



## *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, May 15, 2014**

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

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

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

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:26 a.m. Mr. Rough announced his impending retirement, and discussed the process for hiring a new director. Board members were invited to join the hiring committee.

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

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed to the Agenda. Mr. Warne asked to add the issue of CEU approval for NASW National to the agenda for the 16th during the regular NASW agenda time. Mr. Polovick informed the Committee that Ms. Miller had requested a few minutes to discuss first, and added this discussion to the agenda for the 15<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Michel motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

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

The SWPSC reviewed the 156 LSW applicants and 59 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 9 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from March 19, 2014 through May 14, 2014. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the applicants. Dr. Brun seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **4) Approval of the March 20 & 21 Minutes**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the March 20 & 21 minutes. Dr. Brun pointed out that in the correspondence section, he was quoted as saying that students typically “do worse” when re-taking an exam. He asked to clarify that he only

meant they tend to fail on their second attempts, he has no way of knowing if their score is actually lower. On another correspondence item, Mr. Brady asked if the word “bitcoin” should be capitalized. Mr. Miller confirmed that it should not. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Dr. Brun seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**5) New Business**

Ms. Miller had recently received a list of courses from Stephanie Chambers with NASW national, and identified several courses which she had seen before and asked NASW to not offer to Ohio social workers, as they did not meet Board standards for content. Ms. Chambers responded that NASW does not advertise state-specific approval for courses; the courses are approved by NASW standards, and if they’re not accepted by Ohio then it’s up to Ohio to notify licenses. Ms. Miller opined that this left the Board with only two options, to either allow NASW free rein, or to stop accepting their approval. Mr. Polovick stated that since public protection is a primary concern, and since ensuring CEU quality is a method of protecting the public, then the Board ought to revoke their automatic acceptance of courses approved by NASW National. It was decided to maintain acceptance of courses approved by NASW Ohio. Mr. Rough stated that this would require a new draft of rule 4757-9-05, which will need to be moved through the process in a way that appropriately accommodates public comment. Ms. Miller agreed that clear timelines needed to be communicated to licensees, so they would be able to prepare. She suggested making the rule effective at a later date to allow for a grace period.

**6) Investigations**

**a) Closed cases**

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

- 2014-8            Competency. Close with no violation.
- 2014-30        Record keeping. Close with strong caution.
- 2014-44        Unlicensed practice. Close with a caution.
- 2014-64        Non-sexual boundaries. Case unsubstantiated.
- 2014-65        Scope of practice. Close with caution.
- 2014-66        Confidentiality. Case unsubstantiated.
- 2014-70        Misrepresentation of credentials. Close with caution.

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

- 2014-36        Non-sexual boundaries. No jurisdiction.
- 2014-39        Custody issues. Close with no violation.
- 2014-50        Confidentiality. Close as unsubstantiated.
- 2014-52        Non-sexual boundaries. Close as unsubstantiated.
- 2014-63        Competency. Close with caution.

**b) Consent Agreements**

- a) **Ms. Val B. Sena:** Ms. Sena is a licensed independent social worker. In December 2013, Ms. Sena was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. She was unable to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed her license, and indicated in an email that she would like to surrender her license. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Ms. Sena admits to these allegations. Ms. Sena's license is hereby suspended indefinitely. If and when she submits proof of the 30 required hours of continuing education, the Board may lift the suspension. Mr. Polovick made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Sena based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- b) **Ms. Jennifer L. Strickland:** Ms. Strickland is a licensed social worker. In November 2013, Ms. Strickland was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. She was unable to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed her license. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Ms. Strickland admits to these allegations. The Board will allow Ms. Strickland to surrender his license in lieu of other potential disciplinary action. Mr. Brady motioned to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Strickland based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- c) **Ms. Susan M. Doerfer:** Ms. Doerfer is a licensed independent social worker with supervision designation. The Board received information that while employed at an agency in Westlake, Ohio, Ms. Doerfer violated professional boundaries, beginning in August 2013, by entering into a multiple relationship with a client. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-04(C). Ms. Doerfer admits to these allegations. Ms. Doerfer's license is hereby suspended for two years beginning May 15, 2014. Upon returning to practice, Ms. Doerfer must receive monitoring for an 18-month period. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Doerfer based on the evidence in the document. Dr. Brun seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**c) Goldman Reviews**

- a) **Ms. Tyerell Boughan:** Ms. Boughan violated professional boundaries by allowing a client to stay overnight in her home, in violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-03(A). She was also charged with practicing social work while working under a substance abuse impairment, in violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and (6) and OAC 4757-5-05. Mr. Michel moved to revoke Ms. Boughan's social work license. Dr. Brun seconded the motion. Motion carried, with Mr. Brady abstaining.
- b) **Ms. Marda L. Godsey:** Dr. Brun moved to revoke Ms. Godsey's social work license

because she 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.

- c) **Ms. Rovaughna E. Richardson:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Ms. Richardson's social work license because she 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). Dr. Brun seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- d) **Ms. Amy L. Althouse:** Dr. Brun moved to revoke Ms. Althouse's social work assistant registration because she 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.
- e) **Ms. Victoria R. Hartman:** Dr. Brun moved to revoke Ms. Hartman's social work license because she 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.

## 7) New Business

- a) The SWPSC returned to discussing acceptance of NASW-approved programs, and drafted the appropriate language. Mr. Brady expressed his concerns: NASW is a trustworthy organization with a long history of quality; going back on rules makes it difficult for licensees to know what's expected of them; restricting the content of social work CEUs may restrict the future growth of social work, as the profession moves more and more into the medical realm. Finally, he expressed concern that the committee had its own inconsistencies in approving CEUs, but the courses approved by NASW National are not of consistent quality and this is the most important thing. Dr. Brun agreed with Mr. Brady's concerns, and also pointed out that since it would be unfeasible to inform licensees which courses approved by NASW are accepted and which are not, approval should be removed altogether. Ms. Michel counseled patience; the Board has received communication back from NASW on their process, and should send them clear communication that this rule change is being considered before it's drafted and passed. Mr. Polovick stated that he will ask Mr. Rough to do them the courtesy of writing them a letter informing them of the Board's decision.

Mr. Polovick, Mr. Brady, and Dr. Brun voted to approve the following rule change to OAC 4757-9-05, with Ms. Michel abstaining:

**(F) Social work association provider approval and provider status:**

- (1) The board approves and adopts by reference in these rules the association of social work board's approval process for continuing education providers set forth in the publication entitled "ACE Provider Guidelines", which is available from the association of social work boards (ASWB), 400 south ridge parkway, suite b, Culpeper, VA 22701 at no cost on the association's website at

- [http://www.aswb.org/pdfs/ACE/ASWB\\_ACE\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.aswb.org/pdfs/ACE/ASWB_ACE_Guidelines.pdf). A link to the guidelines is available on the board's web site under social work forms.
- (2) Any course accredited by the ASWB shall be accepted by this board for continuing social work education. If the course materials say "ACE Approved" or "approved as a provider for continuing education by the Association of Social Work Boards," it is acceptable.
  - (3) ~~The board approves and adopts by reference in these rules the national association of social workers (NASW) continuing education approval program set forth in the publication entitled "Continuing Education Approval Program," of August 2010, which is available from the national association of social workers, 750 first street NE, suite 700 Washington, DC 20002 4241 at no cost on the association's website at <http://socialworkers.org/ce/approval/apply.asp>.~~ The board approves and adopts by reference in these rules the national association of social workers Ohio chapter (NASW Ohio chapter) continuing education approval program set forth on their website and available from the national association of social workers Ohio chapter, 33 N. third st., suite 530, Columbus, OH 43215 at no cost on the association's website at <http://www.naswoh.org/?page=428>. A link to the guidelines is available on the board's web site under social worker forms.
  - (4) Courses accredited by ~~NASW and/or~~ NASW Ohio chapter shall be accepted by this board for continuing social work education, provided that they are in compliance with this rule. If the course materials say "~~NASW Approved~~" with a ~~NASW approval number~~ or "NASW Ohio Chapter Approved" with a NASW Ohio chapter approval number, it is acceptable.
  - (5) Other national social worker associations may apply for similar approval. In order to be approved they shall provide proof that their programs are substantially similar to the ASWB and/or NASW [Ohio chapter](#) continuing education approval processes.
  - (6) The social worker professional standards committee shall review the provider status of the associations under this paragraph as part of Chapter 119. of the Revised Code five year rule review process.
- b) Mr. Warne discussed the planned visit from Teresa Lampl on Friday. Dr. Brun stated that he is a member of a group of educators who advocate for students waiting 18 months after graduation to take the Clinical or Advanced Generalist exams, but that they have no specific data to support this. Their main argument is that the tests are designed for applicants who have practice experience. Mr. Polovick replied that the ASWB should have some data on this. Mr. Brady stated that allowing students to take the "LISW" exam out of school ensures that employers can know whether a job applicant can get the LISW within a reasonable period of time. He would personally hire an LSW who has already passed the more difficult exam, because that licensee's future growth is more certain. Dr. Brun pointed out that an LSW has the same scope of practice regardless of which exam they took, employer opinions aside. Ms. Michel stated that she had no problem allowing students a choice on the exam, but that she does not agree with the Ohio Council's arguments on the subject. Mr. Brady pointed out that requiring students to wait for the exam may increase the quality of their supervision by giving them something to work toward, but Dr. Brun responded that supervisors are already asked to document the quality of their supervisees' work, so this is covered. Ms. Michel stated

that the real litmus test is which option protects the public; there has been a lot of focus on what's better for the students, having to take one test or two, but public protection is the Board's primary mission. Workforce issues may or may not compete with the good of the public, but either way they should not be the main consideration. Mr. Warne replied that the public is protected by ensuring that the social work exams are used in a way they are meant to be used.

The SWPSC adjourned for lunch at 12:00 p.m., and returned at 1:00. Mr. Brady and Dr. Brun attended their Investigative Liaison meeting, while Ms. Michel joined the CEU committee.

## 8) Old Business

Mr. Warne raised the issue of adding a definition of counseling to the social work scope of practice. Social work is defined as counseling, social psychotherapy, and psychosocial intervention, and it was decided in March 2012 to add a counseling definition to the rules. In May 2013, the SWPSC expressed concern that it may conflict with definitions for Professional Counselors, and shelved the rule change. Mr. Brady also recalled that Mr. Karr had expressed concern that psychotherapy may already be protected by the Psychology Board. Mr. Warne responded that he and Mr. Rough had gone through the Ohio laws and did not find psychotherapy as a protected term; the Psychology Board calls it "psychological psychotherapy." Mr. Rough had suggested working with other boards to add an amendment to one of their bills defining psychotherapy for all Boards in Ohio. Mr. Warne presented information from the ASWB model practice act, as well as a draft rule change of 4757-3-01(P), adding Counseling and Social Functioning definitions to the rules:

(P) "Social work" means the application of specialized knowledge of human development and behavior and social, economic, and cultural systems in directly assisting individuals, families, and groups to improve or restore their capacity for social functioning, including counseling, the use of psychosocial interventions, and social psychotherapy for a fee, salary, or other consideration.

(1) Counseling means a method used by social workers to assist individuals, couples, families, and groups in learning how to solve problems and make decisions about personal, health, social, educational, vocational, financial, and other interpersonal concerns.

~~(1)~~(2) "Psychosocial interventions" means the application of social work that involves individual, dyadic, family, or group interventions that utilize treatment modalities such as a family systems therapy, client centered advocacy, environmental modifications, community organization and/or organizational change. These modalities are implemented in crisis, short-term, and long-term therapeutic interventions directed at reducing, increasing, enhancing, maintaining, or changing target behaviors, areas of functioning, or environmental structures or processes.

~~(2)~~(3) "Social psychotherapy" means the application of social work toward the goal of enhancement and maintenance of psychosocial functioning of individuals, families, and small groups. It includes interventions directed to interpersonal interactions, intra-psychic dynamics, and life-support and management issues. It also includes the professional

application of social work theory and methods to the treatment and prevention of psychosocial dysfunction, disability, or impairment, including mental and emotional disorders. Social psychotherapy consists of assessment; diagnosis; treatment, including psychotherapy and counseling; consultation; and evaluation.

~~(4) "Social services" means those activities which improve and maintain an individual's functioning in institutions, at home, or in the community and which do not require the specialized knowledge of social work, counseling, psychosocial interventions, or social psychotherapy. For individuals performing only social services licensure is not required pursuant to Chapter 4757. of the Revised Code.~~

(4) "Social Functioning" means living up to the expectations that are made of an individual by that person's own self, by the immediate social environment, and by society at large. These expectations, or functions, include meeting one's own basic needs and the needs of one's dependents and making a positive contribution to society. Human needs include physical aspects (food, shelter, safety, health care, and protection), personal fulfillment (education, recreation, values, aesthetics, religion, and accomplishment), emotional needs (a sense of belonging, mutual caring, and companionship), and an adequate self-concept (self-confidence, self-esteem, and identity).

Mr. Brady suggested that the Board would need to pay special attention to how this would affect billing for CPSTs and Bachelor-level LSWs, so as not to restrict it unnecessarily. Mr. Miller also expressed concern with removing the "social services" definition, as proposed by Mr. Rough; that definition is used in conjunction with the SWA education requirements to determine appropriate coursework. The SWPSC agreed to keep that definition, but to possibly move it to a different rule where it fits better. Dr. Brun also suggested augmenting the Social Psychotherapy definition to include ASWB model practice act language, and Mr. Brady suggested reviewing Current Procedural Terminology codes, where some of these terms are clearly defined.

## 9) Old Business

- a) Mr. Warne passed along information that ICD-10 implementation has been postponed to October 1, 2015.
- b) Mr. Warne discussed a new development from HB-232, doing away with the professional disclosure statement and requiring all licensees to post their license, fees, and contact information. This includes sliding scales for patients with insurance or Medicaid, with the awareness that Medicaid fees must be 60% of the lowest fee offered. This is something to be aware of as rules are written. Mr. Brady also pointed out that due to Medicaid expansion, private practitioners can now bill Medicaid, so this would need to be written into the rules as well. Mr. Rough asked if a fee would ever be waived completely for a Medicaid patient. Mr. Brady responded that the fee would not be waived, but that he could just write it off as a bad debt. Mr. Polovick suggested posting sample fee schedules on the website.
- c) In January, the SWPSC looked at medication fact sheets, and determined that it's appropriate for a social worker to do "hand over hand," giving the patient their

medication and watching them self-administer. The social worker could also have some special knowledge and training in medication. Mr. Warne received an email from CareSource; they want to use social workers to fill a specific Case Manager position, but some of the job description is outside social work scope of practice. The SWPSC reviewed the following job description:

A. The activities of assessment include a telephonic or in-person gathering of information regarding the member's physical, functional, behavioral, social and psychological needs; medical and behavioral health history including diagnosis, treatments and utilization; Individuals preferences, goals an desired level of involvement in care planning; discharge plans, environmental/safety concerns, residential/care setting information, self-care capabilities, readiness to change, and any barriers to care. Once this information is gathered, as a Case Manager, the Social worker would be required to analyze the information and create the Care plan with interventions related to the identified needs that were found while completing the assessment. This information may be related to medical diagnosis as well as psychosocial. (per contract with ODM)

B. The activities of Medication review and reconciliation include obtaining information regarding medication, dose, frequency, and compliance with medications. Along with this intake of data, the Social worker would be required to again, analyze and assimilate this information into the care plan. They would need to recognize where medications may be duplicated, contraindication to take in conjunction with each other (including OTC meds).

The SWPSC agreed that paragraph A looked all right, but paragraph B appeared to be outside scope of practice. The real issue is the term “contraindication,” which means knowing which drugs should be taken together, and is much too medical for social workers. A nurse would need to perform that duty. The committee agreed that medication review is not appropriate for social workers. Mr. Warne asked if a social worker could even ask which medications a client is on, in light of this. Ms. Michel replied that listing medications would be part of assessment, which is fine. Dr. Brun agreed that recording which drugs a client is taking is fine, medication review would mean a social worker making a judgment on whether the medication is correct, which would be inappropriate.

## **10) New Business**

Mr. Rough discussed a proposed amendment to the state budget bill, drafted in part with assistance from NASW that would increase social work license renewal fees to pay for a small student loan debt relief program. The program would provide relief to students who chose to work in underserved areas. Mr. Polovick expressed indignation that an outside group would tell the Board to raise their licensing fees, to cover a program that falls outside Board jurisdiction. Social workers make little money; if the Board is in good financial shape, and has no reason to raise fees, then fees should not be raised to cover an outside program. Dr. Brun agreed and added that the Board’s statute states that fees are *only* established for the licensing of social workers and regulation of that profession, and it would contradict the



statute to establish fees for another purpose. While he personally supported the drive to lower costs for students, he agreed that it was not the Board's responsibility to do so. The SWPSC reached a consensus to oppose the amendment; Mr. Rough stated that he would write a response to NASW for discussion with the senator.

### 11) Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

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

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

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

**Guests Present:** Ms. Bobbie Boyer, Institute for Human Services; Mr. Glenn Karr, Esq.; Ms. Teresa Lampl, Ohio Council of Behavioral Health & Family Services Providers Associate Director; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director

### 1) Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

### 2) Executive Committee Report

Mr. Polovick reported that the search/hiring committee for a new executive director will be formed by the chairs of each professional standards committee, and that interviewing is expected to begin as early as July. He also reported that the ACA has finished adding cultural competency to their code of ethics, and AAMFT is working on that process as well.

### 3) New Business

- a) Mr. Warne presented a list of new rules written by Mr. Rough following the passage of HB 232. The Committee reviewed a new rule 4757-7-03, establishing an Inactive status, and reviewed changes to 4757-1-05, establishing the fees for said inactive status. Mr. Brady pointed out that the term "contact hours" is used throughout the new rule, and should be changed to "clock hours," which is the term used elsewhere in the Board's rules. The Committee discussed the fees and CEU amounts, and determined that they were appropriate. Ms. Boyer also suggested that Mr. Rough look at the Chemical

Dependency Counselor Board's rules, as they have a similar inactive status.

The SWPSC reviewed changes to 4757-19-01, which would require former LSW applicants to re-test if they are applying for licensure and their exam was taken more than seven years ago, and removed eligibility for related degree applicants. Mr. Warne also questioned whether doctoral degrees should still be listed as a qualifying degree for LSW licensure. Mr. Miller clarified that the doctorate in social work was still in the statute for LSW licensure, and was not removed. The SWPSC also reviewed changes to 4757-19-02, which similarly required re-testing for expired LISWs who are re-applying and have not tested within the last seven years, and also clarifies that supervised experience must be overseen by an LISW-S.

The SWPSC then reviewed changes to 4757-23-01, clarifying the role of the training supervisor, and who the LISW can supervise vs. who the LISW-S can supervise. Mr. Warne stated that he is working to develop a supervision training CEU which he hopes to have in place by the next Board meeting. Ms. Smith objected to the idea that this new rule would require SWTs to be supervised by an LISW-S. Mr. Warne responded that the SWT is a registration of training supervision, and since the student is developing proficiencies and learning processes, this falls under the normal training supervision purview of an LISW-S. Mr. Brady asked who could supervise SWTs under the current rules, and Mr. Miller clarified that while the Board had policies on supervision of SWTs, there was no written rule until now. Mr. Brady stated that most students who are SWTs are working in an agency that allows them to bill, and have an LISW acting as their supervisor; this is how the system is currently set up. Dr. Brun stated that MSW programs already require students to be supervised by at least an MSW, and that he agreed with Ms. Smith that this new rule would be unnecessarily restrictive.

- b) The Committee met again with Ms. Lampl regarding proposed rule changes to 4757-19-04, which would require students to complete part of their post-MSW, post-LSW supervision before taking the Clinical or Advanced Generalist exam. She reiterated that the Ohio Council and its members do not support changing the rule change. Dr. Brun restated his position, and that of his cohorts, that the exam is designed for students to wait. Mr. Rough stated that he has made some headway in gathering exam pass rates and comparing them to the date their degrees were conferred, but he has not completed the analysis. He suggested that he may contract with someone to perform that data analysis. Ms. Lampl reiterated that she is concerned this rule would create an additional barrier to LISW licensure; the passage rate for social workers appears to be on par with the passage rate for counselors, so it doesn't appear to need changed. Dr. Brun responded that these tests are designed to be taken after some practice is completed. It might make a difference if the test-taker just has an MSW or holds an undergrad degree in social work as well, and that would be something to check on. Ms. Lampl stated that most students she has spoken to anecdotally say the test is based on reading comprehension and theory, and that working as a social worker will actually *lower* their test score, because over the course of two years they develop an individual scope of practice which conflicts with the generalist perspective of the test. Ms. Michel asked Ms. Lampl's view on how this rule affects public protection. Ms. Lampl stated that in her opinion taking a more advanced

exam demonstrates advanced competency. If MSW-level students are being tested at a Bachelor level of competency, then this is inadequate. Ms. Smith questioned whether having students wait to test ensured public protection in any way, and Ms. Michel responded that this should be the main question in how this issue is decided.

- c) Ms. Lampl also raised an issue regarding evidence-based training programs. Many individuals attend their programs to learn a particular evidence-based practice, and these trainings are often blind to professional border lines, offering the knowledge to all types of different licensees at once. But the credentialing process creates a barrier for attendees, because they're not allowed to receive training supervision hours from these trainings, since an LISW-S or LPCC-S or etc. are not providing the training. Ms. Smith stated that she agreed this was an issue, but that at least *some* hours of training supervision do need to come from an LISW-S, in order to socialize the supervisee into the profession. Mr. Polovick responded that the SWPSC has approved hardship requests for a couple of these licensees; they've received valid arguments for social workers who have received supervision from outside the profession due to a specific specialization. Ms. Lampl stated that she would also support a balance, as proposed by Ms. Smith. Mr. Brady responded that under the current system, licensees can still attend these trainings; having to complete training supervision does not *prohibit* them from attending evidence-based programs. Ms. Lampl reiterated that training supervision is an extra barrier in these cases, and simply gives the licensee too much to do. Mr. Warne expressed his concern that many states *require* training supervision to be completed by a social worker, and will not accept hours under endorsement if they were provided by a different type of licensee; he could not give an exact number of states that required this, but on a recent ASWB survey of 30 states, 25 responded that they require a social worker for supervision. Mr. Polovick asked if it would solve the problem to allow LPCCs and IMFTs to provide supervision. Ms. Lampl responded that almost any independently licensed mental health practitioner can provide these evidence-based trainings. Mr. Rough stated that he could write a draft rule which would allow LSWs to receive a certain percentage of their supervision from another independent licensee, if they could document training in evidence-based practice; he would propose this to the Counselors as well. Mr. Brady reiterated his position that these trainings are separate from supervision, and that not accepting supervision from non-social workers is not prohibiting LSWs from being able to work and earn a living. Ms. Lampl stressed that evidence-based practice ought to be a part of an LSW's advanced training, and the Board should help to ensure that clients have access to these practices.
- d) Ms. Smith asked if the SWPSC could discuss the proposed rule change to 4757-23-01 with Ms. Lampl present. Mr. Rough reiterated that SWTs are under training supervision, and an LISW-S should provide both clinical and training supervision for students who are performing diagnosis and treatment (students not performing these duties can be supervised by an LISW or an LSW with an MSW). This was one of the original intents of the LISW-S when it was created, but the statute did not allow for it at that time. Ms. Lampl asked to be sent a copy of the proposed rule, and she will run it past some agencies to see who they're currently using for supervisors.

#### 4) **Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Rough reported that the board members of the CPSC and the MFTPSC no longer need to be split between independent licensees and non-independent licensees, under the new statute changes. Since social workers can be licensed with either a Bachelor's or Master's degree, however, the SWPSC will still require two LSWs and two LISWs for members. HB232 recently passed, and rules are being written. Board members seem comfortable overall with the new inactive status, and this will be sent out for public comment. Dr. Brun passed along that the phrase "contact hours" needs to be changed to "clock hours," and Mr. Miller stated that the new rule did not seem to show any requirements for completion of ethics or supervision hours. Mr. Rough discussed other rules, including a series of fees for individuals who fail a CEU audit, a slight change to the title of the LISW-S in the rules, and adding Counselors to diversity ethical standards. Dr. Brun asked if related degree applicants will be completely gone after July 10. Mr. Rough responded that no one will be able to apply or reapply under a related degree after that date, but the Board may choose to allow some leeway for individuals who have already applied and taken the exam before that date, and wish to move forward with the last few steps for licensure. VERSA, the new licensing system is on its way. Changes to rule 4757-9-04, requiring quality standards for CEUs, are now in effect, and changes to 4757-9-05 will be in effect June 1.

#### 5) **New Business**

Ms. Boyer reported that she was contacted by an organization offering a mental health first aid training. The intent of the program is to get word out to the public at large, to help clients recognize their own mental health issues. The CEU was rejected by the Board, then reviewed again by the CEU Committee, who also stated that the information was too elementary for licensees. The organization asked Ms. Boyer to help see what could be done in appealing the decision. Mr. Brady stated that CEUs need to be intended for licensees; if the intended audience are all lay people, then the course is typically not approved. Mr. Polovick responded that the Committee would take another look at the course, based on the documents in the organization's original submission.

#### 6) **NASW Report**

Ms. Smith discussed the student debt relief efforts coming out of NASW-Ohio's Advocacy Day. Senator Edna Brown had contacted the NASW to set up a model which would initially use no general revenue funding and rely only on a rise in licensing fees, but this was rejected by NASW members. Then a model involving general fund money and a smaller rise in licensing fees was crafted, and this was the model presented to the Board. In light of the Board's comments, a letter was sent to Senator Brown asking her not to add the amendment to the budget bill. Mr. Polovick reiterated that the big issue is that the Board's statutes would seem to compromise this proposed amendment, but was also not happy with the idea of the Board being a vehicle to collect money for another organization. Fees should only be raised for the Board's regulatory needs. Ms. Smith agreed that the proposed language was not ideal, but that it was exciting to have a legislator willing to work to retain social workers in the state, and to allow access to the general fund for this purpose. She provided the rest of

her report in writing to the SWPSC.

At this time, Mr. Polovick also informed Ms. Smith of the SWPSC's decision to end automatic acceptance of NASW-approved programs, and explained their rationale for doing so. Ms. Smith responded that not only should she have been a part of the conversation, but that the courses being discussed *are* appropriate for social workers. Mr. Polovick stated that the primary issue is that the CSWMFT Board seems to have a different standard from NASW National, and this can't be reconciled. Ms. Smith replied that only five states in the country do not accept NASW-approved programs, which argues that there is a national standard for social work practice. She promised to continue fighting this rule change as it moves through the filing process, as she strongly believes that CEU approval by national organizations is of high benefit to Ohio social workers.

7) **Old Business**

At the Board's March meeting, Mr. Brady asked if the Minimum Data Set will be mandatory for licensees to complete, and if the data collected will be public record. Mr. Warne reported that based on information provided to him by Mr. Rough, the Health Department has not actually been pushing their MDS program very hard recently. There was a lot of emphasis on it a few months ago, but the big push seems to have died down. The CSWMFT Board will be including an MDS questionnaire in their renewals, and may contract with an outside group to have the data collected and bundled. Since the Board would not be handing the data directly, it would not be part of the Board's public records.

8) **ASWB Report**

Mr. Warne reported that he and Mr. Polovick had attended the ASWB National Conference earlier that month. The conference focused on improving ethical standards in investigations, and worked on fostering initiatives to partner with schools and help them provide regulatory and licensing issues as part of the CSWE curriculum. Dr. Brun stated that he would be attending an ASWB new board member training in August, and asked if there were any questions or concerns he should bring to them at that meeting. Mr. Polovick suggested that Dr. Brun ask them to weigh in on the exam issues the SWPSC have been discussing.

9) **Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:14 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).

### May 2014 meeting

No follow-up required

### Tabled for now

1. Discussion of LCSW