



Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board

50 West Broad Street, Suite 1425
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5919
614-466-0912 & Fax 614-728-7790
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmftinfo@cswb.state.oh.us

COUNSELOR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday April 20, 2006

11:00-12:00 p.m. CPSC Session

Attendees: Dr. Susan Norris Huss, Mr. Jan White, Dr. Randi Cohen, Dr. Victoria Kress-White; **Staff:** Mr. James Rough, Ms. Rena Elliott, Mr. Simeon Frazier; **Guests:** Dr. Susan Sears, Dr. William Nemec, Dr. Nick Piazza, Dr. Linda Barclay

The meeting was called to order at 11:13 am.

Dr. Susan Huss established/reiterated the objective and agenda of the meeting: "The Role and Duties of the Executive Director" and the operation of the full board (an arranged marriage between licensing committees), specifically, with respect to being supportive of the Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT) license at the expense of weakening the scope of practice of the PC and PCC license.

Dr. Huss: stated that we do not want to support anything that weakens our license, and questioned if it is our role to support the MFT's ability to diagnose and treat mental and emotional disorders (dx &tx).

Dr. Victoria White-Kress: Questioned a comment that was made at the opening session regarding: "Making everyone the same" in terms of licensure.

Mr. Jim Rough: Discussed the process of securing the MFT's ability to diagnose and treat based on the Ohio Attorney General's published opinion:

-Psychologists and psychiatrists simply did not want the MFT and IMFT licensees to be able to diagnose and treat since it's not listed in their definition.

-Per Rep. Webster and Rep. Evans: "Everyone should have the 'Biologically Based' exception, or no one should."

Dr. Huss: "What, if any, is our role in this? Also, does the CPSC need to be involved in the MFT's ability to diagnose and treat? Does it affect us as a board?"

Mr. Jan White: commented on the disproportionate amount of time on a subject that is not yet a CPSP issue, and that there are other more CPSP relevant issues to discuss. Special note was given that the MFT license was not being belittled.

Dr. Randi Cohen: Stated that it is up to the professional organizations to speak out.

Dr. White-Kress: Questioned the CPSP role.

Mr. Rough: stated that, though several board members are currently uncomfortable, no one has yet articulated it. He requested direction, i.e. if there are provisions that must be supported, then 'what are they?'

Dr. Cohen: questioned whether or not this was the time or place for this discussion.

Dr. Huss: advised that the CPSC cannot give direction. It must be given by the full board.

Mr. White: Advised that, while he wants to be as supportive as possible, he also wants to ensure that the CPSC and the Counselors' agendas are not jeopardized due to this issue.

Mr. Rough: Requested that this be said at the full board meeting.

Dr. Cohen: Her understanding of the MFT license is that of a modality or a specialty. She is unclear of what it is. She understands that the University of Akron (U of A) runs their MFT program by way of their counseling program.

Dr. William Nemeč: offered that there are three tracts at U of A: MFT, PCC, and PC. The MFT needed the MFT program along with all clinical coursework (following American Association of Marriage and Family Therapist 'AAMFT' standards which don't train for Dx and Tx).

Mr. Rough: Needs to be advised what, specifically is missing from the program.

Dr. Susan Sears: Offered that she doesn't believe that it's the board's job to protect the profession. It shouldn't be engaged in the work of professional organizations. The bill is weak and the board has advocated for this.

Mr. Rough: Advised that he was operating under his direction.

Dr. Sears: Eventually, via advocacy, regulatory boards "get in bed" with professional organizations and their willingness to revoke or sanction licenses gets compromised.

Dr. Cohen: Often times we blend our view as mental health professionals.

Mr. Rough: He was engaged in his directive, and he has consistently repeated

Upon entering the room, Mr. Philip Yassenoff, private practitioner, introduced himself.

Dr. Nemeč: Questioned if there has been reluctance to immediately share ongoing information with professional organizations.

Dr. Cohen: asks, again, to have professional organizations send a representative to the CPSC meetings and the full board meeting.

Dr. Sears: offered that the Ohio Counselor Association (OCA) was used against consolidation, and now they can't be contacted with dealings regarding issues such as these. Additionally, because they do not want to have the PC license challenged, they now must stand in favor of Rep. Webster's first bill against the MFT license.

Dr. Huss: **(Action Item)** Proposes a motion that should be properly shared to the full board that the CPSC does not believe that it is the board's responsibility to be advocates for law changes to enhance or improve a law; they consequently believe that it is not the executive director's job to advocate for a license. Furthermore, she advises that this decision will create dissonance, since it will ultimately neutralize the MFT license. Also, unless this is done, the PC license may have its scope of practice placed in jeopardy.

The session broke at 12:11 p.m.

1:00-3:00 p.m. CPSP Session

Meeting convened at 1:06 p.m.

Attendees: Dr. Susan Norris Huss, Mr. Jan White, Dr. Randi Cohen, Dr. Victoria Kress-White;
Staff: Ms. Rena Elliott, Mr. Simeon Frazier, Ms. Rhonda Mr. P.R. Casey, Ms. Rhonda Franklin, Ms. Patricia Miller, Ms. Tamara Tingle; **Guests:** Dr. Susan Sears, Dr. William Nemec, Dr. Nick Piazza, Dr. Linda Barclay, Mr. Phillip Yassenoff, Ms. Thelma Greaser

Dr. Huss: advised that she ate lunch with the Marriage and Family Therapist Professional Standards Committee (MFTPSC), advising them of the direction that the CPSP were heading. They (MFTPSC) don't wish for the PCs to jeopardize their (PC) license, only to allow the MFT's license to be credible. The MFTPSC will prepare their arguments against the CPSP proposal.

Introductions: all attendees from the previous meeting are in attendance, along with Thelma Greaser, P.R. Casey, Rhonda Franklin, and Patricia Miller.

In a brief discussion of this meeting's agenda, Dr. Nemec stated that the roles for the CPSC, the full board, and the executive director should be clearly defined.

Dr. Nick Piazza inquired why the Board has "a dog in this fight?"

Mr. White: answered that because the boards are blended under one umbrella, they each take an interest in each other's plight.

Dr. Sears: Gave a history of how the board began as a blended entity, and how, over time, it eventually became more separate and departmentalized. She believes that the current incarnation of the board tries too hard to keep it blended.

Dr. Huss: asks the committee members if they believe that the CPSC should pursue potential action regarding Rep. Webster and Rep Evans' bill?

Dr. Cohen: Believes that the CPSC needs to discuss their (committee) role before they discuss their position. It remains to be seen if the committee should be, at all, engaged.

Dr. Kress-White: stated that the committee must serve and protect the public. If the Counselor's scope of practice is compromised, then the public, themselves, will, also, be compromised.

Mr. White: offered that he's not sure if the choice to disengage even exists at this point, given what has already taken place.

Dr. Cohen: retorts that the choice, does, still exist. As things become clearer, they may still disengage.

Dr. Huss: Offered that as the MFTs move forward, eventually, the Counselors will be involved.

Mr. White: Believes that the CPSC should discuss their role, however it is still prudent to be prepared.

Dr. Huss: stated that, in terms of the current bill, the CPSC didn't need to do anything, however, henceforth, they should disengage.

Dr. Piazza: offered that, at this point, the professional organizations should take over as advocates, as he believes the board has gone beyond the original intent of "cleaning up the language."

Dr. Huss: (**Action Item**): Two persons (at least one CPSC member) must write a proposal for the full board meeting addressing the CPSC's concerns. Volunteers: Dr. Kress-White, and Dr. Nemeec.

It was then outlined by Dr. Huss that the next Thirty (30) minutes would revolve around the topic of supervision.

Huss: then opened the floor for topics and goals. She wanted to know the issues, and how the CPSC believes they should be addressed.

Dr. Cohen: Offered that different states are increasingly requiring collaboration hours. The belief is that a practitioner must be connected to someone so they don't operate as an island. It (post independent licensure supervision) does not need to be hierarchical, just collegial.

Mr. Phillip Yassenoff: added that ten (10) contact hours seems to be a token gesture to secure the supervisory credential, when other states require forty (40) to fifty (50).

Dr. Cohen: suggested that the committee may be creative with respect to how supervision is obtained, i.e. webcams, video tape, etc.

There were questions presented regarding the qualifications of a university supervisor vs. an on site supervisor. Whose position should carry more weight? Should the university be more involved in training supervision?

Dr. Huss: inquired if the committee should strengthen the pre and post degree supervision.

Dr. Piazza: suggested that the university should not be able to be privy to the first hand knowledge of another agency's client's. He believes that the answer is found in increasing the training and strengthening the field supervisors.

The conversation shifted to how to go about strengthening the training of field supervisors.

Dr. Huss: discussed potential merits and demerits of live supervision vs. viewing taped sessions.

Dr. Piazza: stated that supervisors at the University of Toledo must have first hand knowledge of the work (live, taped, etc.) also, they have testing and a good deal of follow up.

Dr. Sears suggested that by placing the burden to get the supervision on the Counselor Trainee (CT) the committee would be placing itself in a better position to get the rule change through the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR).

Dr. Huss: Asked the CPSC if the number of required renewal hours should be an increased from six (6); perhaps by way of "collaborative hours" that are appropriately documented for renewal?

It was suggested to include, on the "Evaluation and Verification of Supervised Experience" form, a field to confirm that first hand knowledge of the accrued clinical hours was achieved. Furthermore, there may be a section to outline the medium by which the observation was completed.

The concept of collaborative supervision was discussed for post PC and PCC licensure. One example was that of a "learning community"

(Action Item) A supervisory committee is to be created; volunteers: Dr. Cohen, Dr. Barclay, and Mr. Phillip Yassenoff.

The next portion of the meeting was to focus on the topic of "**Endorsement**"

Dr. Huss: discussed Draft 32906 (Counselor Endorsement Issues); and asked how the committee should honor a PCC licensed status from another state?

To initiate the discussion, a temporary PC license was suggested while the applicant is seeking the additional courses required to meet the educational requirements.

Dr. Sears: Asked if other licensing agencies (i.e. the Medical Board) do this?

Dr. Barclay: suggested that before that was considered, we would, first need to know things like: the scope of practice in the other state, whether it was a license in career counseling vs. community counseling, etc.

The next portion of the meeting was to focus on the topic of the Jurist Prudence exam.

There was conversation that it be a test over the actual, current law. Discussion ensued re: whether or not it should be a part of the licensure process vs. the renewal process; perhaps used as a teaching tool with a pass/fail grade (the standard being 100%). Additionally, it was debated whether the test exist as an entity by itself, or as an extension of the PCC exam, and a part of the endorsement process.

The session broke at 3:05 p.m.

3:15-5:00 p.m. CPSP Session

Meeting convened at 3:15 p.m.

Attendees: Dr. Susan Norris Huss, Mr. Jan White, Dr. Randi Cohen, Dr. Victoria Kress-White;
Staff: Mr. William Hegarty, Ms. Rena Elliott, Mr. Simeon Frazier; **Guests:** Dr. Susan Sears, Dr. William Nemec, Dr. Nick Piazza, Dr. Linda Barclay, Ms. Thelma Greaser

The next portion of the meeting is to center around the topic of Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and Provider status.

The discussion involved making the CEUs relevant and changing the process to vest the providers appropriately.

The current belief is that the board should strengthen it's stance on future program approval. Currently, it appears to be very relaxed.

Mr. White: would like to see a universal standard towards approving programs.

Dr. Kress-White and Dr. Nemec: passed out their motion (below):

The CPSC moves that the CSWMFT Board withdraw any efforts to change and modify chapter 4757 of the ORC effective immediately.

The CPSC further moves that the CSWMFT Board's proposal to amend Chapter 4757 of the ORC that would expand the MFT scope of practice exceeds the Board's authority by advocating for a profession it is supposed to regulate. It is recommended that any further proposal to change or amend any legislation for any of the three professions, be initiated by the appropriate professional associations.

It was determined that the first sentence was the motion. The sentences that followed should be considered part of the resulting discussion.

Mr. White: stated that he is uncomfortable, as the motion does not allow for room to deal with counseling licensure. He believes that the proposal's first sentence should relate to the MFT license.

Dr. Huss: maintained that the motion should positively address the appropriateness of the committee's actions.

William Hegarty: Stated that whatever is done should be done diplomatically.

Dr. Huss: Stated that the wording needs to precisely state that “the role of the board is not to advocate, but to regulate.”

It was amended in the group setting to read:

*The CPSC moves that the CSWMFT Board withdraw any efforts to change **or** modify Chapter 4757 for the ORC **at this time**.*

*The CSWMFT Board’s proposal to amend Chapter 4757 of the ORC that would expand the MFT scope of practice exceeds the Board’s authority by advocating for a profession it is charged to regulate. It is recommended that any further proposal to change or amend any legislation for any of the three professions, be initiated by the appropriate professional associations. **The role of the board is not to advocate for this profession. The role of the executive director is to carry out the wishes of the Board***

Dr. Sears passed out a formal statement (attachment I).

She asks that the board focus on being a regulatory body to protect the public.

Mr. White: Believes that the board cannot wait until May to make a decision.

Dr. Huss: asks the committee how strong a statement should be made regarding the current status of the bill, and what parameters should be placed on the Executive Director’s actions?

At the end of the session, the final language of the proposal reads as follows:

The role of the board is regulatory, not one of advocacy, and thus we move that the Board and Executive director discontinue its current legislative activity.

Discussion will follow.

Dr. Huss: The CPSC should not act on this until the full board session on Friday.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Friday April 21, 2006

8:00 a.m. CPSP Session

Meeting convened at 8:45 a.m. (due to extensive executive session held, earlier)

Attendees: Dr. Susan Norris Huss, Mr. Jan White, Dr. Randi Cohen, Dr. Victoria Kress-White;
Staff: Mr. James Rough, Ms. Rena Elliott, Mr. Simeon Frazier, Ms. Patricia Miller; **Guests:** Dr. Susan Sears, Dr. William Nemec, Dr. Nick Piazza, Dr. Linda Barclay, Ms. Thelma Greaser, Ms. Jennifer Jones, Ms. Lynne Guillot-Miller,

Dr. Huss established that the focus at the beginning of the session should be on the working plan for the Executive Director. Dr. Cohen shared Dr. Huss' concerns over how to keep the relationship with the legislative process without compromising the public outlook on board unity. It was shared that the MFTPSC will make the motion/proposal to the legislator.

Dr. Kress-White: suggested an amendment to the motion:

“The role of the CSWMFT Board is regulatory, and not one of advocacy; thus, we move that the board and its executive director discontinue its current proposed legislative advocacy efforts.”

Dr. Kress-White moved to accept the amended motion, Mr. White seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

The next established focus: **Faculty and Staff at colleges and universities.**

Dr. Cohen believes that the draft that was circulated, earlier, may be too exclusive to PC/PCC licensees.

According to the existing rule, content may be taught by appropriately licensed people. The clinical courses should be taught by PCs and PCCs.

The next established focus: **Program Approval and Reviews.**

Regarding the two hundred forty hours of direct service in an internship, the concern is that there is no direct requirement for specific hours of Diagnose and Treatment that is outlined.

It was discussed that program reviews must now be more extensive than in the past.

Dr. Piazza: expressed concern that the extensive process will be too time consuming for programs that have already gone through the CACREP accreditation process.

The next established focus: **Executive Director's goals, duties, objectives, action plan, and performance measures (attachment II)**

(Action Item): Item five regarding strategic issues facing the board during 2004/2005 must be reworked.

The next established focus: **Supervising Counselors**

- By law, supervisors are to only have five (5) supervisees. This should be noted on forms that supervisors must sign.

(Action Item): A Supervision Advisory Committee will be formed to gather information and develop training requirements for Supervising Counselor status. It is to include the requirement of field supervisors to gain first hand knowledge to account for face to face supervision.

The next established focus: **Endorsement:**

After the question was posed regarding what other professions do, discussion ensued, and the following was determined:

- Licensure by endorsement may not lessen the PC license.
- Criteria to be considered must include the definitions and scope of practice for the out of state licensee, with the final decision being up to the board.
- The endorsement standard for a licensed professional coming to Ohio may not be lower than the licensure standard in Ohio.

The next established focus: **Criminal Records Checks**

The CPSC was overwhelmingly in favor of the introduction of criminal records checks. Information is to be gathered. Facets to be considered include costs, when/how the checks are to be implemented (renewal vs. initial license vs. audits, etc.), and how quickly they may be integrated into the current process.

The next established focus: **The Jurisprudence Exam**

It was determined that this is a good idea. There is uncertainty of how it will be implemented (replacing existing exam vs. offering it as an addition to the second exam).

It was recommended that this be done for all licenses and be part of consent agreements.

Dr. Susan Sears volunteered to be on the committee to develop the exam, its standards, and its implementation.

The next established focus: **CEUs**

The following was determined:

- Currently, the CPSC is not on the same page with the other committees with regards to CEUs. It was noted that, due to the differences in the licenses, being in agreement is not always the priority.
- It was steadfastly stated by Mr. White that it is the committee's responsibility to deal with CEUs, and the responsibility should not be outsourced.
- With regard to provider status, it was generally agreed that there should be some sort of fee attached with the acquisition of provider status, although universities should have an exemption from this requirement.
- The main concerns of the program surround content, however, there should be a minimum number of programs to acquire and maintain provider status.
- On the brochure, advertising the program, the number of approved contact hours in each area (supervision, ethics, etc) should be clearly displayed.

It was determined that when the board meets on Thursdays, they will discuss a predetermined relevant topic. When they convene on May 18, 2006 at 8:00, they will discuss Faculty Issues. The meeting broke at 10:49; however an additional session was called at 11:36 following a meeting of the Executive Committee Chairs and Mr. Casey.

Additional CPSP Session

Meeting convened at 11:36 a.m.

Attendees: Dr. Susan Norris Huss, Mr. Jan White, Dr. Randi Cohen, Dr. Victoria Kress-White; **Staff:** Ms. Rena Elliott, Mr. Simeon Frazier, Ms. Patricia Miller; **Guests:** Dr. Susan Sears, Dr. William Nemecek, Dr. Nick Piazza, Dr. Linda Barclay, Ms. Thelma Greaser, Ms. Jennifer Jones, Ms. Lynne Guillot-Miller

Dr. Huss reported that the Executive committee met at the request of MFTPSC acting chair, Kenneth Trivison. The MFTPCS requested that the other committees not put any motion on the floor that affects any of their (MFTPCS) efforts, negatively. Additionally, they requested that the Board pull efforts to move forwards with legislation, until they (MFTPCS) had the opportunity to get everything resolved. Also discussed, was the notion that, because "Advocacy" was not clearly defined, it could be interpreted to prevent/stagnate the Executive Director's duties from being clearly performed. There was an additional concern that there should be a record of the proposal, so the CPSC's intentions would still be duly reflected, despite the formal proposal not being enacted.

Mr. Casey suggested going into executive session at the full board meeting to discuss the Executive Director's role. There will be a summary of the discussion, however, the committee must be certain that they do not discuss the issues surrounding advocacy that have dominated the meetings.

Mr. White moved to withdraw the previous motion for the CPSC to cease and desist. Dr. Cohen seconded, motion carried, unanimously.

Mr. White moved to go into executive session to discuss personnel issues. Dr. Cohen seconded, motion carried.

When the meeting convened the committee asked for any discussion from the guests.

-Dr. Sears offered that there is already legislation that has been introduced that will go forward, regardless of the decisions that are made at this meeting. She further voiced her disappointment that the Assistant Attorney General recommended the committee to go into executive session to prevent items from appearing on the record.

-Dr. Piazza offered that the MFTPSC would be best served by withdrawing their efforts and placing them in the hands of their professional organization.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Dr. Susan Norris Huss
Chairperson