4757-01-04 of the Administrative Code; and,

(B) The applicant shall include with the application the required fee per paragraph (D) of rule 4757-1-05 of the Administrative Code.

(C) That the applicant have:

(1) A master's degree in social work, or a doctoral degree in social work; and,

(2) Two years of supervised social work experience: defined as follows:

(a) "Two years employment experience" means at least two complete years supervised experience which includes three thousand hours of work for a fee, salary or other consideration, during which time the applicant was engaged in the practice of social work and held licensure as a social worker; except that no applicant may be credited with more than fifteen hundred hours of experience during any twelve-month period;

(b) Any supervised experience obtained after October 10, 1986, in the state of Ohio must be supervised by an independent social worker.

(c) The dates that the supervised experience was obtained, not the date of application, will determine the type of acceptable experience required for an applicant to be licensed as a licensed independent social worker. Applicants re-applying for licensure, after having been unlicensed for ten years or more, shall be required to have their supervised work experience re-evaluated by the Board before it can be accepted.

(3) That the applicant pass the examination meeting the requirements established by the social work professional standards committee to determine the applicant's ability to be an independent social worker. Applicants shall be pre-approved to take the examination per rule 4757-19-04 of the Administrative Code.

(4) Applicants shall have passed the required examination within seven years of application date, unless they are currently licensed in an equivalent capacity in another state and passed the prescribed examination as part of the licensure requirements in that state.

Mr. Brady motioned to approve the rule change. Mr. Polovick seconded. Motion carried.

- e) The SWPSC reviewed a proposed rule change to OAC 4757-19-08, related to the rule change for 4757-19-02:

**4757-19-08 Approval of applications for social worker licenses and registration.**

Applications for social worker licenses and registration shall be approved per section

4757.16 of the Revised Code and this rule. The staff of the Board shall review all applications and process as follows:

(A) Applications that meet the basic requirements as detailed below shall be approved upon receipt of all applicable parts. Ten percent of applications approved by staff shall be reviewed by the social worker professional standards committee at the following meeting for quality control purposes.

(1) Applications for independent social worker license that meet the basic requirements for licensure in section 4757.27 of the Revised Code and rule 4757-19-02 of the Administrative Code shall be approved if the following conditions are met:

(a) Process application for independent social worker received with no questions requiring review by the board such as felony convictions, loss of license in another state, etc.

(b) Transcript provided directly from an accredited educational institution of a master's or doctoral degree in social work.

(c) Proof of completion of at least two years of post-master's degree social work experience supervised by an independent social worker. Applicants re-applying for licensure, after having been unlicensed for ten years or more, shall be required to have their supervised work experience re-evaluated by the Board before it can be accepted.

(d) Proof of passing an examination administered by the board for the purpose of determining ability to practice as an independent social worker.

Mr. Brady motioned to approve the rule change. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

### 3) New Business

- a) Mr. Warne conducted a survey of LISW-S licensees to ask them a few questions about supervision, specifically pertaining to the idea of a written contract between supervisors and their supervisees. He and Mr. Rough also requested information from ASWB about other states that require a supervision performance evaluation, and received responses. From the LISW-S survey, he found that in general, licensees were supportive of the idea of a contract, but don't want the Board to regulate it. They want more guidance on the supervision process overall from the Board, and would like an evaluation rubric attached to the PER form, but have mixed feelings about the Board requiring a specific CEU. He received 300-400 comments in the survey, and Stacey Simera, one of the members of the LinkedIn Training Supervision Discussion Group, went through them and wrote up a summary. Licensees generally believe that if the Board required a written contract, this would create a backlog and add a barrier to licensees' ability to begin the supervision process. Mr. Brady asked why a contract was being considered. Mr. Rough stated that it ensures that the LISW-S and their supervisee have a formal agreement of their expectations with each other. Mr. Polovick added that some supervisors don't endorse their supervisees at the end of the process, and this would help with that. Supervision logs are currently intended to address this issue, but may not be. Mr. Warne stated that the content of logs do sometimes reflect deficiencies, which the supervisees weren't attempting to hide. Ms. Michel asked if CEBroker could be used to track supervision.

Mr. Rough believed it was possible, and Mr. Warne added that software exists for students to track their supervision with their school, but that software costs money. Ms. Michel expressed concern that while a written agreement is positive, a formal contract implies legal consequences. If a private contract between two social workers is violated or broken, lawyers may need to get involved, and supervisees could use it as a legitimate reason to file complaints against their supervisors. Mr. Rough had received information from Cindy Webb on what she would include in a supervision contract. According to Ms. Smith, it articulates the function of supervision and how it ought to proceed. Many NASW members have expressed a desire for more information at the front end of the process. If the State won't require a contract, the NASW supervision contract should be suggested as a guideline. If nothing else, an overview of the process should clear up confusion. Ms. Boyer agreed that social workers seem to want guidance, not requirements. Mr. Brady asked if schools provide students information on the supervision process, which should be covered in a field seminar course. Mr. Young, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Michel all agreed that schools do not. Mr. Miller stated that some schools do offer a field seminar along with the internship course, but not all do.

- b) Mr. Warne presented an addendum to the PER form designed by himself and Mr. Rough, which includes a final evaluation rubric for the supervisor to complete, based on the CSWE's MSW-level competencies. He asked if this would help provide direction on supervision. Mr. Brady asked what the Board would do if an evaluation came back with all mediocre scores; Mr. Warne replied that this would still demonstrate the supervisee as competent, albeit marginally, and they could be licensed. Ms. Michel suggested changing the phrase "Advanced Beginner" to "Developing," which is a clearer phrase. She also suggested reducing the number of checkboxes overall, asking the supervisor to only rate the core competencies and listing the subcategories on an instruction page by way of explanation. Mr. Rough stated that, if the committee was interested in moving forward with this, then the form should be sent out as a link in a Listserv email, and comments gathered. The SWPSC agreed to this.

#### **4) NASW Report**

Ms. Smith reported on the continued push to get HB232 passed. NASW members are calling in support to have it moved out of committee. The Legislature will likely take an early recess, starting April 15, which still gives time to have the bill pushed through. The NASW-OH will put on a specialty conference in Cincinnati in the spring, possibly on the topic of science in social work. Advocacy Day will be March 20<sup>th</sup>, and will focus on anti-poverty efforts. The State of Social Work panel at the Annual Conference was very well received. There's also an effort to get representatives from Ohio social work schools to attend Board meetings. The NASW-OH may begin writing up practice and research briefs for the Board on practice and policy issues. Mr. Rough suggested that a reference guide to a variety of topics would be more helpful overall, and that it would also help to have NASW committee members or employees become knowledgeable about different areas of social work practice. Mr. Polovick asked how Ms. Smith felt about the proposed change to have applicants wait to take the Clinical and Advanced Generalist exams. Ms. Smith stated that she had taken no formal stance on that issue. One argument against the idea that the test is practice based is

that agency rules and state laws inform practice in every locale, and the test would cover more generic concepts. Mr. Warne asked if the SWPSC was still planning to attend Advocacy Day. The committee expressed interest. Ms. Smith stated that the morning is spent in training on how to perform advocacy, and the afternoon is spent talking to legislators; Mr. Rough stated that the afternoon would be more important and useful, and clarified that Board members must be speaking as private citizens and not as Board members. Only he is authorized to speak for the Board publicly.

#### 5) **Executive Director's report.**

Mr. Rough gave more detail on the Board's next outreach program, the survey being administered to students, supervisors, and faculty. The logistics were discussed. The Five Year Rule Review will be on the March agenda. The ACA code of ethics revision has been put out for review, and is of interest since it contains information on the supervisory relationship.

#### 6) **New Business**

- a) Mr. Rough presented information on other states and their supervision processes. He asked if the SWPSC would be interested in changing rules to allow licensees from other disciplines to provide training supervision to social workers. According to an ASWB survey, about half of states will accept such supervision under endorsement if it's allowed by the state where the applicants completed the supervision. The SWPSC agreed that if a licensee is working in a particular specialty area and submits a hardship request, that request is more likely to be granted, but they were not initially receptive to the idea of an overall rule change.
- b) Ms. Michel reported on her telephone conversation with Stephanie Chambers from NASW National. Ms. Chambers had stated that her staff had been disrespected by communications from the Board, and had since been instructed to only communicate through the NASW-OH chapter as an intermediary. Ms. Michel responded that nothing could be done about the past, and that she would work to improve the relationship going forward. Ms. Chambers promised to send her full thoughts on the matter in writing. She also stated that she is not frequently in the office, and all emails to her should include a CC to the general CEU office for acknowledgement of receipt. Mr. Polovick replied that this was a step, but quality of continuing education is a major responsibility of the CSWMFT board, and this situation needs to be firmly resolved. Ms. Michel reiterated that the past can't be fixed, but that a solution going forward could be found, and she intends to work toward one.

#### 7) **Investigations**

**Consent Agreement for Aimee M. Loree:** Ms. Loree is a licensed social worker. From May 2002 to April 25, 2013, she was employed at Neil Kennedy Recovery Clinic in Youngstown OH, where she failed to maintain appropriate boundaries by entering into a sexual relationship with a current client of the agency. This inappropriate conduct constitutes

a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-04(A) and (B). Ms. Loree admits to this allegation. Ms. Loree's license is hereby suspended for three years beginning January 17, 2014. It is her responsibility to renew her license when appropriate if she intends to return to practice. She must receive personal counseling from a Board-approved practitioner for one year during the suspension, and at the end of the suspension and upon return to practice, must be monitored in all aspects of her practice by a Board-approved monitor for two years. Ms. Michel made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Loree based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**8) Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

---

Mr. Steve Polovick, Chairperson

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### January 2014 meeting

1. Get data on exam pass rates for recent graduates vs. licensees who have field experience, and pass rates for other states (Correspondence).
2. Update PER form/rubric and send out for feedback (New Business).

### Tabled for now

3. Discussion of LCSW
4. Discuss counseling definition in May 2014