



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

STATE OF OHIO

COUNSELOR, SOCIAL WORKER AND MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPIST BOARD

September 20, 2013

Chairperson, Ms. Mary Venrick, at the LeVeque Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH, convened the regular meeting of the Board at 1:00 p.m. on September 20, 2013. Dr. Terri Hamm, Dr. Otha Gilyard, Mr. Timothy Brady, Dr. Christin Jungers, Ms. Margaret Knerr, Dr. Thomas McGloshen, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Ms. Stephanie McCloud, Ms. Maureen Cooper and Ms. Erin Michel. Absent: Mr. Steve Polovick and Mr. Alan Demmitt. Staff present: Mr. James Rough, Mr. William Hegarty, Ms. Patricia Miller, Ms. Tracey Hosom, and Mr. Andy Miller.

Also present: Mr. Jim Lockwood, AAG, Ms. Elizabeth Delano, Columbus State Community College, Ms. Bobbie Boyer, Ohio Human Services Training System, Ms. Myrian Rabaste, PC Supervisee, Ms. Julie Arnold, PC Supervisee, Ms. Della Smith, Columbus State Community College.

- I.** Discussion and approval of agenda. Ms. McCloud approved the agenda with modifications, seconded by Dr. Hamm. Carried.
- II.** Ms. Cooper moved to accept the July 19, 2013, minutes, seconded by Dr. Gilyard. Carried.
- III. Executive Director Report presented by Mr. Rough:**

Mr. Rough reported:

1. Copy of the report given to each of the Professional Standard Committees will be attached to the minutes. The MFTPSC went through the report and instead of Mr. Rough giving a report only specific questions were asked.
2. A vacancy remains on the SWPSC and the MFTPSC. Three board members on the CPSC are up for re-appointment in November of this year.
3. The July site visit went well.

4. Legislation is progressing well. A meeting is scheduled with Rep. Sears to make some last minute amendments that have been vetted with the affected associations.
5. The budget is in good shape even with the extra expenses.
6. Thanked Ms. Adorjan for her help with the rules, it is good to have someone on the staff knowledgeable of some of Mr. Rough's responsibilities.
7. Regulations regarding e-mailing information were reported.
8. The Insurance Navigator issue was resolved without the need of writing a letter. The individual giving the information is liable for the plan or the information they pass on to others.
9. Adding two items to the work plan; peer consultation, viewing continuing education differently after visiting the different sites and understanding what information is actually needed.
10. Reviewed the number of licensees report, the numbers continue to increase.
11. ASWB will pay the expenses of one attendee at the November conference, Ms. Michel will attend. Mr. Rough is requesting to attend or Mr. Warne.

IV. Investigative Report presented by Mr. Hegarty:

Mr. Hegarty reported:

1. An increase in cases, especially in the number of counselor cases. These are not audit cases.
2. The largest number of complaints includes audits and renewals, and then sexual and non-sexual boundary violations. The largest number of complaints in one area are in Columbus.
3. Thanked Ms. Hosom, Ms. Tingle and Ms. Adorjan for their hard work.
4. Counselor license denial hearing in November.

V. Legal Update presented by Mr. Lockwood:

1. The appeal in the Ms. Jill Pritchitt's case was dropped.
2. A motion to dismiss was filed for the Ms. Stacy Scott case.
3. Mr. Rough thanked Mr. Lockwood and Ms. Brunner for their help with statute changes.
4. Mr. Hegarty clarified some questions regarding his report.

VI. Marriage and Family Therapist Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Ms. Knerr:

Ms. Knerr reported:

1. Approved four MFT and two IMFT license applications. Approved two exam requests. Denied one supervision hardship.
2. Drafted a rule to lower the home study hours to fifteen per renewal.
3. Made changes to the license application changing “arrested” and “charged” to “convicted”.
4. Discussed the supervision form.
5. Ms. Adorjan is working on a new board member training manual.
6. Discussed 4757-5-02 paragraph (G), cultural competency. JCARR stated the reference to NASW cannot be used for counselors and marriage & family therapists. The Board will look at this for future rule changes.
7. Ms. Venrick questioned the change to lower the home study hours to fifteen. Ms. McCloud stated due to more availability of courses for MFT’s and for consistency.

VII. Counselor Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Ms. Cooper:

Ms. Cooper reported:

1. A hearing was scheduled but the individual did not show.
2. Discussed Peer Consultation and CEU’s being awarded.
3. Approved one consent agreement.
4. Four Goldman Hearing’s, approved three and denied one.
5. Discussed CACREP and changes.
6. Discussion on the wording when denying continuing education.
7. Approved one-hundred and sixteen PC’s, sixty-six PCC’s, six-hundred and eighty-four CT’s and mailed one-hundred and fifty-three exam packets.

VIII. Social Work Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Mr. Brady:

Mr. Brady reported:

1. Approved one-hundred and thirty-six LISW’s, four-hundred and thirty-five LSW’s. There are currently eight thousand and forty-four LISW’s and sixteen thousand five-hundred LSW’s.
2. Closed cases, approved a hearing officer report and a consent agreement. One Goldman hearing.
3. Reviewed correspondence.
4. Discussed supervision and the law.
5. Ms. Michel added that discussion took place on lowering the number of home study CEU’s that could be completed per renewal. Also discussed NASW National, NASW Ohio Chapter and the Board agreeing on the decision of approving continuing education. The

current issue occurring is NASW approving a program that the Board denies.

6. Ms. Brunner added a license expired for seven years needs to re-take the licensure exam.
7. Mr. Brady moved to send two people to the ASWB conference in November, Ms. Michel and a staff member. Ms. Knerr seconded. Carried.

IX. Committee Reports

Executive Committee

Reported in Mr. Rough's report.

CEU Committee – Dr. Jungers

A report on the number of failed audits and reasons was given by Ms. Broome. The biggest issue is licensees renewing without completing all thirty hours or no approval number on the certificate. Various problems of information not being completed on the certificates.

Discussed the quality of home study programs, peer review, citation being required or referenced. Also discussed lowering the number of CEU's completed through home study.

Investigations Ad Hoc Committee – Mr. Hegarty

Worked on a monitoring contract, Ms. Adorjan worked on getting feedback and creating a template of a contract. An effort is being made to improve the system. Ms. Adorjan will draft a template and e-mail to the liaisons.

X. Old Business:

1. The NASW conference conflicts with the November board meeting dates. SWPSC is going to attend the keynote presentation on Thursday November 21, 2013, and extends an invite to everyone to attend.
2. Ms. Knerr suggested going one day in March of next year for the off-site visit, discuss the outcome at the May meeting and then spend one day of the July meeting off site.
3. Mr. Rough suggested one person from each committee get together and make the decisions of where to visit and to make the visit local. That person then needs to start e-mailing the information to the various sites and setting the plans in motion.

4. Mr. Rough stated if one committee wants to make changes to add the change to the agenda for the full board meeting so it can be discussed.
5. 4757-9-04 will be worked on and submitted to JCARR.
6. A discussion took place on the boundaries involving faculty and students, the issue if the faculty member is licensed or not and the authority of the Board. ACA puts the responsibility on the school. Mr. Rough will talk to OACES.

XI. New Business:

1. None

Ms. Cooper commented on the good idea of Mr. Rough cross-training the staff in case he were to retire early due to health concerns. Wished everyone a Good Fall.

XII. Adjourned: 2:15 PM

Mary Venrick, PC, Board Chair



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

STATE OF OHIO

COUNSELOR, SOCIAL WORKER AND MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPIST BOARD

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2013

Chairperson, Mary Venrick, at the LeVeque Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH, convened the executive committee meeting of the Board at 8:20 a.m. on September 19, 2013.

Members present were Ms. Margaret (Charlie) Knerr, Mr. Steven Polovick, Ms. Maureen Cooper and Dr. Otha Gilyard. Staff present: Mr. James Rough

- Approve agenda and minutes - *agenda and minutes approved by committee*
- Board member appointments: The Governor's office of Boards and Commissions is working on two appointees from 10/10/2012 expiration. Mr. Rough has followed up and secured additional applicants. We have a LISW academic and MFT vacancies to be filled. We also need re-appointments for three counselor committee members: Maureen, Terri & Otha all of whom have applied.
- Budget issues: FY 2013 is in good shape as shown in the reports. The FY 2014 budget is in very early stages and I believe we have the money to do some extra things this year.
- New House Bill - Rep. Sears introduced HB-232 on July 17, 2013. Mr. Rough will ask to add an Option for an Inactive License and has a number of additional changes that he hopes to have in place for a meeting with her in early October.
- We are still at a standstill with JCARR, Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review on rule 4757-9-04 paragraph (D) the 10,000 words per hour discussion. The CEU Committee is still working on this issue. I have some reviews of some CEUs being offered by a counselor and social worker on some distance learning items. We also have a draft language for requirements for quality of CEUs. The CEU committee is working on draft quality standards to send out for comment.
- Planning meeting for July 2013 – we need to review the minutes and professional standards committee inputs on any agenda items. The only one I see is the peer

consultation issue. I believe we can encourage CE offerings to provide a certain amount of peer consultation meetings for CE credit. I would recommend 6 meeting hours over a period of time for three CEU credits. If done this way we can easily document who attended by certificates.

- **Executive Director Work Plan:** review the results of the Planning Meeting and issues for future resolution. Below issues are based on the outcome of the 2012 planning meeting. I will review these issues with any new ones with the Executive Committee in September.
- 1. Cultural competency/diversity – need for counselors’ and MFTs’ association ethics codes to have citations to become part of our ethics code. – *Track by Jim*
- 2. Growth of MFTs - MFT professional standards committee – *in work*
- 3. Need for an “S” status for MFTs - MFT professional standards committee – *in work*
- 4. Need for Investigator liaison training – CLEAR, AG’s office? – *Bill will track opportunities for training*
- 5. Importance for statute bill to pass. – Counselor education programs need to be accredited through CACREP. NASW will lobby for bill passage. – *Jim will track*
- 6. Need for effective communication with consumers of services – *NASW Ohio Chapter provided revised language for our online consumer brochure.*
- 7. How to encourage peer consultation – *possible CE courses*
- 8. How to review CEUs differently in light of the July visits – *each Professional Standards Committee needs to discuss*

Discussion of investigation liaison and how to reduce licensee error got Ms. Cooper thinking and she proposed an incentive for licensees to engage in peer consultation. Licensees who at renewal indicate they are in a peer consultation relationship would get a sticker of recognition to put on their wall certificate. There was much discussion around other ways to enhance peer consultation. Mr. Rough was asked to reach out to other boards concerning their experience in this area.

Mr. Rough discussed having completed a Workforce Plan and met with the governor’s office personnel to discuss the board’s status. The biggest issue is cross training staff to cover many of the things that Mr. Rough does.

Mr. Rough discussed the five year rule review rules that will be on the agenda in November for review by each professional standards committee.

Ms. Knerr raised an issue of a MFT setting up a private practice with a very nice website, but nowhere did it list her supervisor or that she was working under supervision. We need to discuss appropriate advertising when working under supervision.

Meeting adjourned at 8:56 a.m.

Board Chair



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

CEU Committee Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2013

Chairperson, Dr. Chrissy Jungers, LPCC, at the LeVeque Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH, convened the CEU committee meeting of the Board at 11:03 a.m. on September 19, 2013.

Members present were Dr. Alan Demmitt, IMFT and Ms. Erin Michel, LSW. Staff present: Mr. James Rough, Executive Director, Ms. Rhonda Franklin, Renewal Coordinator, Ms. Patricia Miller, Continuing Education Coordinator, and Ms. Paula Broome, Audit Coordinator.

1. Approve agenda and minutes from May – committee noted Ms. Knerr had appointed Dr. Demmitt to the committee and they needed to elect a new chair. Dr. Jungers volunteered and was duly elected. The committee approved minutes and agenda.
2. Ms. Broome's report on CE audits. Issues with programs and providers for committee review. Ms. Broome provided her report noting eight providers who had errors on certificates and follow up action by them to correct their errors, which included: missing names, no dates on certificate, handwritten approvals, using wrong provider number, passed out blank certificates, advertised false information, sponsoring agency missing and CE not related to licensure.
3. Mr. Rough was contacted by JCARR during rule filing process and filed rule 4757-9-04 "To-Be-Refiled".
Ms. McCloud reported at the May meeting on discussions with JCARR executive director, who anticipated an implementation of a quality based process instead of a word count, would be better received. In order to do this, we would need to review each text based program. The text based programs have questions that require answers that live presentations do not have. A possible good quality standard would be citations to research in peer-reviewed journals and evidence based practices. The committee discussed these issues and also discussed maybe all CEUs through distance learning was not the best option.
Attached are reviews of some programs as examples with costs for reviews, which are based on the following standard: **Trainings shall be based on published "research" in "peer-reviewed" journals with citations to the journals or**

appropriate government published documents, such as by Center for Disease Control, National Institute of Health, U.S. Surgeon General, etc.

The committee asked that staff and/or the assistant attorney general review existing rules to see if we could deny courses that were deemed unsatisfactory for quality without a change to the existing rules.

Rules 4757-9-01, 02, 03 & 05 require that programs meet specific content areas for each profession. However, we do not have anything that specifies quality of programs nor appropriate hours awarded. We do not see any existing language that would allow us to deny a program for poor quality or awarding more hours than appropriate in our current rules. The committee had lengthy discussion of options and the issues involved. Mr. Rough and staff will draft rule changes to address these issues for review at the next meeting.

4. Several continuing education issues from Ms. Miller.
 - a. Mr. Polovick requested the Committee review a booklet of home study programs by CME, approval was granted by both NASW National and ASWB. Mr. Polovick felt the programs did not meet the Board's standard. Mr. Rough and Ms. Miller will send a letter to NASW National and ASWB asking for their criteria for approving the programs.
 - b. Ms. Miller requested the committee review two specific advocacy programs, both were approved.
 - c. Ms. Miller reminded the committee when denying a program or provider a specific reason must be given. In a recent denial of provider status a specific reason was not given making it difficult to write a notice of a hearing.
 - d. Ms. Miller received a letter of appeal from an expired provider who continued to offer programs seven months past their expiration. The agency was requesting to not have to wait one year before re-applying for provider status. The committee denied the request.
 - e. A program from INR was in question because of the presenter's credentials, the committee approved the request.

Committee adjourned at 12:11 p.m.

Dr. Chrissy Jungers, LPCC
CEU Committee Chair

Minutes of Investigative Liaison Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 1:00 pm

Board Members Present: Tim Brady, Charlie Knerr, Mary Venrick, and Maureen Cooper

Staff Present: Bill Hegarty, Tammy Tingle, Tracey Hosom, and Margaret-Ann Adorjan

Margaret-Ann discussed the inputs she had received from the monitors on the proposed monitoring contract that she had sent out to them. The Committee had previously received and reviewed the draft copy of this contract. The Committee felt that the inputs from the monitors with regard to expectations and goals were good and these ideas would be inputted into a revised monitoring contract.

Margaret-Ann will e-mail the Committee Board members the revised monitoring contract before the November Board meeting so that the Committee can meet then to hopefully finalize this.



Bill Hegarty
Deputy Director



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

September 11, 2013

Executive Director's Report

Board Meeting Dates and Rooms

Thursday September 19, 2013

Executive Committee – Executive Director's Office at 8:15 a.m.

CPSC – SWPSC Conference Room – 9:00 a.m. Hearing at 9:15 a.m.

SWPSC – CPSC Conference Room – 9:00 a.m.

MFTPSC – Conference Room – 9:00 a.m.

CEU Committee – Executive Director's Office – 11:00 a.m.

Investigative Liaison Committee – Bill's Office – 1:00 p.m.

Friday September 20, 2013

CPSC – SWPSC Conference Room – 9:00 a.m.

SWPSC – CPSC Conference Room – 9:00 a.m.

MFTPSC - Conference Room – 9:00 a.m.

Board Meeting – LeVeque Tower 15th Floor Petroleum Board – 1:00 p.m.

Issues to Discuss

Full Board Issues:

The following Board positions need new appointments, which have not been made: Two appointments are for Tommie Robertson's and Bob Nelson's positions. I also sent a list of the three counselor positions up for re-appointment this October.

Name	Type	Home Town	Expiration	1st or 2nd Appt
Vacant	MFT		10/10/12	
Vacant	LISW		10/10/13	
Maureen Cooper	C	North Canton	10/10/13	2nd
Terri Hamm	C	North Canton	10/10/13	2nd
Otha Gilyard	P	Columbus	10/10/13	2nd full term

I have been in consistent contact with the Governor's office concerning these appointments.

Site Visits & Planning Meeting:

Please review the minutes of the discussion of our July outreach meetings and the discussion following for action items. Letters with Proclamations for our visit arrangers were sent to the heads of each of the three entities whom board and staff members visited in July.

Legislation:

Rep. Sears introduced HB-232 on July 17. I have a meeting scheduled with her for October 3 to review these final, I hope, amendments. See attached letter with prior requests.

I worked with PCSAO, Public Children Services Association of Ohio, and reached agreement to amend the existing bill as follows:

Amendment Request 1

- The current language under 4757.41(A) page 167, explains that the chapter does not apply to the following:

(12) A case worker employed by a public children services agency under section 5153.112 of the Revised Code.

PCSAO request an amendment that states:

(12) An unlicensed ~~A~~ caseworker employed by a public children services agency under section 5153.112 of the Revised Code.

Amendment Request 2

- PCSAO would like language added to 4757.41 stating:
(E) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to require public children services agencies to hire licensed social workers.

I worked with CACREP and Ohio Rehabilitation Counselor Association to reflect the affiliation agreement between CACREP and Council on Rehabilitation Education, (CORE), to institute a new CACREP accreditation program for rehabilitation counselors. There is ongoing discussion about the CACREP accredited addictions study and marriage and family standards, which are changing under proposed CACREP 2016 updated standards. I asked three Ohio professors with detailed CACREP experience to provide feedback on this issue.

- Under 4757.22 & 4757.23 revise to read as follows:
(2) To meet the requirement of division (B)(1)(b) of this section, a graduate degree in counseling obtained from a mental health counseling program in this state after January 1, 2018, must be from a counseling program accredited by the council for accreditation of counseling and related educational programs.
(3) A graduate degree in counseling from a clinical mental health counseling program or a clinical rehabilitation counseling program accredited by the council for accreditation of counseling and related educational programs meets the educational requirements of division (B)(1)(c) of this section.

I also worked with Ohio Rehabilitation Counselor Association and Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission on the following amendments to the statute to allow CRCs to call themselves counselors outside of RSC settings, if they are certified by CRCC:

- Under 4757.41(A)
(11) A vocational rehabilitation counseling professional who is providing rehabilitation counseling services to individuals under section 3304.17 of the Revised Code, or who has a national rehabilitation counseling certification granted by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification, (CRCC) who is providing rehabilitation counseling services

consistent with the recognized scope of practice, standards, and ethics of the rehabilitation counseling profession as established and regulated by CRCC.

Budget:

The FY 2013 is almost complete with a few bills yet to be received and/or paid.
The FY 2014 is progressing well as shown in our reports.

Ohio Administrative Code changes ~ Rules:

Five Year Rule Review – September 2012

Two rules were delayed from final filing due to issues raised and only one needs discussion by the professional standards committees as noted:

CEU Committee & each professional standards committee– the 10,000 word requirement added to 4757-9-04, Clock hours for continuing professional education. We received comments from the JCARR, Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review, chair and vice-chair on rule 4757-9-04 paragraph (D) the 10,000 words per hour discussion. They were very clear that they considered the rule to have adverse impact. See paragraph below. The CE Committee needs to review the rule and provide feedback to professional standards committees and possible discussion at the full board meeting on Friday.

Public member Stephanie McCloud had several discussions with the director of JCARR. They inquired about a more substantive review of all home study courses for quality and number of hours to be earned. There are 44 current providers who offer an unknown quantity of home study courses and 85 existing individually approved programs. I asked several counselors and a social worker to review some courses to get a feel for the time, effort and cost to have courses reviewed. I will provide that feedback to the CEU Committee.

- When JCARR receives a rule that has an adverse impact and has been reviewed by the CSI, JCARR will analyze the rule’s regulatory intent and determine if adverse impact on business is justifiable. If in the analysis it is determined the regulatory intent is not justified (new prong – reason to invalidate), the JCARR Committee will vote to make a recommendation to create a concurrent resolution to invalidate the rule.

Rule 4757-9-05 “Approval of continuing professional education programs required for renewal of licenses and certificates of registration issued by the board” (rule that sets requirements for CE programs, CE providers, and other details of CE), changes concerning NASW approval have been resolved by the Social Worker PSC.

I plan to file 4757-9-05 after the board meeting along with some other rule changes that are needed.

Five Year Rule Review – September 2014

The following rules need to be reviewed for next year and will be provided in detail at the meeting.

4757-01-02	Notice of board meetings	9/20/2014
4757-01-04	Applications of first licensure	9/20/2014
4757-01-05	License fees	9/20/2014
4757-01-07	Fines	9/20/2014
4757-03-01	Definitions	9/20/2014
4757-03-02	Abbreviations and titles	9/20/2014
4757-05-10	Standards of ethical practice and professional conduct: reporting unethical actions	6/11/2014
4757-05-11	Standards of ethical practice and professional conduct: change of name	6/11/2014

	and/or address	
4757-06-01	Reports prepared for court review	9/20/2014
4757-06-02	Summary suspension	9/20/2014
4757-07-01	Renewal of license or certificate of registration	9/20/2014
4757-07-02	Practice with expired license or certificate of registration is prohibited	9/20/2014
4757-09-01	CE requirements for renewal of a MFT or IMFT license	9/20/2014
4757-09-05	Approval of CPE programs required for renewal of licenses issued by the board	9/20/2014
4757-09-06	Sources of continuing professional education	9/20/2014
4757-09-07	Documentation of CPE required for renewal of a license or certificate of registration	9/20/2014
4757-11-01	Denial and disciplinary action for licenses or certificates of registration	9/20/2014
4757-11-02	Impaired practitioner rules	9/20/2014
4757-25-01	Education requirements for admission to the examination for MFT	9/20/2014
4757-25-02	Marriage and family therapist examination policy	9/20/2014
4757-25-03	Requirements for licensure as a marriage and family therapist	9/20/2014
4757-25-04	Requirements for licensure as an independent marriage and family therapist	9/20/2014
4757-25-05	Temporary marriage and family therapist license	9/20/2014
4757-25-06	Endorsement of a marriage and family therapist license	9/20/2014
4757-25-07	Approval of applications for marriage and family therapist licenses	9/20/2014
4757-27-01	Scope of practice of a marriage and family therapist	4/10/2014
4757-27-02	Scope of practice of an independent marriage and family therapist	4/10/2014
4757-29-01	Marriage and family therapy supervision	4/10/2014

ODMH Rule 5122-29-30 – Medicaid Billable Services – ODMH is now OMHAS – Ohio Mental Health & Addiction Services – merger of ODADAS & ODMH

ODMH filed a change to add CPST service under the approved services billable by licensed MFTs & IMFTs without using the “QMHS” title.

There is an outstanding issue with getting the Medicaid agreement with Ohio amended under the CMS agreement to include MFTs.

Licensure application issue: The staff has amended the questions for approval or as approved for each professional standards committee. The MFTPSC needs to review the charged, arrested or convicted question. See attached AAG memo distributed at the last board meeting.

Chemical Dependency Board – rule change

The Chemical Dependency Board has a draft rule to add the treatment of gambling disorders and forwarded a copy for our information.

(F)“Gambling disorder” means a persistent and recurring maladaptive gambling behavior that is classified in accepted nosologies, including the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders and the international classification of diseases, and in editions of those nosologies published after the effective date of this section.

OIT, Office of Information Technology, recommendation for Agency Emails

Attached is a guideline for emails with sensitive information. Each board and staff member needs to read and ensure they understand proper use of email when sensitive data is included. I will discuss this at the full board meeting.

Insurance Navigators

No letter about the insurance Navigator rule we discussed at July's board meeting is needed. I talked with JCARR who put me in touch with the right person at Ohio Department of Insurance (ODI). They are interpreting paragraph (F)(1) "Licensed health care provider..." as including all health related licensees in Ohio.

But there is a caution; it is not an exemption to recommend any plan, but to encourage clients to go to a licensed insurance navigator or insurance agent to get enrolled. Should the licensee recommend a plan that could result in a complaint, if there is a bad economic result due to that recommendation.

ACA Ethics Code Revision is out for Review

Attached is a written response with several sections noted on pages 2 & 3. There is new language on the following that Bill and I think should be reviewed for addition to our ethics rules. Please see attached document. We would appreciate feedback from each committee.

1. **Supervisee-Supervisor Relationships**
2. **Student-Educator Relationships**

Executive Director Work Plan: review the results of the Planning Meeting and issues for future resolution. Below issues are based on the outcome of the 2012 planning meeting. I will review these issues with any new ones with the Executive Committee in September.

1. Cultural competency/diversity – need for counselors' and MFTs' association ethics codes to have citations to become part of our ethics code in paragraph (G) of 4757-5-02.
2. Growth of MFTs
3. Need for an "S" status for MFTs
4. Need for Investigator liaison training – CLEAR, AG's Office
5. Importance for statute bill to pass
6. Need for effective communication with consumers of services
7. How to encourage peer consultation
8. How to review CEUs differently in light of the July visits

Sincerely,

James R. Rough
Executive Director



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

AGENDA

September 20, 2013

1. Discussion of Agenda
2. Election of chair of the Board for this fiscal year - 2014
3. Approval of Minutes of May 17, 2013 Board Meeting
4. Executive Director's Report
5. Deputy Director's Report
6. Legal Update
7. Marriage and Family Therapist Professional Standards Committee Report
8. Counselor Professional Standards Committee Report
9. Social Work Professional Standards Committee Report
10. Standing Committee Reports
 - a. Executive Committee
 - b. Continuing Education Committee
 - c. Investigative Liaison Committee
11. Old Business
 - a. Off-site planning meeting future agenda items
 - b. Rule 4757-9-04 – CEU words per hour requirement or quality
12. New Business
13. Chairman Comments



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

STATE OF OHIO

COUNSELOR, SOCIAL WORKER AND MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPIST BOARD

July 19, 2013

Chairperson, Ms. Mary Venrick, at the LeVeque Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH, convened the regular meeting of the Board at 1:00 P.M. on July 19, 2013. Dr. Terri Hamm, Dr. Otha Gilyard, Mr. Timothy Brady, Dr. Christin Jungers, Ms. Margaret Knerr, Dr. Thomas McGloshen, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Ms. Stephanie McCloud, Ms. Maureen Cooper and Mr. Alan Demmitt. Absent: Mr. Steve Polovick and Ms. Erin Michel. Staff present: Mr. James Rough, Mr. William Hegarty, Ms. Patricia Miller, Ms. Tracey Hosom, Mr. Andy Miller and Mr. Doug Warne.

Also present: Mr. Jim Lockwood, AAG

Ms. Venrick welcomed new board member Mr. Alan Demmitt, IMFT, PCC-S, to the Board and to the Marriage and Family Therapist Professional Standards Committee.

I. Discussion and approval of agenda.

Dr. McGloshen nominated Ms. Venrick for another term as Board Chair, Ms. Knerr seconded, Dr. Gilyard moved to close the nominations, Ms. Brunner seconded. Unanimously approved. Carried.

II. Dr. Gilyard moved to accept the May 17, 2013, minutes, seconded by Dr. Jungers. Carried.

III. Executive Director Report presented by Mr. Rough:

Mr. Rough reported:

1. Copy of the report given to each of the Professional Standard Committees will be attached to the minutes.
2. Good comments were received on each of the site visits. Discussion of future retreats and incorporating board issues is needed. Mr. Rough will reflect his work plan on each meeting agenda.

3. SWPSC discussed removing the arrested section on the application to be in accordance with statute changes. Discussion on how to change the form and take out the expunged record question.
4. HB 232 posted on legislative website, Mr. Rough will write a summary of HB 232.
5. 4757.41 Civil Service, not sure if change requested has been made will add link to our website.
6. CPSC did not understand the e-mail sent by Mr. Rough on Applied Behavior Analysis, will re-write and re-send.
7. The budget is in good shape. Lack of board members, and not many hearings left extra funds in the budget. A new scanner was purchased. Discussed revenue increase due to fees added.
8. Discussed licensee report and the increase in number of licensees.
9. Staff working well and the new phone system is also going well. Appreciate everyone's efforts.
10. Mr. Robertson was not present to receive his recognition of service plaque. Mr. Rough and Dr. McGloshen went to Cincinnati to present him the proclamation. Mr. Robertson is doing well and misses everyone.
11. Dr. McGloshen asked if the licensure report would help in cases when it's hard to find a certain type of licensee, Mr. Rough stated the problem is more finding licensees to do the type of work needed. Mr. Rough will touch base with schools and the VA.

IV. Investigative Report presented by Mr. Hegarty:

Mr. Hegarty reported:

1. There are forty-five new cases.
2. The department has traveled for a large number of cases.
3. Twenty-five renewal issues found with the audits.
4. A total of eighteen social work licenses were revoked or surrendered.
5. Most complaints came out of Toledo.
6. Thanked the liaisons: Ms. Venrick, Mr. Brady and Ms. Cooper. Also thanked staff: Ms. Hosom and Ms. Tingle.
7. A counselor denial hearing will take place in September.

V. Legal Update presented by Mr. Lockwood:

1. Distributed a memo on moral character stating whether the Board can determine if an individual lacks good moral character on the basis of having been arrested or charged with a crime, the answer is no.
2. The case involving Ms. Jill Pritchitt was favorably won but Ms. Pritchitt appealed to the 10th District Court of Appeals. Should have more to report in a couple months.

3. Dr. Hamm asked if the statement that other states have less rules would have an impact in the Pritchitt case. Mr. Rough said no, it would not have relevancy in Ohio.

VI. Social Work Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Mr. Brady:

Mr. Brady reported:

1. The SWPSC re-elected Mr. Polovick as Committee Chair.
2. Approved one hundred and forty- eight LISW, four hundred and ten LSW and twenty- one SWA applications. Two hundred and ten LISW's, one thousand three-hundred LSW and one hundred and two SWA applications are pending. There are seven thousand five hundred and fifty-seven active LISW's, fifteen thousand five-hundred and six LSW's and five hundred ninety SWA's in active status.
3. Reviewed supervision audits.
4. NASW gave a report which included the topic of Insurance Navigators. Ms. Brunner stated NASW is requesting the board submit testimony to support Insurance Navigators in the nursing home setting be exempt from the law. Ms. McCloud asked what qualifies one as an Insurance Navigator. Navigators have a vital role in helping consumers prepare electronic and paper applications to establish eligibility and enroll in coverage for an insurance affordability program. They provide outreach and education to raise awareness and refer consumers to health insurance assistance. Since the Board is not clear on what an Insurance Navigator qualifications or responsibilities are a decision cannot be made as of yet. Insurance Navigator's are limited to public employees; social workers are currently not allowed to give out the information on insurance. Ms. Brunner requested Mr. Rough write a letter to JCARR, if possible and she would make some calls.
5. Provider discussion.
6. Requested an evaluation.
7. Denied one hardship request and had one Goldman Hearing.

VII. Marriage and Family Therapist Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Ms. Knerr:

Ms. Knerr reported:

1. Ms. Knerr was elected Committee Chair and thanked her committee.
2. Thanked Ms. Adorjan for her hard work.
3. Welcomed new board member Mr. Demmitt and his great input.
4. Approved one IMFT and four MFT applications.
5. Discussed forms for supervision evaluation.

6. Discussed time at the site visit. It was good to have Mr. Warne on the visit and to have Ms. Hosom and Mr. Hegarty take part in the discussion afterwards.
7. Temporary license possibility discussed.
8. Ms. Adorjan is putting a board member training manual together.
9. Dr. McGloshen added it was good to have staff, Ms. Miller, Mr. Lund and Ms. Adorjan at the sites to answer questions.

VIII. Counselor Professional Standards Committee Report was presented by Ms. Cooper:

Ms. Cooper reported:

1. Ms. Cooper was re-elected as Committee Chair.
2. Approved fifty-eight PCC and one hundred and eighty-two PC and five hundred and fifty CT applications.
3. Discussed correspondence.
4. Closed ten cases.
5. Approved four consent agreements, several surrendered their license.
6. Discussed supervision.
7. Good trip to the site, glad to have Ms. Franklin to answer questions on post-requests for continuing education. Only saw a few counselors, mostly in the administrative roles.

IX. Committee Reports

Executive Committee

Reported in Mr. Rough's report.

CEU Committee – Ms. Knerr

No meeting was held.

Investigations Ad Hoc Committee

No Report

X. Old Business:

1. After the retreat discussed any suggestions for changes with the Board.
2. Dr. McGloshen stated traveling to a site was a good experience.
3. Mr. Brady brought up the question, is the Board licensing as many people as they should and are people doing social work licensed.

4. Dr. Jungers felt the site visit was a good idea and hopes to do it again, also a good public relation idea. Not a lot of changes heard from the VA regarding the Board. Some comments on the website.
5. Dr. Hamm enjoyed the site visit and talked about the new legislation for counselors and MFT's to be hired. Also discussed making Universities CACREP as a positive step. Mr. Rough said if a student did not graduate from a CACREP school then they were not eligible to work at the VA. Dr. Hamm stated when the rule became effective an employee at the VA had to be let go because they did not graduate from a CACREP school.
6. Dr. Gilyard thanked Mr. Polovick for coordinating the trip to the sites, wonderful job. Mr. Rough commented the idea of the site trips was entirely Mr. Polovicks. Dr. Gilyard would like to visit sites again in the future. Important that staff attended the site visits too. Received some good comments on Mr. Hegarty.
7. Mr. Demmitt added some comments on the impact of online courses. Also asked, if more complaints are received from online programs versus live programs.
8. Ms. McCloud stated she is okay with the way reciprocity is handled with the Board, no issues and lower cost CEU's.
9. Ms. Brunner felt the site visits were beneficial, the VA appreciated the Board visiting. Did request our website be more accessible. Requested considering interns from OSU to be used to write information videos for the Board. Dr. Gilyard commented to also take interns from other schools.
10. Ms. Knerr reported MFT's are hired at Southeast.
11. Ms. Cooper was impressed with the peer consultation with staff and the staff getting licensees more involved with peer consultation. Licensees need to be more aware of legislation.
12. Ms. Hosom will write an article on peer consultation, this will be good for a licensee out in the field the last twenty or thirty years, who do they consult with.
13. Ms. Venrick was impressed, made her more aware when approving programs and to be more open minded about medical issues. Asked about the newsletter coming back.
14. Mr. Rough will draft a response to JCARR from the CEU Committee and send it to Ms. McCloud for feedback. Ms. McCloud commented about limiting the number of ceu's permitted by home study.

XI. New Business:

1. Mr. Rough reminded everyone that the reimbursement for mileage has increased from .45 to .52, effective August 1, 2013.

Ms. Venrick thanked everyone for re-electing her as Board Chair. Also reported she will be traveling with Mr. Rough to NBCC in a few weeks. She reminded everyone to leave quietly.

XII. Adjourned: 3:00 PM

Mary Venrick, PC, Board Chair

DRAFT



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
<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

STATE OF OHIO

COUNSELOR, SOCIAL WORKER AND MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPIST BOARD

July 18, 2013

Chairperson, Ms. Mary Venrick, at the LeVeque Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH, convened the retreat meeting of the Board at 1:10 P.M. on July 18, 2013. Mr. Steven Polovick, Dr. Terri Hamm, Dr. Otha Gilyard, Mr. Timothy Brady, Dr. Christin Jungers, Ms. Margaret Knerr, Dr. Thomas McGloshen, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Ms. Stephanie McCloud, Ms. Maureen Cooper and Dr. Alan Demmitt. Absent: Ms. Erin Michel. Staff present: Mr. James Rough, Mr. William Hegarty, Mr. Doug Warne and Ms. Tracey Hosom. Others Present: Danielle Smith, NASW-OH director, Courtney Diener and Brandon Barcus, NASW interns

Mary Venrick opened the meeting and welcomed Alan Demmitt to the Board. She turned the meeting over to Steve Polovick who set up the visits for the Board members from 9 a.m. to Noon at Southeast, Inc., the Veterans Administration, and Children's Hospital – main campus. Steve said this was a way for the Board to get out into the community and hear the concerns of the licensees.

Steve said that at Children's Hospital the group met with management and social workers and LPCCs. There were also smaller group tours. They talked to social workers, physicians, nurses, and physical therapists. They met with the front line social workers. This was a positive experience. The staff commented on the ethics training provided by Bill Hegarty and Tammy Tingle. The staff there enjoys their work and Children's only hires master's level clinicians.

Tom McGloshen reported that his group went to the VA and met with the Chief of Social Work Services. They employ 65 social workers and no counselors or MFTs at the moment. This is an outpatient service provider. The Cleveland VA hires 175 social workers and there are also VA clinics in Dayton, Cincinnati and Chillicothe. Chillicothe has an inpatient unit. Tom said they met with about 20 social workers. They were energized and cohesive. Their group also sat in on a teleconference meeting with the majority of the other VA directors in the state. They seemed very supportive of the Board and mentioned Tammy Tingle's ethics trainings.

Charlie Knerr reported on her group going to Southeast, Inc. This is a community mental health clinic and their staff goes all over the city. They also have an art gallery which features art from clients. They have high case loads and a lot of documentation requirements. They are a primary health facility and have a hearing impaired division. They split up into separate teams. This was a great experience and a great use of time.

It was reported that Children's had great pay and benefits and so had limited turnover of staff. Southeast reported that they lose people to the VA since the VA has less productivity requirements and more money for staff. Children's and the VA offer CEUs in house for free for staff. Southeast reported that they provide CEUs, but it tends to get repetitive. They would like to see some reasonably priced but challenging CEUs. Southeast also hoped that licensure for West Virginia under reciprocity or endorsement would be allowed or improved.

There was discussion about telecommunications with families/clients that are in other states. There was a need to be allowed to practice when clients are in the other states but then jurisdictional problems arise. As more and more is being done over the internet, this may be a problem.

Some of the community mental health agencies have unionized - Columbus Area as an example.

There is confusion over what case management is and is not as some times licensed social workers are required to do this, and other times non-licensed individuals can do the work.

Many of the Southeast employees have associates degrees. Southeast has a full health care center. Their pharmacy is for-profit. They also have a job program/training service and offer placement service for clients. There is competition among the community mental health agencies as they compete for money and clients.

There was a discussion of the ADAMH services and funding. The Franklin County Drug Court can track clients to a certain degree. There is also a Veteran's Court that assists the individuals getting services through the VA.

Ms. Cooper brought up the value of group supervision and maybe there should be a mandated peer review requirement established. Would this be something that CEUs for group and peer supervision be given? Could the Board regionalize and facilitate peer review meetings. Could the Board mandate that a portion of the 30 CEU hours be in peer review? There would be a need to differentiate peer review from supervision.

Board members broadened their view of the scope of CEUs – there is need to be more flexible in approving CEUS. There have been CEU programs that have been denied that maybe should have been allowed.

Social workers tend to be the mediators among staff on interdisciplinary teams.

Children's has a good support system for stressful environments – use of chaplains, etc.

There was discussion from the hosts on the Board's actions:

1. Some found the Board's website comprehensive while others found it difficult to navigate.
2. The e-mail list serve is a good thing.
3. There is concern on the discussed changes around when social workers could test for their independent license.
4. Social work licensing is going well.
5. Appreciate that renewal fees have not increased.
6. There is a rumor that the Board is going to crack down on scopes of practice issues.
7. Concern over CEU programs that are really open houses for nursing homes

It was reported that the VA is now hoping to hire LPCCs and MFTs. There needs to be strong affiliations with associations. There were positive responses from all three sites. There was desire for training on the aspect of gate-keeping for the professions.

Send appreciation certificates to the three hosts.

XII. Adjourned: 2:42 PM

Mary Venrick, PC, Board Chair

Rough, Jim

To: Angles, Christopher
Subject: RE: IT Recommendations for Forwarding Email

From: Calderone, William
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 10:40 AM
Subject: Forwarding Email

Dear Colleagues,

Since there have been numerous questions regarding *"Forwarding Email"*, the [DAS/OIT Office of Information Security & Privacy](#) has established the following guidelines and/or best practices to address these concerns.

Additional information or clarification requests should be directed to the following:

Daren Arnold	David Brown
Chief Privacy Officer	Chief Information Security Officer
State of Ohio	State of Ohio
chief.privacy.officer@oit.ohio.gov	State.CISO@OIT.ohio.gov

Respectfully –

Bill Calderone

Bill Calderone, ITS Infrastructure Manager
614.995.1057



External Email Communication in General

First, we don't and can't restrict agencies with regard to what information they can or cannot send through email to individuals outside of state government. That determination, based on risk, compliance and business need, is solely left to each agency. BUT, if sensitive data is in an email, then there is state policy that says the sensitive data must be properly secured.

State policy – [IT Bulletin ITB-2007.02, Data Encryption and Securing Sensitive Data](#) – requires that if an agency intends to send sensitive data through the Internet including email, it must be properly secured, primarily through adequate encryption. Email as it's typically sent over the Internet is not secure. It's been compared to a postcard that is written in pencil and sent through the mail – anyone along the line can read or even change it although the likelihood of the latter is low. Therefore, for public records and similar low-risk information, standard Internet email is fine, but email containing sensitive data needs to be encrypted. The bulletin explains what data is "sensitive data."

As far as receiving sensitive data in email from people outside state government, it can't be prevented in many cases. However, agencies should never mandate or encourage members of the public to use unsecure email to submit sensitive data. Instead, alternative means, such as submission of sensitive data through a secure web application, should be made available. In fact, agencies should actively discourage the use of email for sensitive data, because it creates a risk exposure to the agency.

Internal Email Communication in General

Email that is sent or received completely within the State's email system is not exposed to the Internet and has a reduced risk profile. Agency employees should still use caution when sending sensitive data internally over the state's email system. For example, employees should take care to ensure that the right information is sent to the right individual. Encrypting particularly sensitive data in the form of attachments can eliminate some of the risk of unintentional disclosures even internally. Finally, there may be some types of data that are governed by laws that require very strong security controls.

Mixing Internal and External Email Systems for Internal Communication

First, the state is moving to a consolidated email environment. As a starting point then, the expectation is that agencies will use state email as their email service. Then, any scenarios that entail the use of personal email for state business should be few, if any. We would urge caution before an agency engages in a practice that would mix the use of the state email service with personal email services.

Generally, speaking in terms of security and privacy risks, sensitive state data may not be transferred to a personal device or service. Therefore, a scenario in which a personal email account ends up with sensitive state data is prohibited by state policy. Furthermore, the table below outlines the benefits using state email as compared to non-state email for agency business.

When they use state agency email:	When non-state email is used
Records are kept properly and are readily retrievable, including public records disclosure, discovery, auditing, accountability, history/continuity.	Records are much less likely to be properly maintained, and if they are retained, they are more difficult to retrieve.
Reply and forwarded emails and any other follow-up email conversations are retained within the system.	Because the user is in the personal email system, there is the tendency to reply, forward and have follow-up conversations from within that personal email system. The result is that the agency loses control to manage those records independent of the individual user.
Access to view and send is limited to the authorized user.	Security often is not as strong and other individuals (spouses, family, co-workers/employees and even hackers) can gain access to view or send without authorization.
Encryption functionality can be added on for those who regularly send sensitive data.	Typically, encryption is not available as a function of the email service.
The co-mingling of the user's own personal data is limited, if at all, and it's usually clear to the user, due policies, context, etc., that the state agency may review anything that's in its email system so that the user understands that any of his or her own information in the system is also subject to review.	When an individual starts using a personal account for state business, he or she faces a number of privacy risks. The individual's email account may be subject to inspect by the inspector general or law enforcement. The account may be subject to electronic discovery requests.
The "from" address shows the user is acting in a	The "from" address leaves ambiguity as to whether the

state capacity.

sender is speaking in the role of a government official/employee. Users are prone to communicate

Therefore, agencies should not regularly use practices that encourage internal agency users to leverage personal email services for work purposes. Practices in which employees are regularly emailed at home or where an Outlook rule automatically forwards email to a home account should be avoided. There are a number of alternatives that can provide the access to email that is desired. For example, there is the availability to access state email over the web. Agencies needing to interact with employees may provide smartphones with email access to the employees. Or if the employee agrees, there are even technical solutions that allow state email to be securely accessed on personal mobile devices but still be managed and kept separate from personal data on the device.



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

<http://cswmft.ohio.gov> & cswmft.info@cswb.state.oh.us

April 24, 2013

American Counseling Association
Ethics Revision Task Force
5999 Stevenson Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22304

RE: ACA 2014 Code of Ethics

Dear ACA Ethics Revision Task Force,

The Counselor Professional Standards Committee (CPSC) of the Ohio Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board provides the following input. The CPSC under statute section 4757.04 has the authority to speak for the board on issues solely related to professional counseling.

The CPSC applauds the language in sections F.3.b. Sexual Relationships: and F.10.a. Sexual or Romantic Relationships: of the revised ACA Code of Ethics. The CPSC believes the standard for former clients should be... "sex with a former client is never appropriate." We note that the Association of Social Work Boards model law states: "A social worker who has provided clinical social work services to a client shall not engage in or request sexual contact as defined in Part 5, Subpart 5, with the former client under any circumstances."

Should you have any questions, you may write me, call 614-752-5161 or email me at jim.rough@cswb.state.oh.us.

Sincerely,

James R. Rough
Executive Director

Client-Counselor Relationship

A.5.d. Potentially Beneficial Interactions

When a counselor–client nonprofessional interaction with a client or former client may be potentially beneficial to the client or former client, the counselor must document in case records, prior to the interaction (when feasible), the rationale for such an interaction, the potential benefit, and anticipated consequences for the client or former client and other individuals significantly involved with the client or former client. Such interactions should be initiated with appropriate client consent. Where unintentional harm occurs to the client or former client, or to an individual significantly involved with the client or former client, due to the nonprofessional interaction, the counselor must show evidence of an attempt to remedy such harm. Examples of potentially beneficial interactions include, but are not limited to, attending a formal ceremony (e.g., a wedding/commitment ceremony or graduation); purchasing a service or product provided by a client or former client (excepting unrestricted bartering); hospital visits to an ill family member; mutual membership in a professional association, organization, or community.

Supervisee-Supervisor Relationships

F.3.e. Potentially Beneficial Relationships

Counseling supervisors are aware of the power differential in their relationships with supervisees. If they believe nonprofessional relationships with a supervisee may be potentially beneficial to the supervisee, they take precautions similar to those taken by counselors when working with clients. Examples of potentially beneficial interactions or relationships include attending a formal ceremony; hospital visits; providing support during a stressful event; or mutual membership in a professional association, organization, or community. Counseling supervisors engage in open discussions with supervisees when they consider entering into relationships with them outside of their roles as clinical and/or administrative supervisors. Before engaging in nonprofessional relationships, supervisors discuss with supervisees and document the rationale for such interactions, potential benefits or drawbacks, and anticipated consequences for the supervisee. Supervisors clarify the specific nature and limitations of the additional role(s) they will have with the supervisee.

Student-Educator Relationships

F.10.f. Potentially Beneficial Relationships

Counselor educators are aware of the power differential in the relationship between faculty and students. If they believe a nonprofessional relationship with a student may be potentially beneficial to the student, they take precautions similar to those taken by counselors when working with clients. Examples of potentially beneficial interactions or relationships include, but are not limited to, attending a formal ceremony; hospital visits; providing support during a stressful event; or mutual membership in a professional association, organization, or community. Counselor educators engage in open discussions with students when they consider entering into relationships with students outside of their roles as teachers and supervisors. They discuss with

students the rationale for such interactions, the potential benefits and drawbacks, and the anticipated consequences for the student. Educators clarify the specific nature and limitations of the additional role(s) they will have with the student prior to engaging in a nonprofessional relationship. Nonprofessional relationships with students should be time-limited and initiated with student consent.

Reference

American Counseling Association (2005). *ACA code of ethics*. Retrieved 4/11/13 from

<http://www.counseling.org/Resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf>

CSW - # of Cred by Prefix and Status		
Report generated on 9/11/2013 at 1:10:54 PM		
Prefix	Credential Status	Count
C	ACTIVE	5303
C	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	380
C	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - CE PENDING	3
C	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	58
C	Application Incomplete	94
C	DECEASED	19
C	DENIED	122
C	EXAM PENDING	923
C	EXPIRED	9250
C	FAILED TO RENEW	436
C	FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	8
C	LAPSED	11
C	NEVER LICENSED	397
C	PENDING	545
C	REVOKED	5
C	SURRENDERED	1
C	Surrendered in Lieu of Discipline	10
C	SUSPENDED	5
C	UPGRADE	6864
Credential Prefix Totals		24434
E	ACTIVE	4311
E	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	521
E	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - CE PENDING	1
E	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	89
E	Application Incomplete	71
E	DECEASED	34
E	DENIED	6
E	EXAM PENDING	551
E	EXPIRED	1332
E	FAILED TO RENEW	235
E	FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	4
E	NEVER LICENSED	39
E	PENDING	28
E	REVOKED	14
E	Surrendered in Lieu of Discipline	9
E	SUSPENDED	7
E	UPGRADE	901
Credential Prefix Totals		8153
F	ACTIVE	193
F	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	8
F	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	1
F	Application Incomplete	10
F	DECEASED	4
F	DENIED	1
F	EXAM PENDING	4
F	EXPIRED	36
F	FAILED TO RENEW	18
F	FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	1
F	NEVER LICENSED	5
F	PENDING	11
Credential Prefix Totals		292
I	ACTIVE	7199
I	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	708
I	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	132
I	DECEASED	59
I	DENIED	3
I	EXPIRED	3953
I	FAILED TO RENEW	460
I	LAPSED	1
I	NEVER LICENSED	202
I	PENDING	219
I	REVOKED	14
I	SURRENDERED	1
I	Surrendered in Lieu of Discipline	6

9/11/2013

CSW - # of Active Cred by Prefix and Stat			
Report generated on 9/11/2013 at 1:11:53 PM			
Prefix	Subcat	Credential Status	Count
C		ACTIVE	3265
C		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	354
C		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	52
C		FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	7
C	CR	ACTIVE	1053
C	PROV	ACTIVE	4
C	SUPV	ACTIVE	247
C	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	26
C	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	6
C	TRNE	ACTIVE	667
PC (no CR or CT)			3961
E		ACTIVE	1809
E		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	243
E		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	40
E		FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	2
E	SUPV	ACTIVE	2499
E	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	278
E	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	49
E	SUPV	FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	2
PCC			4922
F		ACTIVE	193
F		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	8
F		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	1
F		FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	1
IMFT			203
I		ACTIVE	2475
I		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	252
I		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	32
I	SUPV	ACTIVE	4723
I	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	455
I	SUPV	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	100
LISW			8037
M		ACTIVE	110
M		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	12
M		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	3
M	TEMP	ACTIVE	1
MFT			126
S		ACTIVE	14005
S		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	1816
S		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	326
S		FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	7
S	TEMP	ACTIVE	2
S	TRNE	ACTIVE	366
LSW (no SWT)			16156
W		ACTIVE	502
W		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	79
W		ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	7
SWA			588
Total			33993

I	SUSPENDED	4
I	UPGRADE	5784
Credential Prefix Totals		18745
M	ACTIVE	112
M	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	12
M	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	3
M	Application Incomplete	37
M	DECEASED	2
M	DENIED	12
M	EXAM PENDING	61
M	EXPIRED	19
M	FAILED TO RENEW	8
M	NEVER LICENSED	30
M	PENDING	18
M	UPGRADE	42
Credential Prefix Totals		356
R	EXPIRED	523
R	REVOKED	2
Credential Prefix Totals		525
S	ACTIVE	14392
S	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	1820
S	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - CE PENDING	2
S	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - INCOMPLETE	1
S	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	326
S	DECEASED	69
S	DENIED	77
S	EXPIRED	20675
S	FAILED TO RENEW	1381
S	FAILED TO RENEW - PAID	8
S	LAPSED	1
S	NEVER LICENSED	1780
S	PENDING	1347
S	REVOKED	86
S	SURRENDERED	3
S	Surrendered in Lieu of Discipline	26
S	SUSPENDED	10
S	UPGRADE	4282
Credential Prefix Totals		46286
W	ACTIVE	503
W	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL	79
W	ACTIVE IN RENEWAL - PAID	7
W	DECEASED	3
W	DENIED	31
W	EXPIRED	1866
W	FAILED TO RENEW	170
W	NEVER LICENSED	131
W	PENDING	95
W	REVOKED	15
W	Surrendered in Lieu of Discipline	3
W	SUSPENDED	1
W	UPGRADE	175
Credential Prefix Totals		3079
Grand Totals		101870