



## *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, September 19, 2013**

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

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

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

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m.

#### **2) Discussion/Approval of the September 19 & 20 Agenda**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed to the September 19 & 20 Agenda. Ms. Miller asked to add two items related to continuing education: an issue regarding medical social work CEUs, and issues regarding NASW approval of CEUs previously denied by the Board. These items were added under Correspondence. Mr. Brady motioned to approve the agenda. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **3) Approval of the July 18 & 19 Minutes**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the July 18 & 19 minutes. He then asked for clarification on an item from the NASW Report section of the minutes, where it was stated that only health insurance brokers could be designated as “navigators” under the new health exchanges established by the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Miller clarified that this information was correct. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

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

The SWPSC reviewed the 435 LSW applicants and 136 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 17 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from July 18, 2013 through September 18, 2013. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the applicants. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## 5) Correspondence

- a) The SWPSC examined the file of an LISW applicant who had previously been licensed as an LISW from 6/1986 to 6/1988. A question arose since he did not have any post-MSW supervision documented in the Board's records; the original file could not be located. The applicant clarified that he had received supervision prior to 1986, but not from an LISW. Mr. Miller examined the rules and explained that prior to 1986, OAC 4757-11-02 stated that supervised work experience could be administered by an LISW or by a Qualified Mental Health Professional as defined by the ODMH. The current rule, OAC 4757-19-02, states that any supervised experience obtained after 10/10/1986, in Ohio, must have been overseen by an LISW. Mr. Hegarty stated that the applicant could not now complete a Professional Employment Reference form documenting unlicensed work experience. The SWPSC discussed the issue, and decided that the supervised work experience completed by the applicant could not meet current licensure regulations, and he should be encouraged to apply for an LSW instead of a new LISW.

## 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. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2013-16	Improper billing. Close with caution.
2013-64	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with strong caution.
2013-110	Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.
2013-142	Improper billing. Close as unsubstantiated.
2013-146	Competency. Close with no violation.
2013-150	Record keeping. Close with caution.
2013-151	Sexual harassment. Cannot substantiate violation.
2013-157	Competency. Close with caution.
2013-168	Poor communication. Close with caution.

### b) **Notices of Opportunity for hearing.**

- 1) For case #2013-180, Mr. Brady made a motion to issue a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Timothy Dycus based on the evidence provided. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- 2) For case #2012-206, Mr. Brady made a motion to issue a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to George Kennedy based on the evidence provided. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

### c) **Consent Agreements**

- a) **Ms. Peggy A. Dodds:** Ms. Dodds is a licensed social worker. In 2013, while

employed at an adoption agency in Columbus OH, Ms. Dodds falsified a Home study done on behalf of a client. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-09(B). Ms. Dodds admits to these statements. The Board will allow Ms. Dodds to permanently surrender her license, and she will be precluded from applying for any license with this Board in the future. Mr. Polovick made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Dodds based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- b) **Ms. Alice E. Dawson:** Ms. Dawson is a licensed independent social worker. From about May 20, 2009, through about March 28, 2013, Ms. Dawson treated a client, from whom the Board later received a complaint. The Board obtained a copy of the client file. The notes maintained in the file were illegible, and could compromise the continuity of services provided to the client in the future. The client file also did not contain the required individual service plan, nor did it contain the required release document from the client required to allow the client's husband to participate in her sessions, and the case notes did not reflect that Ms. Dawson informed the husband of his role in the therapy. Ms. Dawson's actions constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1), OAC 4757-5-02(B)(7), and OAC 4757-5-09(B) and (C). Ms. Dawson admits these allegations. The Board will require Ms. Dawson to undergo 18 months of face-to-face monitoring, and complete the Board's online Laws and Rules exam. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Dawson based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- c) **Mr. James A. Roman:** Mr. Roman is a licensed social worker. In January 2013, he was audited for compliance with continuing education requirements. Mr. Roman was unable to provide proof of the 30 hours needed to have renewed his license, and stated that he wished to surrender the license. Failure to comply with an audit constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Roman admits these allegations. The Board will allow him to surrender his social work license in lieu of other potential discipline. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Roman based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Michel seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**d) Hearing Officer Report**

- a) **Danielle J. Shuler:** Ms. Shuler is a licensed social worker, and renewed her license in 2012. Her renewal was audited, and she delayed in responding to the audit. When a response was received, she was found to lack 4.75 of the required 30 hours. She was given the opportunity to complete the remaining hours, but again delayed in doing so. After some time, the matter was referred to Investigations, and a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing was issued. Ms. Shuler requested the hearing, and the hearing was held on June 28, 2013. Her actions were found to constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). At the time, the hearing officer recommended the board impose an indefinite suspension until such a time as Ms. Shuler completed her missing 4.75 CEUs. Since that date, she completed the

remaining CEUs, leaving the issue of whether she ought to be disciplined for her long delays in completing the required audit. Ms. Michel motioned to suspend Ms. Shuler's license for a period of two weeks, beginning 10/1/2013. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**e) Goldman Reviews**

- a) **Ms. Kaleigh Ziegler:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Ms. Ziegler's social work license. On June 4, 2013, the Board received a complaint providing evidence that, while employed with Catholic Social Services, Mr. Ziegler borrowed or misappropriated at least \$845 from her clients' homes. This conduct is a violation of Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-5-03(A), (A)(3), and (A)(4)(d). Ms. Ziegler has received communication from the Board regarding the complaint, but has made no effort to cooperate with the investigation. Ms. Michel seconded the motion to revoke. Motion carried.
- b) **Ms. Danielle Bowman:** Mr. Brady moved to revoke Ms. Bowman's social work assistant registration because Ms. Bowman 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. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- c) **Ms. Jennifer R. Rizzo:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Ms. Rizzo's social work license because Ms. Rizzo 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.

**7) Correspondence**

- a) An LSW licensee had written in to Mr. Warne asking if his job experience allowed him to take the clinical exam, or whether the experience was too generalist. Mr. Warne drafted a response, breaking down the scope of practice for an LISW into clinical and "macro" categories, by way of explanation. He asked the SWPSC if this response was in line with their thinking. Ms. Michel asked to table the issue until Ms. Brunner arrived, so she could weigh in. Ms. Brunner later examined Mr. Warne's response and said it looked good. Mr. Polovick agreed that the advice was strong, and founded in the law.
- b) Mr. Warne received an email from a licensee who passed the Clinical examination, but whose supervised work experience was being completed in macro practice. She wanted to know if this would cause an issue for her when applying for the LISW. Mr. Warne responded that our rules allow licensees to do this, but that there may be issues with competency if she performs clinical work later on. He presented the email and response to the SWPSC for review and discussion. Ms. Michel stated that many social workers are in positions where they cross over, working with clients and providing services even in a macro setting. Mr. Warne discussed the issue with the ASWB, regarding their concern that clinical workers ought to be taking the Clinical exam as an evaluation of their

competency, and not the Advanced Generalist. Ms. Michel replied that there seemed to be a discrepancy there, because clinical workers often do macro work without any additional training, and there seems to be little concern for that. Mr. Brady responded that people doing clinical work need to have specific training; Ms. Michel reiterated that someone doing administrative work without any training is also a danger to clients and the organization. Mr. Warne stated that he would respond to these questions by stating that the Board can't say which type of work a licensee must perform, clinical or macro, but that the licensee should choose work relevant to their education and training, and work which will help prepare them for their future careers. Mr. Miller stressed that much of the concern over this issue comes from the ASWB's point that macro workers have the ability to enter a private practice, where they would be unsupervised.

## **8) Working Meeting**

The SWPSC began its working meeting to review pending applications for licensure, files to be audited, CEU Programs & Providers, Related Degree course worksheets, and Licensure Renewal Issues. Ms. Michel attended the CEU Committee meeting at 11:00 a.m. The SWPSC adjourned for lunch at 11:45, and resumed at 1:00.

## **9) Correspondence**

- a) Mr. Warne had provided a one-hour CEU with the social work staff at Mt. Carmel on 8/16/13. During the question and answer session, he was asked two specific questions that he told the participants he would present to the SWPSC for clarification. The questions were: 1) Is it within the scope of practice for an LISW to do a competency evaluation? And 2) What is the liability for the LISW if they make a placement recommendation for an individual who the LISW determines is not competent, for those individuals who have not completed the adjudication process and been appointed a guardian? According to ORC 2154.54, only a psychiatrist, psychologist, or a professional employed by a psychiatric facility certified by the department of mental health can provide competency evaluation; therefore an LISW cannot do competency evaluations for guardianship unless appointed. Mrs. Brunner pointed out that "competency" is a legal term and suggested that if a client is confused and/or disoriented that that this should be noted by the social worker in the client record, but that social workers should not be using the term "competency". Mrs. Brunner also stated that the client should have a health care Power of Attorney in place and the LISW should consult with the POA about patient care. Mr. Brady suggested that the NASW often sends out policy updates and practice guidance, and may have something to offer on this topic; if not, something should be sent out through either the Board or the NASW. Mr. Warne stated that he would follow up with these suggestions.
  
- b) Ms. Miller raised the issue that several Athena Forum CEUs approved by NASW, which the Board must accept, have presenters who are trained in medical work, and the topics deal with medical issues. Since the Board generally denies CEUs that deal with these topics, she questioned if this was an issue. Mr. Polovick responded that social workers who attend these CEUs generally need them for their jobs. Ms. Michel agreed that if the

course outcomes deal with mental health at all, or ethical issues and client rights, then these are things social workers are involved with. Ms. Miller responded that the difficulty can be in defining what social workers *don't* do. Ms. Michel suggested looking at the program areas that are in the OAC rules, and comparing them to the topics outlined in the course; if the course can be linked to one of these program areas, then it would seem appropriate. Ms. Miller stated that another issue is whether a social worker is a presenter or preparer, which she would like to see in each course. Mr. Brady stated that he was okay with the courses in this instance, but did express his concern that CEU providers often confuse “knowledge” with “knowledge of how to do.” Background information is not needed, the courses ought to teach information that contributes directly to practice. Ms. Michel stated that these courses did at least speak to issues directly used in practice, and the SWPSC agreed that they were acceptable.

- c) Ms. Miller brought up another course approved by NASW, one that had been denied by the Board. The keynote speaker of the conference is a fiction author discussing her personal story, and the Board generally does not approve personal stories as being instructive to practice. The conference also featured a course on using yoga to treat eating disorders. Ms. Michel pointed out that the presenters were very good, but the topic was weak. Social workers would never directly use yoga as a treatment modality for a client. Mr. Brady suggested that the Board needs to contact NASW and let them know these courses are a concern. Ms. Miller suggested it might help to get some rationale on why the courses were approved, and the SWPSC agreed that would be appropriate.
- d) A licensee emailed Mr. Warne asking if working in a nursing home qualified for Master's-level training supervision. Mr. Warne gave his standard response that licensees working in a Bachelor-level position but practicing at a higher level are generally okay. The licensee asked if supervising an MSW student two days a week would be sufficient to meet that level. Mr. Warne responded that this did seem like Master's level work, but that there should probably be more in addition to that. The licensee's supervisor responded back that the Board needs to set more specific benchmarks regarding what constitutes MSW-level work. Mr. Brady stated that the expectation for MSW-level work has always been a part of the profession's history. If licensees are not able to add an MSW-level component to their work, they should probably change jobs. The Board will likely not set a benchmark on how many hours per workweek need to be MSW-level; if the work as a whole does not contain an MSW-level component, then none of the work will count. It's easiest if the work requires an MSW. Ms. Michel stated that she works in a Bachelor's-level position, but she sees how many BSWs struggle in that position. As an MSW, she's able to do more and understand the full scope of the organization. Mr. Brady asked if supervisors are tasked with making their own determination on this subject, and Mr. Warne responded that there is a check box on the form for this. Mr. Brady asked whether an LSW receiving training supervision receives any warning at any point as to whether their work will count. Mr. Rough replied that staff is developing a supervision training course to provide guidance to supervisors and supervisees. It's very rare for supervisees to get to the end of the process and find out they have not been recommended.

- e) The SWPSC received a hardship request from an LSW working in a setting dealing with autism spectrum disorder, and who wanted to receive additional training supervision from a psychologist trained in that setting. The SWPSC had previously received a very similar request from an applicant working in multisystemic therapy, and that request was denied as not meeting the requirements of a hardship since the licensee was able to receive supervision from a social worker, but simply preferred someone else. The committee agreed that the additional training from the psychologist could be helpful for her job training, but it didn't really meet the definition for hardship since she was already receiving training supervision from a social worker and was able to continue doing so. There would be no clear need to consider her meetings with the psychologist as training supervision. Ms. Brunner suggested that Mr. Warne respond back to the licensee and ask her to state a case for clear hardship. To accept the request as is would set a bad precedent.

## **10) Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 3: 28 p.m.

### **Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes** **Friday, September 20, 2013**

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

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

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

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

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

## **2) Correspondence**

The SWPSC received a supervision hardship request wherein the licensee explained that due to her son's medical issues, she was having trouble getting to her supervision meetings. Previous supervisors have asked her to leave her supervision group, and her current supervisor is having trouble scheduling her. She requested to use a professional counselor for supervision, who was on-site and could work more closely with her. Ms. Michel suggested that she needed to pursue Skype or other video chat as an option, which would

allow her to receive supervision from home and circumvent these issues. At this point, it didn't appear that she had spoken to a great many supervisors, and it needs to be clear that she has exhausted her other options before a hardship could be granted. The SWPSC agreed. Mr. Polovick asked if hardship requests could be reviewed by staff outside of Board meetings, rather than bring them to the committee. Mr. Miller pointed to OAC 4757-23-01(D)(7), which states that hardship requests need to be made in writing "to the committee," probably to encourage checks and balances within the system.

### 3) **NASW Report**

Adrienne Gavula was leaving the organization, and Dorothy Martindale would be taking her place. As of this meeting, NASW planned to hire a part-time practice associate, a clinical social worker who could deal with practice issues in an advocacy context. NASW was working to oppose SB 181, which would require drug testing for OWF recipients. The bill would require an intake worker to make an assessment and determine chemical dependence, and NASW was questioning whether an unlicensed person could do that. Mr. Rough suggested that ODJFS will probably be the organization that would end up writing rules for that. NASW also met with Medicaid to see about the Board's licensees being able to bill Medicaid independently, and established that Health Exchange navigator rules do in fact include an exemption for licensed social workers, allowing them to at least present information on insurance options.

The SWPSC continued to discuss issues with NASW CEU approval. NASW National had recently sent a list of CEUs approved by them to help demonstrate their process. Mr. Polovick stated that the SWPSC doesn't know how to handle CEU providers that get NASW approval after they've been denied by the Board. It will help to be more collaborative. Ms. Smith responded that they can communicate back to NASW National any courses that have issues. Mr. Hegarty asked if other state boards were having these problems; according to Ms. Smith, other NASW state chapters have not reported a conflict, although there are five state boards that don't accept NASW approval. Mr. Polovick asked if the Board could have a list of programs denied by NASW. Ms. Smith responded that she would try, but went on to further say that there will always be subjectivity in CEU approval, and that problem will never go away completely. But if the Ohio Board denies a course, NASW can make sure they don't approve that course for Ohio. Ms. Miller raised the example of NetCE, which dropped Board approval and took on NASW approval because Board rules require a post-test. Ms. Smith responded that NASW wasn't aware of the post-test requirement, and that criteria could be added as well. Ms. Michel suggested that the main task ahead was to improve the lines of communication, so that the two groups can coordinate instead of arguing about standards. She suggested setting up a meeting to talk through these issues and make plans for how to improve the process in the future.

### 4) **New Business**

- a) The Board received a new application from a licensee who had not been licensed for several years. He was licensed under a related degree, and took the exam to qualify for licensure. A question arose as to whether he would need to retake the exam. Ms. Michel

suggested that having applicants re-test would help to prove their current competencies. For someone who's been out of practice for a long while, it demonstrates their ability to work. Ms. Brunner pointed out that CEU requirements kick in once they're re-licensed, requiring them to seek current education in the field and get caught up. Either way, current rules don't say an Ohio applicant re-applying for licensure is required to take the exam again if it was already passed. The SWPSC agreed.

- b) Mr. Miller raised a similar issue that had come up regarding endorsement. Under current laws, an applicant must be currently licensed in another state if applying to Ohio, or else re-take the exam. However, the rules do also allow the SWPSC to consider the length of time the applicant was licensed in another state, how long the license has been lapsed, and other issues. Mr. Miller asked if a general standard should be set. He also asked if the committee would like to establish a rule requiring all applicants to re-take the test if their previous license was expired for longer than a certain time period. Several other states have rules requiring licensees to re-test if their previous expiration date was more than two to five years ago (depending on the state). Mr. Miller suggested that if the SWPSC was interested in setting a rule of this kind, seven years would be a good timeframe, since this is how often the ASWB performs practice analysis. Ms. Brunner stated that a rule change should be drafted so the committee could discuss it further. Mr. Brady supported the idea. The SWPSC asked to have a rule change drafted for applicants previously licensed in Ohio, but agreed to handle endorsement applicants on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Polovick asked if it would be difficult for applicants who have been out of school for many years to pass the test. Mr. Miller pointed out that the exams are based off social work practice analysis, so the exam should be something that a social worker who has practice for a while could handle.

## 5) Old Business

- a) Following up on items from previous meetings, Mr. Miller presented the SWPSC with the new background questions being used on license applications. Mr. Warne decided to table discussion of the definition of social work counseling. Mr. Warne had checked with Mr. Hegarty, and it's normal for the Board to receive a couple of complaints a year regarding both licensed and unlicensed social workers working in nursing homes, but that there have been no nursing home social workers disciplined in recent years. This was corroborated by the Ohio Department of Health Division of Quality Assurance. Ms. Smith did point out that there is no clear complaint process for clients to go through with the ODH, however. The Center for Medicaid/Medicare Services writes rules for social workers in nursing homes, and their definition of a social worker is very broad. In the last meeting, Mr. Brady had asked if a social worker acting as a health officer fell under the jurisdiction of the CSWMFT Board or the ADAMH Board. Mr. Rough had investigated, and ADAMH rules show that both boards would have jurisdiction.
- b) Mr. Warne discussed the ongoing supervision log audit process. As of this meeting, 72 LISW applicants had been audited since November. Audits are random, although they can be imposed if there are obvious discrepancies. Typical issues with logs include lack of detail, counting administrative staff meetings as supervision, copying the logs and

putting on different dates, and using one supervision log for everyone in a supervision group. Most social workers want to do the right thing, and correct issues when asked. Mr. Brady has been asked to review around 22 of the audits. Three or four have been asked to complete another 90 days of supervision experience to correct their issues.

- c) Mr. Rough and Mr. Warne had drafted changes to the Board's Professional Employment Reference form, to include competency areas which the supervisor could evaluate. Mr. Warne asked if they should begin using this form. Mr. Brady stated that he and the committee could use some time to consider this, and asked to table the issue.

## 6) **New Business**

- a) One applicant is contending the decision to make her complete another 90 days of supervision, and has asked for an appeal. To appeal the decision, her LISW application would need to be formally denied, and she would need to be granted a 119 hearing. As of this time, she was deciding what she wanted to do.
- b) The CEU Supervision Training committee hasn't had another meeting yet, but a survey did go out, and a printed report of the comments generated have been provided to committee members. A LinkedIn account has been set up to facilitate discussion.
- c) One member of the Supervision Training committee had commented that the Board should draft a rule requiring supervision CEUs to contain content specific to the Ohio Board's rules. Mr. Rough stated that licensees would not be able to take any generic supervision courses under this rule (unless they included specific information about Ohio regulations), and asked if the SWPSC wanted to draft this change. They could also require licensees to take a CEU created by the Board. Mr. Miller stated that national CEU providers would be extremely resistant to being required to include Ohio law in all supervision CEUs, which would drive them away from seeking Board approval at all. Ms. Boyer stated that people seem to believe that all the supervision course categories listed in the laws must be included in every supervision CEU; Mr. Warne confirmed that only one category needs to be present for the CEU to be valid. Mr. Polovick suggested the Board simply produce a one-hour supervision CEU for licensees to take, as had been discussed before.
- d) Ms. Boyer's Institute for Human Services provides CEUs for ODJFS employees. They issue transcripts showing the completed courses and the licensee's name, but do not issue formal CEU certificates that show the license number and provider number. Mr. Rough suggested that since they are a large provider and are well-known to the board, an exception could be made for them, and they would not need to provide certificates. Ms. Brunner stated that if a system is outsourced by a government agency to a private corporation, it should be the corporation's responsibility to design a product that meet's the government's guidelines; the government should not be required to bend its rules to accommodate the deficiencies of the corporation's system. Ms. Boyer responded that there is an ongoing development project that would allow licensees to print their certificates, as well as other features. Ms. Brunner stated that this development needs to

happen, and Ms. Michel agreed that provider numbers and license numbers need to show up on any kind of report. For security, there should also be some way to certify that a report was generated by a specific person and that the information was accurate. Mr. Polovick recommended that Ms. Broome's and Ms. Miller's input needed to be solicited as well throughout this process.

- e) Ms. Brunner suggested that the SWPSC should attend the keynote address of the NASW-OH Annual Conference on the morning of November 21<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Polovick agreed this would send a message of cooperation, and the group decided to attend.

**7) Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Rough discussed the current status of the Board's bill, HB232, and its progress. The CEU Committee has reviewed 4757-9-04, as JCARR has made it clear they believe a 10,000 word requirement would have an adverse effect on business. Mr. Rough provided a list of other rules that are currently coming up on their Five-Year Review schedule, and will be discussed further. ODMH and ODADAS have merged into ODMHAS; they have filed a rule change to allow MFTs and IMFTs to bill for CPST services, and have also drafted proposed rule changes that would prohibit individuals who have committed certain crimes from working in foster homes, residential facilities, and adult homes. The Chemical Dependency Board is seeking to add gambling addiction to their scope of practice. OIT has provided new guidelines for sending sensitive information through state email. The ACA has revised their code of ethics, and Mr. Rough had flagged several items which may be good additions to the Board's ethics rules.

**8) CEU Committee Report**

At the CEU Committee meeting, Ms. Michel had proposed drafting a rule which would restrict the number of fully text-based distance learning CEUs a social worker would be allowed to take. She had proposed restricting the number to five; if the Board will not be able to regulate these CEUs, then they need to be limited. The SWPSC will also continue to work together with NASW to ensure quality control, and go over NASW approval standards to make sure they're similar.

Ms. Michel also asked to attend the ASWB Annual Conference this year. The SWPSC approved her to attend.

**9) Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.