



## ***Counselor, Social Worker & Marriage and Family Therapist Board***

50 West Broad Street, Suite 1175  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5919  
614-466-0912 & Fax 614-728-7790  
www.cswmft.ohio.gov

### **Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes** **Thursday, July 17, 2014**

**Members Present:** Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Steve Polovick, Ms. Mary Venrick

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

**Guests Present:** Ms. Danielle Smith, NASW-OH Executive Director

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

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:22 a.m.

#### **2) Discussion/Approval of the July 17 & 18 Agenda**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed to the Agenda. Ms. Brunner asked to move the NASW CEU discussion from Friday to Thursday. Mr. Warne also asked to add a discussion of a new rule 4757-1-08, which would allow expedited processing for veterans. Mr. Brady moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#### **3) 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. Ms. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2014-22	Competency. Close with strong caution.
2014-79	Competency. Close with no violation.
2014-81	Competency. Close with no violation.
2014-83	Custody issues, Close with caution.
2014-104	Competency Close with no violation.
2014-107	Sexual boundaries. Allegation unsubstantiated.
2014-109	Solicitation of clients. Allegation unsubstantiated.

2014-112 Sexual boundaries. Allegation unsubstantiated.  
2014-118 Competency. Close with no violation.  
2014-122 Repeat audit failure. Close with caution.  
2014-124 Non-sexual boundaries. Close with caution.  
2014-132 Misrepresentation of credentials. Close with caution.  
2014-142 Sexual boundaries, Close as unsubstantiated.

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

2014-43 Custody Dispute. Close with no violation.  
2014-93 Competency. Close with no violation.  
2014-97 Non-sexual boundaries, Close with caution.  
2014-98 Custody issues. Close due to no jurisdiction.  
2014-110 Custody issues. Close with caution.  
2014-114 Competency. Close with no violation.  
2014-117 Sexual boundaries. Close as unsubstantiated.  
2014-120 Conviction. Close with caution.

#### b) Consent Agreements

- a) **Mr. Matthew J. Siekkinen:** Mr. Siekkinen is a licensed social worker. On June 15, 2014, Mr. Siekkinen self-reported that he found himself in a compromised situation and was no longer fit to practice as a social worker. He offered to forfeit his social work license. A boundary violation constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-03. Ms. Siekkinen admits to these statements. The Board will allow him to surrender his social work license in lieu of other potential discipline. This surrender is permanent and precludes him from applying for a license through this Board in the future. Ms. Brunner made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Siekkinen based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- b) **Ms. Joy A. Shakur:** Ms. Shakur is a licensed social worker. During a period of time between April 2012 and April 2013, Ms. Shakur mishandled agency funds in the amount of \$25,967.10. On May 12, 2014, Ms. Shakur entered into a restitution agreement with the Lucas County Prosecutor's Pre-Trial Diversion program whereby she agreed to repay the total amount mishandled. Her actions constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-09(G). Ms. Shakur admits to these allegations. Ms. Shakur's license to practice social work is hereby Reprimanded, and should she fail to comply with her restitution payments, she will also be considered in non-compliance with her consent agreement and may be subject to further discipline from the Board. Mr. Polovick questioned whether the applicant was being allowed to work while the money is repaid; Mr. Hegarty replied that there was no client harm in this case, which is why the discipline is framed in this way. Ms. Brunner motioned to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Shakur based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

- c) **Ms. Andrea F. Stuck:** Ms. Stuck is a licensed independent social worker. The Board received information that while employed at an agency in Worthington, Ohio, Ms. Stuck violated professional boundaries with a client, beginning in July 2009 through November 2010. This action constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-04(D). Ms. Stuck admits to these allegations. The Board will allow Ms. Stuck to retire from the practice of social work effective 9/1/2014, which retirement will be listed as a permanent license surrender in lieu of other potential disciplinary action. Mr. Brady made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Stuck based on the evidence in the document. Ms. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- d) **Ms. Michele A. Tarshis:** Ms. Tarshis is a licensed independent social worker. In April 2014, Ms. Tarshis resigned her position at an agency without giving proper notice and without terminating her clients. Her actions constitute a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(1) and OAC 4757-5-02(E)(1). Ms. Tarshis admits to these statements. Mr. Hegarty also pointed out that there was no client harm in this case, as the agency stepped in to take care of client referrals. Ms. Tarshis's license is hereby Reprimanded, and she must complete 6 hours of continuing education in ethics. Mr. Polovick made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Ms. Tarshis based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- e) **Mr. Gregory M. Markovich:** Mr. Markovich is a licensed independent social worker. On or about May 20, 2014, Mr. Markovich pled guilty to a charge of patient abuse or neglect; spiritual treatment, and a charge of unlawful restraint, two first degree misdemeanors. As part of his plea agreement, Mr. Markovich agreed to surrender his LISW license. This conviction constitutes a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(7). Mr. Markovich admits to these statements. The Board will allow him to surrender his social work license in lieu of other potential discipline. This surrender is permanent and precludes him from applying for a license through this Board in the future. Ms. Brunner made a motion to accept the consent agreement between the Board and Mr. Markovich based on the evidence in the document. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) **Goldman Reviews**

- a) **Mr. Glenn Stone:** Mr. Polovick moved to revoke Mr. Stone's social work license because he 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. Brunner seconded the motion. Motion carried.
- b) **Ms. Janice A. Lilac-Powell:** Ms. Brunner moved to revoke Ms. Lilac-Powell's social work license because she did not comply with a Board audit for continuing education as required by Ohio Revised Code 4757.36(C)(1) and Ohio Administrative Code 4757-11-01(C)(20)(b). Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c) **Mr. Mark J. Gabor:** On May 22, 2014, the Board issued a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Mr. Gabor. He was provided an opportunity to request a hearing based on the Board's proposal to deny his application for licensure as a social worker because on the date of his application, Mr. Gabor did not possess a qualifying degree in social work as required by OAC 4757-19-01(C)(2)(a). Mr. Polovick motioned to deny the application. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Ms. Brunner argued that since Mr. Gabor did send a written response to the Board, it could be construed as a request for a hearing. A court of appeal could argue that it constitutes a hearing request and that he deserves to be given a hearing with legal counsel, which would be sent back to the Board. Mr. Hegarty stated that based on precedent and consultation with the AAG, he did not view Mr. Gabor's response as a hearing request since at no point did he request a hearing. If the license is denied, he could always request an appeal, or the denial could be tabled and a hearing granted, but either way the evidence is very clear that he does not qualify for a license. Mr. Brady agreed that Mr. Gabor is not licensable. Mr. Polovick and Mr. Brady to deny, Ms. Brunner voted against denial due to procedure allowing for a hearing, but agreed with the substance of the denial. Motion carried.

**d) Notice of Opportunity for Hearing**

**2014-137:** Ms. Brunner made a motion to issue a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Ms. Jennifer Howell. In June 2014, while employed at a mental health agency in Loveland, Ohio, Ms. Howell failed to perform properly as a licensed social worker due to the use of drugs, a violation of ORC 4757.36(C)(6). Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Mr. Polovick asked if the licensee might be eligible for a treatment diversion program in lieu of discipline. Mr. Hegarty responded that she is not since there was client harm. Motion carried.

**4) Old Business**

The SWPSC read over meeting minutes from the Informal Hearing on June 27, and public comments received from licensees, regarding the decision to remove NASW CEU approval. Ms. Brunner suggested a reorientation of the rules, requiring a certain percentage of a licensee's CEU coursework to be in a core social work methods, theories, and skills. Then the various groups involved in the discussion could all draft language on what they think might work, which can then be reviewed by the SWPSC. Mr. Polovick stated that there are two separate issues: 1) whether NASW National was properly monitoring continuing education, and 2) whether the Board is too narrow in approving CEU content. In his opinion, many of the letters received were trying to resolve both issues, and they are separate. He stated that, having been part of this process for the past 5 years, he believes the Board already accepts what's appropriate. CEU providers are asked to elaborate and provide detail on their coursework, would it be helpful to cordon off time for CEUs on the agenda, and allow time for providers to speak with us in person? Ms. Brunner referred to a letter that stated there is a problem with presenters who are not qualified to teach CEUs, which may be the more relevant problem. She asked if language could be written requiring that the instructor be properly credentialed in their field. Ms. Smith stated that NASW already requires qualified

instructors. Mr. Polovick stated that the Board looks at it as a competency issue rather than credentialing; there are no licensed life coaches here in Ohio, but a licensed social worker who has competency in coaching can explain it and provide a CEU on it. Ms. Brunner suggested that if a course is below a certain core percentage of core social work content, then the presenter should need to be a licensee to ensure social work relevancy. Mr. Polovick responded the he was not worried about presenter credentials, he was more concerned with whether the social worker receiving the training is receiving information useful to social work practice, or simply job training required by their HR department.

Ms. Brunner suggested that clear guidelines needed to be provided to NASW National. If the Board could clearly enunciate their needs, NASW could be allowed to provide proposed rule language and be brought into the drafting process. Mr. Polovick responded that NASW has routinely been asking the Board how to repair their relationship, rather than focus on fixing their approval process. Ms. Brunner replied that if the Board doesn't communicate what a "fixed process" looks like, it's going to be had to expect a good result. Mr. Polovick expressed his opinion that the Board shouldn't be working harder than NASW on this issue; if delegation of approval has been granted to NASW, it should be their responsibility to make it work. Ms. Brunner replied that the Board should try to do what's best for licensees; even though public protection is the main mission of the Board, the welfare of licensees must be a consideration. She suggested that if this really is a problem that can't be fixed, then the Board needs to go through a process, and prove absolutely whether or not it can't be fixed. NASW needs to be given a chance to see what they can do, and if they can't fix the problem then the Board is in a better position to revoke approval.

Mr. Brady suggested that the Board could yield a little on content. He agreed that organizations frequently offer courses that are routine trainings, and try to make them appear to be related to social work practice so they can get them approved. In the minutes of the Continuing Education Committee, he noticed that in their approach to content issues they had clear bookends: they had two different extremes of CEUs that they knew were outside of social work practice, and worked within those limits to see what was acceptable. Regarding NASW, the Board has done what it can when working within the rules. If this were a contract, with a start and end date, better guidelines could have been set. He expressed a desire to review the Psychology Board's rules to see how they handle things, since they accept a broader range of CEUs. Mr. Polovick reiterated that he has not been impressed by communications from NASW, that rather than them saying they understand their process is flawed, they keep insisting that the Board is just too narrow in terms of content. Ms. Smith asked if, outside of communication issues, there have been any specific requests made of NASW National that weren't specifically about CEU content. To her, that seemed to be the only issue that's been discussed. There *have* been delays in communication, but all information requested has eventually been provided. Mr. Polovick stressed that his issue is accountability. Ms. Brunner stated that if the Board is receiving heated responses from licensees, which they are, then the rule filing through JCARR will be very difficult.

##### **5) 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. Brunner left the meeting, and Ms. Venrick joined.

**6) Approval of Applications for Licensure**

The SWPSC reviewed the 363 LSW applicants and 135 LISW applicants approved by the staff, and the 9 SWA applicants registered by the staff, from May 14, 2014 through July 16, 2014. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the applicants. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**7) Approval of the May 15 & 16 Minutes**

Mr. Polovick asked if any changes or discussion were needed for the May 15 & 16 minutes. Mr. Brady made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Venrick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**8) Correspondence**

- a) The Board received a letter from a licensee who had taken the exam twice; the first time her exam console crashed and lost her exam, and the second time she failed by one point. She wrote to request that she either be allowed to not take the exam, or that the Board pay for her next test. Mr. Polovick stated that the exam requirement could not possibly be waived, ever, according to the law. He asked about ASWB's procedure in dealing with this situation. Mr. Miller stated that they acted according to their policy, by allowing her to re-take the exam at no cost. Mr. Brady agreed that the law could not be waived. Mr. Polovick stated that the Board has no influence over ASWB policy, and they would be the only ones who can make an exception on exam payment. While the committee sympathized with the licensee, they had nothing to offer her under the law, and asked that she be referred back to ASWB.
- b) Mr. Warne received an email asking if a social worker can take a verbal referral from a doctor for a placement in the next level of care post discharge, such as a skilled nursing facility or home health care. He stated that according to past decisions, a social worker can document a conversation with the doctor in the client record, but cannot take a direct medication order. The email explained the order would be transcribed in the following manner by the social worker "... patient to be placed in skilled nursing facility, telephone order per Dr. William Smith ..." The email stated "... the social workers are not allowed to do this, then at this particular facility they cannot have direct conversation with the physician, this responsibility would fall onto the nurse, as the nurse cannot take a second hand conversation and write it up as an order. Mr. Brady stated that it seemed all right that social workers could take orders from a physician for placement issues because the social worker is working in a multidisciplinary team. The SWPSC, however, does not want social workers practicing medicine without a license. It was agreed that placement is within a social worker's scope of practice, so long as they have competency in it. The SWPSC determined that it would be appropriate for a social worker to take this verbal order from a physician in this situation.

c) The Board received an email from a licensee asking about phototherapy. In this type of therapy, who do the photos belong to? Are they part of the client's file, and if so do they need to be shared with courts if requested? If a therapist also keeps video recordings of these sessions, would they need to be turned over as well? Mr. Brady stated that there are two categories of notes, psychotherapy notes (client chart), and everything else. If a licensee puts the recordings into the general file, then it's something else. Ms. Venrick stated that it also depends on how the subpoena is phrased, if the court just wants the chart or the whole file. If you leave a photo in a file, it's part of that file. Mr. Brady said that he would sometimes have child clients do art therapy, and would either throw away the picture or let them take it home. Ms. Venrick stated that she would put it in the file, and add relevant case notes on the back. Mr. Hegarty stated that the Board's guidelines say records must be maintained for seven years, and "records" can mean everything. Videos can be deleted over time due to record retention rules, but must be retained within the appropriate timeframe. If a court requested a video, and it's part of the file, then it could be subpoenaed. The SWPSC concluded that photos and videos are part of the record, and client consent is also required for taping

9) **Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

**Social Worker Professional Standards Committee (SWPSC) Minutes**  
**Friday, July 18, 2014**

**Members Present:** Mr. Tim Brady, Ms. Jennifer Brunner, Mr. Steve Polovick, Ms. Mary Venrick

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

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

1) **Meeting Called to Order**

Mr. Polovick called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) **Election of New Committee Chair**

Ms. Venrick nominated Mr. Brady to be the new Committee Chairperson. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

### 3) New Business

- a) Mr. Warne stated that the Board sometimes received applications from licensees who were revoked due to CEU audits, and are then able to re-apply after one year under the rules. The question is, can these applications be approved by staff, or should they come to the committee for approval? Mr. Polovick asked how many of these applications the Board receives; Mr. Warne responded that there were not many, and only one currently that he knew of. Mr. Polovick suggested that the applicants should come in for a face-to-face meeting. This would be more punitive, and would set a tone for the situation. Mr. Brady suggested that the current applications could be reviewed by the committee, and if a large number start to come in, then this process can be reviewed at a later date. Mr. Polovick cautioned that this might get the Board into a revolving door situation. More punitive measures would make licensees treat the situation more seriously. Mr. Brady stated that he wanted to handle the applications case by case for now, and the SWPSC can review the need for a rule or policy change later on. Mr. Carr asked how people who never respond to audit requests are disciplined; Mr. Hegarty responded that precedent has been to revoke the license. Mr. Carr recalled a recent medical board case where an appeals court overturned a revocation due to an address issue; he promised to look into it.
- b) Mr. Warne stated that a large number of related degree applicants have been coming in, due to the impending statute change removing related degree eligibility. At that time, there were three applications that were still outstanding but almost complete, and will likely be licensed. Mr. Rough stated that his policy has been that if a person completed everything well before the deadline, but the documents simply haven't been received yet, then leeway has been shown. Mr. Brady asked what would happen if a related degree licensee was revoked and wanted to come back; Mr. Rough stated that they would not be eligible. Mr. Warne stated that for now, staff would be bringing these applicants to the Board if they need to be approved.
- c) Regarding the supervision of Social Work Trainees by an LISW-S, as required by a pending rule change, the Board received an email from Teresa Lampl with the Ohio Council of Behavioral Health & Family Services Providers. She surveyed the community, and found that most SWTs who are performing diagnosis and treatment are already being supervised by an LISW-S. This seems to be common practice, and most schools require it; this lines up with new rules stating that SWTs will need to be supervised by an LISW-S if they're performing social psychotherapy. Mr. Warne explained that this is because the SWT is a registration of training supervision, and the purpose of the LISW-S is to *provide* training supervision. Mr. Brady asked if this is consistent with the other professions. Mr. Miller stated that the CPSC requires an LPCC-S for their CTs, but was not sure what the MFTPSC was planning since they are still drafting rules to create MFT trainees and the IMFT-S. Ms. Smith stated that schools have been told it is board policy to require an LISW-S, so they're mostly already requiring it.
- d) Mr. Warne brought up another issue that had been raised by Ms. Lampl, which has to do with supervision needed to upgrade to an LISW: can it be provided by someone other

than a social worker, if that supervisee is involved in training for evidence-based practice? Social workers are often required to attend these trainings, which can be very intensive, and Ms. Lampl argued that they should receive supervision credit for them. Mr. Rough presented a draft rule which would allow for this; Mr. Warne had expressed an opinion that the language was too broad, and that the number of supervision hours should be specifically limited. Mr. Rough drafted new language samples in response, to be added to 4757-23-01(D)(2):

(2) Employment experience obtained after October 10, 1986, that is required for licensure as an independent social worker, shall be supervised by an independent social worker. Employment experience obtained after September 1, 2008, that is required for licensure as an independent social worker, shall be supervised by an independent social worker with supervision designation, except that supervision received from a licensed professional clinical counselor, an independent marriage and family therapist, a psychologist, a psychiatrist, an individual authorized to practice as a certified nurse practitioner, or clinical nurse specialist under Chapter 4723. of the Revised Code of training for evidenced based practice may be accepted for a portion of the required 150 hours of training supervision as determined by the SWPSC.

Or:

(2) Employment experience obtained after October 10, 1986, that is required for licensure as an independent social worker, shall be supervised by a independent social worker. Employment experience obtained after September 1, 2008, that is required for licensure as an independent social worker, shall be supervised by an independent social worker with supervision designation, except that supervision received from a licensed professional clinical counselor, an independent marriage and family therapist, a psychologist, a psychiatrist, an individual authorized to practice as a certified nurse practitioner, or clinical nurse specialist under Chapter 4723. of the Revised Code of training for evidenced based practice may be accepted for a maximum of 50% of the required 150 hours of training supervision, which means no more than 75 hours of training supervision can be provided by a clinician other than an independent social worker with supervisory designation.

Mr. Warne stated that a question had been sent out through the ASWB to ask other jurisdictions how they handle the issue. A matrix was received from ASWB; they have 60 jurisdictions, and 23 allow for supervision to come from someone other than a social worker, while 13 don't specify, and 8 require extenuating circumstances. A lot of jurisdictions won't accept supervision as substantially equivalent if it wasn't received from a social worker, which is concerning. Mr. Carr stated that many therapists do use a combination of doctrines, combining theory and evidence-based practice. Mr. Brady stated that one issue in this discussion is hardship requests, and the other issue is who may supervise whom.

#### 4) Old Business

- a) Mr. Brady asked if any more discussion was needed on the NASW issue. Ms. Brunner asked, if the Committee wanted to go through with the idea of a task force on this issue, does that responsibility lie with the Board, or does the executive director need to set that up? Mr. Polovick responded that the issue has already been discussed for three years, and he didn't see the need for a task force. Ms. Brunner suggested that NASW approval doesn't have to be all or nothing, that maybe there's another way to carve things up. Mr. Polovick expressed his concern that the decision to give away approval was made much too quickly, that some board members were cautious that if approval was given away it could never be taken back. Issues like this could evolve into creating a large umbrella board that allows social workers no authority over their own profession. Ms. Brunner stressed her opinion that it was important to show the board making one more effort, in the face of the impending JCARR filing. Mr. Carr stated that, as a point of comparison, the psychology board farms out their entire CEU program to the Ohio Psychology Association. They administer the program on behalf of the board, and the board has no veto power at all on courses. Mr. Polovick stated that other states have chosen not to allow NASW approval, and even more have issues. Ms. Brunner stressed the need to run a board that serves the needs of licensed social workers as well as protecting the public.

Ms. Brunner made a motion that the Board develop a relatively small task force made of two members of the Board, two staff members, a member of NASW National, a member of NASW Ohio, and a member of the social work profession, who will try to develop two or three alternative models or proposals to find some resolution to the differences between Ohio and NASW National, to deliberate on this issue for two months, and to withdraw the rule change and re-file at a later date depending on the outcome of the task force. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. Ms. Brunner asked whether appointment of members to the task force would be up to the executive director. Mr. Brady stated that there probably wasn't enough time to wait for volunteers. Mr. Polovick reiterated his opinion that many hours and many phone calls and many meetings have been spent on this issue already. NASW has not been on board with the Committee, and have not made an effort to be. He expressed a desire for a task force that was out of our Board's hands completely, one that would allow independent voices to analyze the problem and make a recommendation to the Board. Ms. Brunner stated that in her experience this process has never worked because there was no common goal to work toward. If NASW National doesn't make an effort to participate in this task force, then the Board has done everything possible, and it would be a reflection on NASW. Mr. Polovick wondered aloud whether giving NASW National back their blanket approval would end all discussions on the expanding role of the social worker, and whether the Board is too narrow on CEU topics, by simply taking away the Board's authority on the topic. Ms. Smith stated that she did not see the conversation as ending. NASW approves a relatively small amount of CEUs; the issue would still remain. Mr. Brady stated that, in his opinion, even if the Board is right back where they started in another two months, the process is still worthwhile. On the proposed motion, Ms. Brunner and Mr. Brady voted aye, Mr. Polovick voted nay. Motion carried.

- b) Mr. Warne asked if the proposed rule filings for 4757-21-03 and 19-05, regarding SWT supervision, were acceptable and should be filed. Mr. Brady stated that with two Committee members missing, and especially since he would like to hear Dr. Brun's thoughts on the subject, it should be tabled for now. Mr. Warne asked if discussion of 4757-23-01, regarding training supervision through evidence based trainings, should also be tabled. Mr. Brady agreed, and asked Ms. Smith her thoughts. Ms. Smith stated that she supports putting a limit on that kind of supervision, but likes the idea overall. She also pointed out that the Board would need to define evidence-based practice training very specifically to make sure everything's right.

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

Mr. Rough discussed the new rule, 4757-1-08, allowing expedited processing for veterans. At first he'd been reluctant to write the rule because he thought it was unnecessary due to language already added to 4757-1-04, but the governor's office told the AAG that a rule needed to be written. This rule would ensure that licenses are issued quickly to applicants who are either active military or recently discharged. Regarding the five year rule review, Mr. Rough asked the committee to review rules 4757-1-05 and 4757-7-03. He reported he was also looking into peer consultation, and re-drafting some language on that possible rule change. He gave an update on the new licensing system, and stated that the Executive Director work plan would be modified based on the Board's planning meeting. Mr. Polovick asked that the Board also discuss issues of attendance. He was concerned with getting the word out that committee members need to commit to attending meetings.

The Committee reviewed the proposed rule filings for 4757-1-05 and 4757-7-03. Ms. Brunner motioned to accept the two rules as written. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Committee reviewed the proposed rule filing for 4757-1-08. Ms. Brunner motioned to accept the rule as written. Mr. Polovick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

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

Ms. Smith discussed a grant NASW Ohio received through the national office to do research on salary levels and educational debt in Ohio. They've received \$3000 to do a survey of licensees, a faculty member has volunteered to perform data analysis. The hope is to complete the survey within 6 months, and have results within 8 months. Questions on county and practice areas are being included so the data can be categorized. Mr. Polovick asked whether they'll be able to discern from the results whether the respondents are licensed and actually practicing in Ohio. Ms. Smith responded that the survey does not ask questions about licensure, only what the respondent's highest degree is.

#### **7) Working Meeting**

The Board resumed its working meeting.

8) **Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.



---

Mr. Tim Brady, Chairperson