



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

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes **Thursday, March 21, 2013**

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Bob Nelson, Mr. Steve Polovick

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

1) Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.

Mr. Nelson informed the committee that he would be resigning from the Board following this meeting. He had recently retired from the state school system, and as a result must relinquish all state employment for a certain period of time.

2) Approval of the January 17 & 18 Minutes

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the January 17 & 18 minutes. The Committee reviewed them. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3) Discussion/Approval of the March 21 & 22 Agenda

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the March 21 & 22 Agenda. Mr. Nelson motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

4) Approval of Applications for Licensure

The SWPSC reviewed the 201 LSW applicants and 89 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 20 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from January 17, 2013 through March 20, 2013. Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the applicants. Seconded by Mr. Brady. Motion carried.

5) Investigations

a) Closed cases

Mr. Nelson 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.

2012-222	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.
2012-240	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with no violation.
2013-3	Falsification of application. Close with no violation.
2013-6	Misrepresentation of credentials. Close with caution.
2013-31	Competency. Close as unsubstantiated.

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

2012-147	Sexual boundaries. Close with no violation.
2012-213	Sexual harassment. Close with no violation.
2012-217	Confidentiality. Allegation not substantiated.
2012-220	Custody issues. Close with caution.
2012-225	Non-sexual boundaries. Allegation not substantiated.
2012-233	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with strong caution.
2013-2	Custody dispute issues. Close with caution.
2013-17	Competency. No violation found.

b) Consent Agreements

1) Ms. Dana R. Baker: On or about November 8, 2012, Ms. Baker, while employed with Volunteers of America in Cleveland Ohio, blurred her professional boundaries by entering into a social and/or personal relationship with a client. Her inappropriate conduct constitutes a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-5-03(A)(4)(b). Ms. Baker admits to these allegations. Upon employment or at her current place of employment, Ms. Baker must be monitored in all aspects of her social work practice, and receive face-to-face monitoring for one hour every two weeks for a full two-year period.

Mr. Nelson made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Baker based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2) Ms. Sarah Bruce: From August 2012 through October 2012, while employed at an agency in Toledo Ohio, Ms. Bruce submitted records for home visits which did not accurately reflect the length of the visits. This action constitutes a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-5-09(B). Ms. Bruce admits to these allegations. Ms. Bruce's license to practice social work is hereby reprimanded.

Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Bruce based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

6) Mr. Gary E. Ritchie: In October 2012, while employed at an area agency in Ohio, Mr. Ritchie sexually harassed a client. His actions constitute a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-5-02(F).

The Board proposed to take disciplinary action against Mr. Ritchie based on these allegations. Mr. Polovick made a motion to issue a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing, based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

d) Goldman Reviews

Ms. Rebecca Barlow: Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Ms. Barlow's social work license because Ms. Barlow 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. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6) Correspondence

a) Mr. Hegarty received an email from a licensee who suggested that the Board needed to create a certification for social service workers, since licensed social workers are frequently being asked to perform social service work when they should be practicing social work specifically. Ms. Hosom pointed out that this would require a considerable statute change, and that it would be a change to the Department of Mental Health's statutes, not the Board's. Mr. Brady stated that part of this came from agencies requiring their case managers to act as "taxicabs for clients," which social workers were reluctant to do, which lead agencies to hire non-licensed workers to fill those roles and resulted in the QMHS worker.

Mr. Polovick suggested that this connected to the Board's discussion of creating an LCSW credential to clarify the roles of the profession. He suggested that a visit from Dwight Hymans with the ASWB to discuss how to implement the new license. Mr. Nelson stated his primary concern was to have licensees in private practice earn the LCSW, and that maybe licensees working in agencies could keep the LISW, since licensees in private practice are by definition practicing clinical work. Mr. Polovick stated that private practice is hard to define; Mr. Nelson responded that tax records would help with that. Ms. Hosom related the story of a conversation she'd had earlier that day: an LISW-S who had training in administration was being asked by her agency to sign off on diagnoses made by an LSW, even though she had no competency in it. Many agencies may not be able to hire all the personnel they need to operate properly.

Mr. Brady asked if there are many competency complaints made about social workers in

private practice. Ms. Hosom stated the complaints are typically practice issues, and the complaints come from clients. Mr. Brady asked that Mr. Warne respond back to the writer of the email and say the SWPSC is interested in his comments, and they are continuing to look into credentialing. He also asked that the LCSW be placed on the agenda for next meeting. Mr. Polovick stressed the importance of being able to demonstrate to the public which social workers are competent in clinical work. Mr. Warne reiterated that the ASWB model practice act prescribes having a license for the Bachelors, Masters, and Clinical level, and that most states follow this model. Minnesota and Florida have additional educational requirements for their LCSW; Mr. Nelson agreed this may be a good option. Mr. Polovick requested that Dwight Hymans be scheduled for a visit to the September SWPSC meeting, and that the staff coordinate with him on any kind of prep work that may be needed in the meantime.

- b)** The SWPSC received an email from a licensee who wanted to know if teaching social work classes could be used to meet the requirements for his supervised work experience. The committee's consensus was that the rules require a licensee to be engaged in the practice of social work during their supervised work experience, and that the tasks associated with teaching are not equivalent to tasks in the board's definition of social work practice. Mr. Polovick also pointed out that CEUs can be granted to a licensee for preparing a course, which holds to the view that teaching is fundamentally a different type of work from social work practice.
- c)** Mr. Warne received an email from an LISW applicant whose supervision logs were destroyed in a flood some time ago, and was therefore unable to provide them when asked. The supervisor was able to provide her own records of the supervision. The committee discussed, and decided to require the supervisor to sign an affidavit swearing that the records are true and complete, have it notarized, and include in the statement that the supervisee's own records were destroyed in a flood.
- d)** Mr. Miller presented an email Mr. Warne had received from a licensee who was now seeking licensure in Oklahoma. Oklahoma requires that 2 full years of supervision be complete before an applicant takes the Clinical Exam in their state. The licensee maintained that Ohio would have allowed her to take the exam with the 8 months of supervision she had already completed, and asked Oklahoma to do the same. Mr. Miller explained to the applicant that Ohio allows applicants to take the Clinical Exam without completing ANY supervision, and that exam eligibility in Ohio is no comment on the quality or length of any supervision completed to that point. He maintained that Oklahoma is able to accept any supervised work experience they deem substantially equivalent to their own requirements, and that choice is up to them.
- e)** Mr. Warne received an email from an LSW working on her supervision whose supervisor allegedly did not instruct her to keep supervision logs. She suggested that supervisors should be held accountable for providing appropriate direction on the process. The committee agreed that training to supervisors needed improvement. Ms. Hosom argued that supervisors, when they supply a bad evaluation, need to bear responsibility for never having taken corrective action, and the Board can use employee evaluations to back it up.

Mr. Nelson expressed concern that this could become a “he-said, she-said” scenario, but did agree with Ms. Hosom and Mr. Brady that the Board should build some system to require the supervisor to make semi-regular reports to the Board on the supervisee’s progress, to catch issues early as they arise. Mr. Rough reminded the committee of a recent case where the supervisor recommended the applicant but the supervision logs told a different story; reporting would help with that as well.

Mr. Miller reminded the committee that at the January 2013 meeting, they had requested a draft rule change requiring the following: 1. Establish a webinar or training for supervisees and also supervisors to take detailing the training supervision process and expectations; 2. Create a standardized supervision log; 3. Institute an online method for supervisees to submit their logs on a regular basis, allowing the Board staff to monitor them. Ms. Brunner added that the standard log should also include a section where the supervisor could discuss the supervisee’s competency, or include other statements on the supervisee’s performance. Ms. Brunner made a motion to request a draft rule change to 4757-19-02 with the above changes. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- f) The SWPSC reviewed a written statement from Dr. Thomas McGloshen of the MFTPSC regarding reparative therapy. Mr. Nelson agreed that reparative therapy should be illegal, but the Board should not be the one to decide which therapies are good or bad. Mr. Rough agreed that the professional associations should be the ones to pursue it. Ms. Hosom stated that OAC 4757-5-02(G) covers discrimination, including sexuality; Mr. Polovick argued that there would be nothing wrong with the Board taking a public position on civil rights, possibly by publishing information in professional organization newsletters about the need for diversity training. Ms. Hosom stressed that the Board does have many rules on minimum standards of competency, but there are currently no rules about allowable treatment modalities; this would all be new territory. Ms. Brunner stated her opinion that reparative therapy would seem to violate the Board’s current non-discrimination rule; Mr. Warne pointed out that rules do require treatment modalities to at least be evidence-based.

Ms. Brunner motioned to draft a rule change to OAC 4757-5-02(G)(1) as follows: “Counselors, social workers, and marriage and family therapists shall not practice, condone, facilitate or collaborate with any form of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, veteran status, or mental or physical challenge.” Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7) **Working Meeting**

The SWPSC broke for lunch at 11:55 a.m. At 1:00 p.m. 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, while Mr. Nelson and Mr. Brady attended an Investigative Liaison meeting.

8) Executive Committee Report

Mr. Polovick stated that the draft rule change requiring 10,000 words per hour for text-based CEUs was being contested by JCARR as being harmful to business in Ohio, and the Board would need to revisit the issue again. There was discussion as to whether to lower the requirement for 8,000 words or possibly even 6,000, or to leave things as they are with no requirement. The committee discussed, and agreed that a requirement of some kind was needed, and the issue was simply what that requirement needed to be. Mr. Polovick stated the issue would be discussed more at the full Board meeting.

9) Meeting Adjourned

Mr. Polovick adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes
Friday, March 22, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Bob Nelson, Mr. Steve Polovick

Staff Present: Mr. William Hegarty, Mr. Andy Miller, Mr. Jim Rough, Mr. Doug Warne

Guests Present: Mr. Glenn Karr, LLC; Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director

1) Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Before the meeting, Dr. McGloshen recalled his letter from the day before, explaining that he felt it would indeed be inappropriate for the Board to pursue legislation on reparative therapy, and that he would communicate with the professional organizations on the issue.

2) Old Business

a) At the previous meeting, the SWPSC had discussed the need to define BSW-level work as being distinct from MSW-level work, but it had been unclear to the committee why this issue was being raised. Mr. Warne presented sections from the ASWB Model Practice Act showing the definitions of Baccalaureate and Master's social work, and then presented six emails from licensees questioning whether their supervised work experience would qualify as the necessary "master's-level work:"

a) An email from the ODJFS Office inquired whether social workers working in an administrative/oversight capacity would meet supervision requirements. Mr. Warne gave an example of the email he used to reply to this and most other similar questions, that the LISW-S is responsible for determining whether the work is master's-level, and that even if the job description is bachelor-level then it can still count if the supervisee is functioning at a considerably higher level than her cohorts. The committee agreed that this would work, as an LSW with an MSW likely would not allow herself to work at a lower level. The committee discussed whether the LISW is generally perceived as a "clinical-only" license; Mr. Brady expressed the concern that leaving it up to supervisors in the field to make the determination might be a problem if the supervisors don't agree with our point of view on the license.

b) A licensee working as a Rehabilitation Technician emailed, whose work duties were focused on case management, and wanted to know if the work would meet supervision requirements. Mr. Brady inquired whether the job required a license. Mr. Nelson responded that it likely does not, but a licensed person would bring in skills that someone else would not have. Mr. Polovick pointed out that the job description did include "monitoring and revising treatment plans," which sounds like social work, and Mr. Hegarty agreed that job duties can exceed the job title. Mr.

Brady asked that the licensee send a heavily redacted case file or other document to show whether he is completing diagnostic assessments and treatment. Mr. Warne responded that he would request this information from the licensee.

- c) A licensee emailed who is completing triage work for Early Childhood Mental Health referrals, which would not include face to face interventions, and wanted to know if this would count for supervision. The committee was unfamiliar with the term “triage.” Mr. Polovick expressed the overall difficulty of defining social work, as social workers often fill hard-to-define roles in the service field, and their exact scope of practice is not as clear-cut as other licensed mental health professionals. Mr. Nelson agreed that the issue was difficult, and had to do with the long evolution of the profession. The committee asked Mr. Warne to send this licensee his standard supervision response.
- d) A licensee working at a Cleveland rape crisis center wanted to know if her work met supervision requirements. She stated she did not provide counseling on a regular basis, but did provide crisis intervention, psycho-educational programming, and “other services.” Mr. Polovick stated that this sounded more like community development as opposed to social work. Mr. Miller pointed out that community organizing is the focus of Case Western Reserve University’s macro social work track. Ms. Brunner stated that crisis intervention is very broad, and many people perform that task. Mr. Nelson stated that since the LISW can be granted to non-clinical workers, this may be acceptable, but it would not work if the license were an LCSW; Mr. Polovick argued that a licensee would have a great opportunity to develop skills in this setting, and even though it may not exactly match the definition of clinical work, it is still clearly social work. The committee further discussed how this emphasized the importance of defining what type of work experience should lead to which exam and then on to which license. Mr. Brady asked Mr. Warne to provide the standard response to the licensee, and Mr. Nelson added that she should also be advised to be sure her work is preparing her for the exam. Mr. Brady stressed the importance of training supervisors on what is and is not appropriate work.
- e) Mr. Warne received an email from a licensee whose job description only required a bachelor’s degree, but who had the opportunity to also perform clinical work for his supervision. Mr. Warne stated no discussion was needed as the answer was already clear, and he would respond to the licensee that this would be all right.
- f) A licensee emailed who had been trained in clinical work, and taken the Clinical Exam, but who was now working in an administrative setting coordinating programs, and was performing no psychosocial assessments/interventions. Given that she eventually plans to work as a clinician, she wanted to know if a supervised work experience that was not clinical was acceptable. Mr. Warne stated that under the Board’s current rules, there was no real way to say no. Mr. Polovick expressed optimism that LISW licensure is a long process, and a smart clinician would be driven to seek out appropriate advice and work experience along the way. Mr. Nelson stressed again that this showed the need for a separate LISW and LCSW; Ms. Smith argued that LISWs would be resistant to any requirement to complete extra steps for licensure. Employers would also have a hard time figuring out who to hire for any particular position. Mr. Nelson concluded that Mr. Warne should respond back to the licensee saying that her supervision will count, but that she should be

aware she will have difficulty working as a clinician without clinical experience; she can do it, but it's not recommended.

- b) Rule change for OAC 4757-9-05(E):** Ms. Smith reported that NASW National will include Ohio-specific language to CEU providers, and ensure that providers denied by the CSWMFT Board would not be approved by NASW to offer programs; Ohio's approval standards would also be taken into account when making determinations.

Ms. Brunner motioned to approve the following rule change:

(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," ~~effective 2006~~ 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://www.socialworkers.org/ce/approval.asp> <http://socialworkers.org/ce/approval/apply.asp>. A link to the guidelines is available on the board's web site under social worker forms.

(4) ~~Any course~~ 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 ~~State~~ Ohio Chapter Approved" with a NASW Ohio chapter approval number, it is acceptable.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. The SWPSC took a roll-call vote: Ms. Brunner—yes; Mr. Nelson—yes; Mr. Polovick—yes; Mr. Brady—abstaining. Motion carried.

3) Executive Director's Report

Mr. Rough discussed the status of the Board's draft bill, and the 2014-15 budget. In the bill, the Board is seeking oversight over exempt civil servants who are licensed by the board, and there has been some dispute. The rule change to 4757-9-04 (10,000-word rule) has been reviewed by JCARR, and they have commented that the rule would have adverse impact on Ohio businesses. It's in the Board's interests to negotiate with JCARR, and they will discuss. EliteCE was previously willing to accept 6,000 words, but were now not willing to accept any requirement at all. New legislature is seeking to make the Common Sense Initiative review even more rigorous, which could lead to more issues like this. Mr. Rough reported on the implementation of the National Uniform Minimum Dataset, and new HIPAA rules which will require a review of the Board's electronic service delivery rules. There has also been discussion of how the Affordable Care Act will affect the Board and whether new rules might be needed. The overall goal in government is to emphasize preventative care.

4) Old Business

- a) Mr. Warne reported on the status of his supervision log audits. One applicant withdrew her application, as she was coming from out of state and was apparently unable to

provide the records; she said she would apply again later.

- b) A licensee submitted supervision logs that were not of sufficient quality, but was not yet done with supervision. Mr. Warne responded to her that he would accept the insufficient logs, as long as the rest of her logs in the future were okay. The SWPSC agreed that this was an acceptable response.

Mr. Warne gave follow-up on some supervision cases the Board had already looked at in previous months. One, who had not been able to provide logs and had since completed a proscribed additional period of supervision, had been reviewed by Mr. Brady and found to be acceptable. Another, who had provided supervision logs showing many boundary issues and work-related problems, was completing her supervision and doing well. Mr. Warne receives monthly reports from her supervisor, and her logs look good. Mr. Polovick asked that, in the course of these audits, Mr. Warne make note of all supervision he comes across that does and does not meet the Board's requirements, and why.

- c) Mr. Rough had contacted Dwight Hymans to see if other states had rules on requiring a special supervision designation for training supervision and for "supervision of normal work." Mr. Hymans answered that a few states (roughly 16) do have some sort of training supervision designation, but he was not aware of any states that have a work supervision designation. This was interpreted to mean that other states do not have rules on what type of work experience (clinical vs. macro) counts for supervision. Mr. Warne inquired what a rule of this kind might look like if Ohio created one. Mr. Brady mentioned that he did know of a position paper written on this issue, and would provide it to Mr. Warne to examine.

5) New Business

- a) Mr. Warne presented his agenda for the Online Social Work Training Supervision CEU Project meeting of March 26. Richard Boettcher, Linda Helm, Cyndi Webb, Vicki Fitz, and Danielle Smith were scheduled to attend. Mr. Brady suggested that the goal of the meeting should be to identify what the current rules are, what best practices would be, and how to identify differences between the two and reconcile them. Mr. Polovick suggested they needed to focus on how supervisors can help supervisees set appropriate goals to increase their competencies, which will help them to pass the exam and move into LISW practice. Mr. Warne has suggested supervisors need to be able to leave comments on the logs. Mr. Polovick also asked to attend the meeting.
- b) Mr. Warne discussed the system "Time2Track" as a way for the Board to monitor supervision logs as they are being completed, allowing supervisees to upload their logs electronically. Many licensees coming from out of state have reported using the system, so they are familiar with it. Licensees obviously won't want to pay to use the service, so options are being looked into. Ms. Brunner suggested phoning the company to negotiate a special rate; Mr. Polovick suggested seeing what software the ASWB might have available. Ms. Smith expressed her view that the NASW would love to provide this service to the Board, and would be willing to set up a system if they could be guaranteed

that it would generate some revenue for the organization. The SWPSC was amenable to the idea. Ms. Brunner suggested setting up a pilot program to test the system.

- c) Mr. Warne received a request, and has received many others in the past, from an applicant who owes money to her school, and the school is therefore not releasing her transcript. Under current law, the Board can grant a temporary license to an applicant who has completed her degree requirements and graduated and is waiting for the degree to be conferred on her transcript. Should the statute be altered to help applicants who are not able to have their transcripts issued because of debt to the school? Ms. Brunner suggested that if an applicant is on a payment plan to her school, we could set up a temp license that would need to be periodically renewed for as long as the applicant is in repayment. This way the applicant is encouraged to pay off her school in order to gain full licensure, and the school isn't being cheated out of money. Mr. Brady also stressed that the other professions should be encouraged to use the same model, for the sake of consistency. Ms. Brunner drafted language for a potential statute change.

Mr. Brady made a motion to include the following statute change in the Board's upcoming draft bill:

4757.28 Social worker license.

(C) The committee may issue a temporary license to an applicant who meets all of the requirements to be licensed under this section, pending the receipt of transcripts or action by the committee to issue a license as a social worker. However, the committee may issue a temporary license for a period not to exceed ninety days to an applicant who provides the board with a statement from the applicant's academic institution indicating that the applicant is in good standing with the institution, that the applicant has met the academic requirements for the applicant's degree, and the projected date the applicant will receive the applicant's degree transcript showing a conferred degree. A temporary license may be renewed by the committee upon application and for good cause.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6) NASW Report

Advocacy Day was held March 14th with over 300 attendees. The message focused on social workers in health care and Medicaid expansion. A student activist training was held March 2nd with over 50 students, and the Annual Cuyahoga County Conference was held March 22nd with over 600 attendees. NASW-OH plans to offer ethics training in Columbus on April 11th, and also plan a survey of membership to determine what additional resources the Chapter should offer pertaining to ethics. NASW-OH recently convened a meeting with deans and directors of Ohio MSW programs to discuss professional issues. They also implemented a campaign to educate social workers on the need for personal professional liability insurance, and the benefits of NASW's Assurance Services program. Finally, Dr. Anthony McClain has been named CEO of NASW National and will start in May.

Mr. Brady expressed to Ms. Smith that he saw a need in the community for licensees to be

more familiar with sanctioned supervising and monitoring, and whether that monitoring is covered by malpractice insurance. He suggested NASW present this topic.

7) CEU Committee Report

Mr. Polovick reported that the CEU Committee had discussed poster presentations. A presenter who made a short half-hour poster presentation with a group of other people wanted to offer CEU credit for it. The CPSC denied it, but the SWPSC accepted it.

8) Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

Mr. Steve Polovick, Chairperson

ACTION ITEMS

January 2013 meeting

1. Ms. Farley later emailed back to inform Mr. Miller that the contractor had officially opened up tobacco counseling services to LISWs on 10/19/12, and LISWs in Ohio can now bill for that service. A copy of the email threads were presented to the SWPSC. Mr. Polovick asked that Mr. Miller and Mr. Warne include this item in a future Listserv, as social workers in Ohio may not be aware they can now provide this service.

March 2013 meeting

1. Schedule visit with Dwight from ASWB to discuss implementation of LCSW in September meeting
2. Put LCSW discussion on May agenda, per Tim.
3. Mr. Miller reminded the committee that at the January 2013 meeting, they had requested a draft rule change requiring the following: 1. Establish a webinar or training for supervisees and also supervisors to take detailing the training supervision process and expectations; 2. Create a standardized supervision log; 3. Institute an online method for supervisees to submit their logs on a regular basis, allowing the Board staff to monitor them. Ms. Brunner added that the standard log should also include a section where the supervisor could discuss the supervisee's competency, or include other statements on the supervisee's performance. Ms. Brunner made a motion to request a draft rule change to 4757-19-02 with the above changes. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried.
4. Ms. Brunner motioned to draft a rule change to OAC 4757-5-02(G)(1) as follows: "Counselors, social workers, and marriage and family therapists shall not practice, condone, facilitate or collaborate with any form of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, veteran status, or mental or physical challenge." Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
5. During supervision log audits, keep a log of what is and isn't acceptable supervision, and why.
6. **COMPLETED:** Mr. Brady made a motion to include the following statute change in the Board's upcoming draft bill: **4757.28 Social worker license.** (C) The committee may issue a temporary license to an applicant who meets all of the requirements to be licensed under this section, pending the receipt of transcripts or action by the committee to issue a license as a social worker. ~~However, t~~The committee may issue a temporary license for a period not to exceed ninety days to an applicant who provides the board with a statement from the applicant's academic institution indicating that the applicant is in good standing with the institution, that the applicant has met the academic requirements for the applicant's degree, and the projected date the applicant will receive the applicant's degree transcript showing a conferred degree. A temporary license may be renewed by the committee upon application and for good cause.